

CANADA

HOUSE OF COMMONS DEBATES

OFFICIAL REPORT

SECOND SESSION—TWENTY SIXTH PARLIAMENT

13 ELIZABETH II

VOLUME VII, 1964

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE THIRTEENTH DAY OF AUGUST, 1964,
TO THE ELEVENTH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 1964, INCLUSIVE

INDEX ISSUED IN A SEPARATE VOLUME

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

20220—427½

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, August 13, 1964

The house met at 2 p.m.

TRADE

WHEAT—ANNOUNCEMENT OF SALES TO POLAND AND BULGARIA

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian wheat board is announcing in Winnipeg today that it has negotiated contracts for the sale of approximately 200,000 metric tons of wheat for shipment to Poland and 50,000 metric tons of wheat for shipment to Bulgaria. The sale to Poland, totalling about 7,400,000 bushels, is for shipment during the period August to November, 1964. This is the third sale made to Poland under the provisions of the long term agreement signed on November 5, 1963, and represents a preshipment of part of the wheat Poland has agreed to buy during the second year of the three year agreement.

The sale to Bulgaria, totalling about 1,800,000 bushels, is for shipment during the period August to October, 1964. This also is the third sale made to Bulgaria under the provisions of the long term agreement signed on October 8, 1963, and completes the quantities Bulgaria has agreed to buy during the first year of the three year agreement. The credit terms remain as previously announced.

[*Later:*]

[*Translation*]

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I have a question I should like to ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

In view of the statement he made a moment ago, could the minister tell us whether efforts similar to those made to dispose of western wheat are being made to sell the products of eastern farmers and, if so, what are those efforts?

[*Text*]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, the Department of Trade and Commerce has the responsibility for promoting the export sale of products in all parts of the country. This, I think, we do with some success. If the hon. gentleman has some export product he would like to promote, my department would be very happy to listen to him.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, again to the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Even though there are no specific products I would care to mention at this time, could the minister not put on his list of exports the products which eastern farmers have in abundance and cannot dispose of due to a lack of outlets?

[*Text*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

CYPRUS—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON PRESENT SITUATION

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, is the Secretary of State for External Affairs in a position now to advise as to the present situation in regard to the Cyprus United Nations forces? Are additional powers to be secured to enable the forces to go anywhere on the island with the exception of government buildings and, furthermore, to enable them to disarm the local population where the United Nations commanders feel it is necessary so to do in the interests of preserving peace?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated yesterday there is to be a meeting of the secretary general and representatives of the contributing powers in New York today. The meeting is scheduled for four o'clock this afternoon and I would have to wait until that meeting is over, either today, or tomorrow, if it continues. In any event, I would simply repeat that so far as any extension of powers is concerned this is a matter, of course, that can only be determined by the security council. After that body reaches a decision it would then be a matter for agreement between the secretary

general, on behalf of the organization, and the government of Cyprus.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Has there been any indication on the part of Archbishop Makarios that he would accept an increase in those powers? I ask that question in view of an editorial that appeared in the Manchester *Guardian* of August 12 which reads in part as follows:

> —there is no longer any reason for maintaining the United Nations force in Cyprus in its present impossible position. President Makarios should be told bluntly that if the United Nations forces are to do their job properly—

It goes on to say that they must be allowed these extra powers. Has there been any indication in any way that he is prepared to permit an increase in the powers?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, he has already replied, of course, to the secretary general with regard to freedom of movement. Beyond that there has been no reaction, that I am aware of, concerning the attitude he would take with regard to extending the powers of the force. I saw the editorial and I might say I would doubt that was the way to achieve the objective we all have in mind.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Are any representations being made to Archbishop Makarios by the secretary general of the United Nations or by the minister himself as to removing the provisos which are contained in his letter with regard to his willingness to grant freedom of movement to the United Nations forces? I refer particularly to the proviso that the United Nations forces may only go into certain restricted areas after consultation between the government of Cyprus and the commander in chief of the United Nations forces. It is perfectly apparent that during the period of negotiation between the commander in chief and the government of Cyprus, troops and supplies could be unloaded and there would be little value in investigating after that.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, this, of course, is one of the very subject matters of the meeting today; but I have been advised that, notwithstanding the reservation made by the head of the government of Cyprus, General Thimayya has in no instance been refused access to those areas that the government of Cyprus have in their recent communications regarded as secret places.

[Mr. Martin (Essex East).]

Mr. Douglas: May I ask a supplementary question. Were the United Nations forces not precluded from entering the Limassol area and other points of disembarkation? Is this ban to be lifted by the government of Cyprus?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I expect this will be one of the matters discussed today.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Barry Mather (New Westminster): I have a question I should like to ask the Minister of National Defence. Is it correct, as reported on the radio news today, that a new contingent of Canadian peace keeping troops has left this country for Cyprus?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): A very small contingent did leave this morning; it is really integral with the units which are already there.

CONGO—CANADIAN ASSISTANCE TO MAINTAIN STABLE GOVERNMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs concerning the situation in the Congo. In view of the fact that the governments of Belgium and the United States have taken definite action to provide assistance to the government of the Congo for the development of stability in that country, has the Canadian government made any decision regarding assistance in a similar fashion?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Some time ago, Mr. Speaker, the government of Canada took a decision to join in contributions to a special Congo fund. Our contribution this year will be in the neighbourhood of $500,000. This was an earlier contribution, but beyond this we have not gone. I should point out that in relation to other countries this was a generous contribution.

RECOGNITION OF QUEBEC DELEGATION IN PARIS

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Maurice Côté (Chicoutimi): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs?

In view of the fact that, if I am not mistaken, the right hon. Prime Minister once stated with much sympathy that "Quebec had the same right to be in Paris as the other provinces to be in London", could the Secretary of State for External Affairs now say

whether the Quebec delegation in Paris will have the same privileges which are granted to general consulates?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I think that question is based on a statement made the other day by Mr. Lussier. I had the opportunity to read in yesterday's *Le Devoir* the report dealing with that statement by Mr. Lussier, Quebec general delegate in Paris. That matter has been under consideration for some time and our ambassador in Paris has already begun considering it with the French authorities. I hope, in the near future, to be in a position to announce that a solution consistent with the needs of the Quebec general delegation in Paris and with our excellent relations with France, was found to that problem.

[*Text*]

POWER

PASSAMAQUODDY—REQUEST FOR REPORT ON NEGOTIATIONS WITH U.S.

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): I think this question should be directed to the Prime Minister since it covers at least two departments. It has to do with evidence given yesterday before a United States Senate committee by Secretary Udall in connection with the Passamaquoddy-Saint John river power project. According to newspaper reports this evidence is to the effect that Canadian officials should be encouraged by the new report.

Is the Prime Minister in a position to say if the government has conducted negotiations or at the present moment is engaged in consultations with the United States on this project? Has the government had the report from the committee now sitting in Washington to which reference was made by Mr. Udall? Is the government giving sympathetic consideration to this question on the basis not only of the report to congress but the examination being made by Canadian fisheries officials?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): There is at present an examination going on by Canadian officials and technicians as to the feasibility of this project. There have been no discussions with the United States on this matter recently, and there will not likely be until this examination is completed. I saw the report of Secretary Udall to which my right hon. friend refers and, like him, I would be very much encouraged by that report if it turns out to be accurate in the light of engineering and technical examination. We are making inquiries on this report to see if we can get the evidence on which it was based.

Mr. Diefenbaker: And would the Prime Minister, having secured that report, make a statement to the house during the next few days in this regard?

Mr. Pearson: I shall be glad to make a statement, Mr. Speaker, as soon as we get that information.

EDUCATION

STUDENT LOANS—INQUIRY AS TO PARTICIPATION BY ALBERTA

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, the other day I asked the Prime Minister a question concerning some doubts that had been raised about the participation of the province of Alberta in the student loan fund, and he indicated at that time that he would be seeing the premier of the province. I understand that has happened, and I ask if he can clarify or remove these doubts with regard to this particular subject.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I did have a conference with the premier of Alberta yesterday. He did not raise this subject at all; therefore in a sense that is a clarification.

COMBINES

DELAY IN ACTION ON REPORTS OF COMMISSION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. W. Prittie (Burnaby-Richmond): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Justice. My question relates not only to the recent report of the restrictive trade practices commission concerning collusion by Ontario road surfacing contractors but to the fact that there is a growing list of such reports upon which the Department of Justice has taken no action. Will the minister undertake to make a statement to the house soon concerning these several recommendations of the commission?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Yes, Mr. Speaker, subject to my mentioning now that these reports are presently under consideration to ascertain what, if any, action ought to be taken in furtherance thereof.

Inquiries of the Ministry

CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENT METHOD AT DOMINION-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE

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 subject of finding a way in which to amend the Canadian constitution in Canada been placed on the agenda for the meeting of the federal government with the provinces in Charlottetown early in September; and can the Prime Minister tell us anything further with regard to this matter at this time?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I think I have already announced that this is a matter which will be discussed at Charlottetown at the federal-provincial meeting, although that meeting will be primarily ceremonial in character to commemorate the one hundredth anniversary of the Charlottetown conference. This is the only matter on the agenda at the moment, and it will be discussed there.

Mr. Knowles: As a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, if agreement is reached to arrange for the constitution to be amended in Canada, will the necessary enactment be made in another country or will it be made in Canada as a sign of our sovereignty.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I am sure it will have to be made in the proper constitutional way. I would like to look into the matter to find out what that way is, and perhaps I could say something about it tomorrow.

TRADE

JAPAN—CONTROL OF FABRIC EXPORTS TO CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, I address my question to the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Trade and Commerce, depending on which minister is in charge of the negotiations I have in mind. Can the minister now inform the house on the results of negotiations with the government of Japan relating to their exports of certain classes of textiles to Canada?

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I had a similar question the other day and I promised to give a statement to the house as soon as I was in a position to do so. I am not yet in a position to do so.

Mr. Grafftey: A supplementary question. Could the minister tell the house whether the government of Japan have informed the Canadian government that they cannot enforce a formal agreed quota in this regard, but that they will not allow their exports to rise beyond 20 per cent above last year's figure?

Mr. Gordon: I will make a full statement on this matter at the beginning of the week, if I possibly can.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

TRANSFER OF JURISDICTION OVER NATIONAL EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Pictou): I wonder whether the Minister of Labour is now in a position to answer a question I put to his parliamentary secretary on Tuesday regarding the transfer of the national employment service from the unemployment insurance commission to the Department of Labour.

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): Yes. The transfer will be effected just as soon as a parliamentary decision is taken on an item in the supplementary estimates which will provide legal authority for such a transfer.

BRITISH COLUMBIA—EMPLOYMENT OF SOCIAL WELFARE RECIPIENTS ON WINTER WORKS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour regarding the winter works incentive program and the recent decision of the government of British Columbia. In the letter which has been sent to all municipalities in British Columbia, of which the minister has a copy, there is a sentence which says that "the provincial share of the winter works incentive program will be directed solely toward helping those people who have been unemployed and on social assistance for a period of three months or more."

Does this mean that no winter works programs will be approved unless the persons employed thereon have been three months or more on social aid, or does it mean that the provincial and federal governments will have a different sharing arrangement in the programs where there are other

persons employed who have not been on social aid for three months or more?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I read that particular sentence and the same question occurred to me. I think it is somewhat ambiguous. I do not know whether the second part of the sentence is intended to include a different category or whether the second part of the sentence is related to the unemployed. I am not sure on that point, but in any case the programs put forward for federal participation are provincially approved, and the type of program hitherto has been a matter for provincial decision. We as the federal government have made no alteration whatsoever in the regulations governing the programs. We have, as my hon. friend realizes, always asked that preference be given to the unemployed in the matter of hirings, and this would include persons in receipt of unemployment insurance and also those in receipt of unemployment assistance.

Mr. Douglas: A supplementary question. Could the minister get some clarification of this matter, because I should like to know whether persons who are in receipt of unemployment insurance rather than those on welfare will be employed. Does this preclude a municipality from benefiting under the winter works incentive program unless social welfare recipients are employed? A great many are concerned on this point.

Mr. MacEachen: The federal government naturally will provide 50 per cent of the direct payroll costs without strings attached, as we have in the past. In British Columbia they have had a graduated system of bringing the provincial participation up to 100 per cent of direct payroll costs. I will be glad to try to get clarification of this point, because we will need clarification from our own point of view.

Mr. Douglas: A further supplementary question. Is any proviso or condition imposed by the provincial governments precluding municipalities from benefiting from the arrangement by which 50 per cent of the payroll cost is paid by the federal government?

Mr. MacEachen: Except that these projects, as I understand it, must be approved and submitted on behalf of the municipalities through provincial governments. In other words the first stage of approval is provincial approval, and then it comes through the federal government. In that sense, of course, these projects are a matter for provincial decision.

Mr. Douglas: Could I ask the minister whether that would still be true even if the provinces were to impose impossible conditions?

Mr. MacEachen: That is something we would have to consider, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Comox-Alberni.

Mr. Barnett: My question has already been asked and answered, Mr. Speaker.

FISHERIES

NEWFOUNDLAND—REQUEST FOR FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR FISHERMEN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. R. Tucker (Trinity-Conception): May I direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries. In view of the poor salmon, lobster and cod fisheries in Newfoundland to date this year, would the minister advise whether his department would consider assisting our fishermen in the same way that assistance has been given to our farmers when they have experienced crop failures?

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): While the lobster catch in Newfoundland this year may have been slightly below the average, the figures for the salmon season have not yet been fully compiled and I would not wish to comment before we have the final results. It is true that the cod fishery has not started very well, but my information is that in recent days it has shown an encouraging improvement, and my department would not be justified in considering any type of direct assistance before the final figures for the season are known.

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Auguste Choquette (Lotbinière): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Works and ask him whether the air conditioning in this chamber has been cut off in the hope that this will have the effect of shortening the Conservative filibuster on the flag.

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): I will take the question as notice.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

REQUEST FOR ANSWER TO QUESTION ON ORDER PAPER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): I should like to ask the Minister of Justice

when I may expect an answer to my question No. 1,494 dealing with alleged wire tapping by the R.C.M.P. in Toronto, which was placed on the order paper a month ago.

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): The answer has been prepared, and it will be made available to the hon. member the next time questions are called.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

REPORTED STATEMENT BY MINISTER RESPECTING INTEGRATION OF SERVICES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): I have a question for the Minister of National Defence. Has the minister any explanation to give to the house concerning his recently reported statement to the effect that his plans for the integration of the armed services cannot be implemented within two years but will be delayed indefinitely?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Yes. It was an inaccurate quotation. The Canadian Press inaccurately reported what I said. I believe they have sent out a "kill" on that story and issued the correct story.

Mr. Churchill: Could we have the correct story here, instead of being dependant on the press; because we like to hear from the minister?

Mr. Hellyer: I do not like to be repetitious, bearing in mind the rules of this house.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): I think the house would excuse the hon. gentleman being repetitious. This is information to which we are entitled. The view has been expressed and widely disseminated that he said integration would not be completed within two years but would take a very considerably longer period. What did the minister say? Let him tell us so that we do not have to depend on the uncertainties of the press.

Mr. Hellyer: I will send my right hon. friend a transcript of the entire broadcast.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I must say to my hon. friend that my time would be much better spent otherwise.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I must say that I find this announcement by the Minister of National Defence, but with the minister refusing to give the house what he has given to the press, amounts to a denial of the rights of hon. members of this house. This matter affects us directly, and I do not think these statements should be given to us through any leaky bucket.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Speaker, on the same question of privilege, I have already said—and if I did not make it clear I will do so now—that there was no new information in the broadcast, and that what appeared to be new information was an incorrect report.

INQUIRY AS TO RECOVERY OF STOLEN ARMS AND AMMUNITION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence arising out of the fact that activities are now being carried on in Montreal by some young people claiming to be members of the reborn F.L.Q. I would ask the minister whether he is now prepared to answer the question I asked him on May 7 as to whether all the arms which were recovered are in fact the total amount of arms stolen from the armouries in Montreal earlier this year.

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer the question from memory. I think practically all of them were recovered, but I will take the question as notice and give my hon. friend a precise answer tomorrow.

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): A supplementary question to the Minister of Justice. Could the Minister of Justice inform the house whether in his view alien influences are behind the activities of these individuals in question?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I would have to take this question as notice.

EQUALIZATION OF PAY FOR PREVAILING RATES EMPLOYEES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. Nasserden (Rosthern): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Associate Minister of National Defence in regard to the urgency of the situation of prevailing rate employees at the Dana R.C.A.F. station. Is he in a position to answer the question I asked the Minister of National Defence yesterday?

Hon. Lucien Cardin (Associate Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, as there are prevailing rate employees in departments other than the Department of National Defence I have referred the question to my colleague the President of the Privy Council.

REPAIRS TO NAVAL SHIP SOLD TO TORONTO GROUP

On the orders of the day:

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon. member for Port Arthur asked on whose authority work was being carried out on the former H.M.C.S. ship *Haida* at Halifax dockyard. The answer, Mr. Speaker, is on the authority of the Minister of National Defence. The work involved the return to the ship of various articles of furniture and equipment, which were removed at the time *Haida* was taken out of service, for the purpose of restoring it to world war II fighting appearance. All items placed on board are surplus to Royal Canadian Navy requirements.

Haida was purchased by a group of public spirited Canadians who intend to maintain the ship as a national monument in the city of Toronto, and the Department of National Defence in these circumstances was happy to lend every possible assistance.

I am informed that the estimated cost of returning the equipment on board *Haida* was in the order of $1,600.

PENSIONS OF PERMANENT STAFF COMPULSORILY RETIRED

On the orders of the day:

Mr. S. J. Enns (Portage-Neepawa): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Defence. I would ask him whether it is correct that military personnel on permanent staff—I am referring only to permanent staff individuals—are being asked to retire prior to reaching their normal retirement age; and if so, are they being penalized by being asked to accept reduced pensions as a result?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, as has already been announced there will be a number of involuntary retirements in advance of the normal compulsory retirement age. These will be effected during the months that lie ahead. There are special cash benefits to whose who are so retired, and in addition the normal penalty in respect of pension benefit has been waived. This will apply to all those who are compulsorily retired between now and a year from next May.

PROVISION OF NUCLEAR MISSILES TO CANADIAN FORCES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Defence. Is the situation unchanged in Canada's defence preparations, namely that no nuclear arms have been provided for the Voodoo planes in Canada, no nuclear missiles for the Honest John battery with the Canadian brigade in Europe, and that most of the Canadian F-104 airplanes in Europe are not equipped with either nuclear or conventional weapons?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I have had no notice of this question, but from memory I can say that the Bomarc missiles have been armed; the F-104 squadrons in the strike role—six squadrons, two wings in Germany—are operational; the Voodoo aircraft have not yet been armed with nuclear missiles. I am afraid I cannot give an answer as of this date with respect to the Honest John, although the missiles were not available the last time I made a check.

NEGOTIATIONS TO WITHDRAW FROM NUCLEAR DEFENCE ROLE

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether I might ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs what negotiations are in progress with respect to Canada withdrawing entirely from her nuclear role, as promised a year and a half ago by the Prime Minister.

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I do not believe I can answer that question any better—

Mr. Churchill: Any better than you did before—and you didn't answer then.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): —than I answered it some time ago. I would ask my hon. friend to look at the answer I gave several weeks ago.

Mr. Churchill: I did look at that answer, and it was a very evasive one. The minister did not have any notice then, either, and was taken by surprise. I understand there are

no negotiations whatsoever going on with regard to Canada's withdrawal from the nuclear role. Is that correct?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, I cannot be responsible for my hon. friend's understanding; but I believe he will want to look at the reply, and if he is not satisfied with it I will be glad to take this question as notice. I am sure that he, more than most members of this house, would agree there are some questions that are so important that they should be asked only on the understanding that notice is given.

Mr. Churchill: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is this not one of the most important problems that face the government of the day, in view of the promise that was made such a long time ago and in view of the international tension that prevails?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, I fully agree it is one of those questions, and that is why it should not be put so cavalierly by way of a question without notice.

AGRICULTURE

QUEBEC—ASSISTANCE TO MAPLE SYRUP PRODUCERS

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre-André Boutin (Dorchester): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Forestry and "rural development". Could he tell the house whether he received favourable replies to the letters he sent to the minister of agriculture of the province of Quebec in regard to the assistance to be provided to the maple sugar and maple syrup producers who have been requesting such assistance because of last spring's crop failure?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture has written to Hon. Alcide Courcy, minister of agriculture of the province of Quebec, but I do not know whether or not an answer was received.

[*Text*]

PREVENTION OF SPECULATION IN FEED GRAIN FOR EASTERN FARMERS

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm, who was shocked that the Minister of Forestry took some holidays but who chose to do the same, I would like to ask the Minister of Forestry what are the steps he intends to take in order to prevent speculation on feed grain to be supplied principally to eastern farmers?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): Mr. Speaker, the measures which were announced last year, as well as that which I announced some weeks ago, will prevent this possible speculation.

[*Text*]

ARDA—REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF SURVEY IN QUEBEC

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Forestry.

In view of the success of the survey conducted by his department jointly with the Quebec department of agriculture with regard to ARDA, is the minister in a position to state that his department will soon undertake, again in conjunction with the provincial department, a similar survey in the Saguenay-Lake St. John district, in order to find solutions to existing problems?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member is referring to the report tabled in the house a month ago by the Minister of Agriculture.

As far as I know it has not been decided to proceed with this type of survey for the moment.

Mr. Clément Vincent (Nicolet-Yamaska): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a supplementary question to the Minister of Forestry.

Can he tell us whether he will talk to the Minister of Agriculture about the possibility of publishing the report also in French?

Mr. Sauvé: This report is now at the bureau for translations and I hope that it will be tabled in French in the near future.

Mr. Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a supplementary question to the Minister of Forestry.

Could he tell us whether he intends to bring pressure to bear on his colleagues so that the survey will cover the other areas where problems cry for a solution? I am thinking, of course, of the Saguenay-Lake St. John area where a study like the one carried out in Gaspé is needed.

Does the minister propose to act along that line?

Mr. Sauvé: Mr. Speaker, the survey mentioned by the hon. member was a pilot study. We are considering the possibility of continuing along that line but no decision has been taken as yet.

[*Text*]

PENITENTIARIES

PROPOSED LOCATION OF NEW WOMEN'S PRISON

On the orders of the day:

Mr. George Muir (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice. In view of the many representations which have been received in regard to retaining the women's prison at Kingston, where it is adjacent to research and rehabilitation services, would the minister assure the house that no decision is being made to move the prison from that area?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I have already said that the matter was still open and that no formal or final decision had been taken.

SPORTS

OLYMPIC GAMES—EXPENSES OF GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In view of the announcement that the hon. member for York West will officially represent Canada at the Olympic games in Tokyo later this year, will the minister inform the house whether his expenses will be included in the sum of $122,905 provided by her department for sending Canadian athletes to Tokyo in October?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): No, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will go in my place as representative of the government, and the cost of his visit will be part of my ministerial expenses.

AIRPORTS

TORONTO—MEETING RESPECTING MONOPOLY OF TAXI SERVICE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Ralph Cowan (York-Humber): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Transport but in his absence I will direct it to his parliamentary secretary. On page 5 of the metro edition of this morning's Toronto *Globe and Mail* there is a report that the president of Air Terminal Transport Limited of Malton intends to meet officials of the Toronto taxi industry as requested by the Minister of Transport. The report continues that the president hinted he would not help the Toronto taxi industry at this meeting. Is this the spirit in which the Minister of Transport desires the meeting to be held?

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I feel quite sure that it would be the hope of the Minister of Transport that any such meeting would be conducted in a spirit of complete co-operation.

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Speaker, I should like to raise this matter at 10.30 tonight.

LABOUR RELATIONS

MARITIME UNION TRUSTEES—APPEARANCE BEFORE PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. M. Fisher (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the house leader what arrangements he has made with the Minister of Labour and the chairman of the industrial relations committee to carry out what is in effect an undertaking by the trustees to appear before this parliamentary committee, and the undertaking by the Minister of Labour that this meeting would be proceeded with.

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, the matter is under consideration.

CANADIAN FLAG

OFFICIAL ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW DESIGN

The house resumed, from Wednesday, August 12, consideration of the motion by Mr. Pearson:

> 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 the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Diefenbaker.

Mr. G. D. Clancy (Yorkton): Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief in concluding the remarks which I began yesterday. I would like to summarize what I said. I have no

intention of trying to prolong this debate, but I would like to look back on what I said. It is very seldom that a member of this house has the chance to read over what he said the previous evening. However, I would like to restate my basic position as an individual and as a member who I think can speak for a fair number of his constituents. I object to the way the flag problem has been brought in; I object to the design; I object to the way we have been told "Accept it or have it shoved down your throat."

Before two o'clock I met a group of young people travelling through Canada; I rushed down to the court house to watch some new Canadians receiving their citizenship. These people who became Canadians today at 3.30 are just as good Canadians as I am, because the number of generations does not mean anything. What in the world have we got today? Why would the government bring up something that is going to split the nation wide open? I did not believe what my grandfather told me and I do not expect my grandsons to believe the prejudices I teach them, because they would be awfully stupid boys if they did. All right. We are one country. Let us face it. We have enough segregation today. We have it right across the country. There has to be a little compromise. If the Canadian people want a new flag, as a Canadian I say yes; but you show me which flag they want.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Clancy: I am not asking you. I know you fellows are in the position where you are going to do it.

Mr. Grafftey: Under compulsion in some cases.

Mr. Clancy: You are going to shove it down our throats. All I want is to be able to say to my people that I have put up my argument and have said what I think about it. I am not going to hold up the business of the house over an issue which is a disgrace to the Prime Minister. You cannot do this if you want unity. I want that fellow who became a citizen at three o'clock today to be as proud of this country as I am, and you will only do it by—

An hon. Member: The maple leaf.

Mr. Clancy: Mr. Speaker, I heard a member down at that end say to his leader "We can make some political hay out of this, all right." We are Canadians. Let us be Canadians first, last and always. If you split us now it will take 30 years to get us back together again. You will have to start another war, and nobody wants that war.

Mr. Douglas: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, the last speaker waved his arms toward this end of the house and said that some member down here had said to his leader, "We can make political hay out of this". He did not name the party. There are three parties in this corner of the house, and I want to make it perfectly clear that he was not referring to the New Democratic party.

Hon. H. J. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on the flag resolution submitted to the house by the Prime Minister and on the amendment now before us proposed by my leader, the Leader of the Opposition, I continue to be impressed by the wisdom of the amendment. It calls for reference of the question of an official national flag to the people of Canada by way of a plebiscite. I am impressed by its language. It is my opinion that its basic premise is very proper and very much justified, and its recommendation of appropriate action deserves and should have the utmost consideration by every member of the house.

In order that the amendment will be fresh in my mind, and I hope other hon. members feel likewise, I should like to quote it since in my opinion there are various aspects which require careful and thoughtful consideration. So, Mr. Speaker, the amendment reads as follows:

> As the proposal to change Canada's national flag will affect—

I draw the attention of hon. members to the words "will affect".

> —the unity and destiny of Canada now and for years to come, the government be authorized to take such steps as may be necessary to conduct a plebiscite prior to any further action being taken by the House of Commons, in order that all Canadians may be given their rightful opportunity to declare their choice concerning a national flag.

There surely is no difference of opinion in this chamber with respect to the fact that the proposal to change Canada's national flag will affect the unity and destiny of Canada now and for years to come. It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, and I say this most advisedly, that it will adversely affect the unity of Canada. I assert here and now that it is not possible to affect the unity of Canada adversely without having the destiny of Canada adversely affected as well.

I come now to the question of the plebiscite itself. Before proceeding to discuss this

phase of the matter I submit that the many assertions made in this chamber and elsewhere that we do not have a distinctive Canadian flag at the present time do not stand the test of careful examination. In this connection I would ask the house to note that it is not what I say but it is what the order in council says, and the order in council of 1945 sets out the authority.

It is a well known principle of law that usage, consent and possession over the years bring about a degree of moral and even legal claim. Twenty years is the period with regard to the law of ownership by possession. We have had this order in council in effect since 1945, 19 years, and we find that in that same order in council the year 1924 was mentioned as well. So we have the order in council of 1945 authorizing the use of the Canadian red ensign and using the words "wherever place or occasion may make it desirable to fly a distinctive Canadian flag". It places the label "distinctive" upon the Canadian red ensign without any question. There is no doubt about it.

But this government is not prepared to take the judgment of Right Hon. Mackenzie King, the leader of the Liberal party in 1945 and the leader of this country for many years. They are not willing to accept that. They say we have no distinctive flag, and with that I do not agree. I might also refer to the remarks of the hon. member for Calgary North last night who quoted from *Hansard* of 1904, 60 years ago, to show that at that time they were talking about the Canadian red ensign flying from the flagpole on top of this building. Yet the government still tries to deny that the Canadian red ensign is the distinctive flag of Canada.

Because the order in council is not long I am going to quote it. The order in council with respect to the Canadian red ensign is P.C. 5888 and reads as follows:

Order in council re use of Canadian red ensign

P.C. 5888

At the Government House at Ottawa

Wednesday, the 5th day of September, 1945

Present:

His Excellency the Governor General in council:

Whereas the Right Honourable W. L. Mackenzie King, the Prime Minister, reports that by order in council P.C. 134 of January 26th, 1924, authority is given for displaying the red ensign with the shield of the coat of arms of Canada in the fly (commonly known as "the Canadian red ensign") on suitable occasions from all buildings owned or occupied by the Canadian government and situated without Canada;

That the Canadian red ensign was employed by Canadian forces during the present war; and

That, until such time as action is taken by parliament for the formal adoption of a national flag—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): I continue:

—it is desirable to authorize the flying of the Canadian red ensign on federal government buildings within as well as without Canada, and to remove any doubt as to the propriety of flying the Canadian red ensign wherever place or occasion may make it desirable to fly a distinctive Canadian flag.

Now applaud that if you want to.

Therefore, His Excellency the Governor General in council, on the recommendation of the Prime Minister, is pleased to order and doth hereby order that the red ensign with the shield of the coat of arms of Canada in the fly (hereinafter referred to as the "Canadian red ensign") may be flown from buildings owned or occupied by the federal government within and without Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the first duty of this government in presenting this resolution to this house is to rescind that order in council before they introduce any other resolution which in effect discards and destroys the flag authorized by the order in council of a Liberal government and recognizes the Canadian flag since 1945 by order of a committee of parliament known as the cabinet. In 1964 the Liberal cabinet does not even bother to rescind that order in council passed by another Liberal government in 1945. Apparently they wish to ignore that fact, Mr. Speaker.

I submit that the resolution standing in the name of the Prime Minister is incomplete. It would appear to me that it should have a preamble to this effect: "Whereas the Prime Minister and government have decided to disregard, discard and destroy the Canadian red ensign which has been recognized as the distinctive flag of Canada for many years, formalized by order in council of September 5, 1945 as the distinctive Canadian flag, now therefore be it resolved"—then the resolution standing in the name of the Prime Minister could have followed.

The amendment to this resolution is one which everyone who wishes to be equitable, reasonable and patriotic should support. It recognizes the principle of democracy; it recognizes the right of all Canadians to have a voice in the selection of a national flag. It recognizes the need for union, unity and united action. It recognizes concern for the destiny of Canada. What could be more important? What could be more appropriate?

Now I leave this particular phase of the question, and I refer to the resolution which

asks us to accept a certain design. I do not accept it. I hope the majority of the house do not. It stands for nothing by way of history and tradition. It discards the past and I submit has no appeal for the future.

I leave this point of the design for the moment and refer again to the plebiscite. I say, Mr. Speaker, that this parliament has no mandate to scrap the red ensign and choose a new national flag, the design of which is generally conceded to have been chosen by one man. Here we are, 265 representatives in this chamber, being pressured by the government to discard the flag which we have been using for many years and to vote, yes or no, on the alternative design which the Prime Minister selects. Then the Prime Minister and the government inject the question of the choice of a national flag right into the realm of partisan politics when the Prime Minister states that the government is prepared to stand or fall on the acceptance of this resolution. It must be accepted or the house is dissolved and a new parliament is elected.

This simply means that every supporter of the government will vote for it as a matter of party loyalty, unless he or she has the necessary intestinal fortitude to stand for principle rather than party and refuse to be a slave to party discipline on a matter so vital to Canada and to his conscience. There will be very few government supporters who will meet this test. There is no need for this test to be imposed. There is no need for anyone to have to make such a decision, as I will explain later.

In the meantime I continue my argument that this parliament has no mandate to choose a national flag. I base this assertion on the fact that a majority of 265 members is 133 members, and these members are asked by the government to take the responsibility for selecting a flag which will be a symbol recognized and revered, I hope, by 19 million people. This works out exactly, Mr. Speaker, to seven people per million, because seven times nineteen makes 133. Let us think this over. Should we let seven persons per million of population choose the flag for any country? This is the question I want answered here. This is the ridiculous situation with which we are confronted today, and we never should have been asked to face it.

Who is to blame? Well, the Prime Minister is, because the resolution is in his name. Generally speaking the Liberal party is to blame as well, since there will be only a few people who will put principle ahead of party. I realize the government may argue that this was an issue in the last election. I submit it was not; not in any general way, in any event. The Prime Minister says it was promised, and perhaps that is so. Where was it promised? I say it was not emphasized, it was not even a major plank in the Liberal platform. In my constituency of Victoria-Carleton I do not recall having heard a word about it, and my opponent never mentioned it once. I have no doubt many members can make similar statements. I repeat that we have no right to arbitrarily decide upon a new national flag and discard or destroy the Canadian red ensign in the process.

Even allowing, Mr. Speaker, that there may have been a minor mention of it made in the election, the important factor is the Prime Minister did not secure a majority of the votes cast or a majority of the seats in this country. This is a minority government, and it has no mandate to proceed with such a tremendous change simply on the basis of a majority vote in parliament. The Prime Minister must know and the government must know that this change, the design, is not acceptable to a large percentage of the people of Canada. In my opinion it is not acceptable to the majority of the people of Canada. However, the government proposes to have us swallow this design. Then, they say, if you do swallow it and comply with our wishes we will let you have a few days off to spend with your wives and families in your constituencies. I cannot and I will not accept this proposition.

The Prime Minister says he is committed. I do not agree that he is, in the light of the arguments previously advanced. I say to him even if he were committed he should put Canada before commitments unwisely made in the heat of an election campaign. He should explain, and he should refrain. To carry out unwise commitments is the negation of duty. He should not force a design upon the people of Canada in view of the large number of people, I believe a majority, who do not favour its acceptance.

I have another argument to present. A change such as is contemplated by this resolution is not, generally speaking, made by the majority in any assembly. If we examine the situation in the United States in connection with amendments to the constitution, or more recently the motion stopping debate on civil rights legislation, I submit we will find that questions of that nature, which are in the same general category as the flag issue in Canada, are decided only by a two thirds majority. Surely we will acknowledge that

changing the flag of a country is equally as important as these things I have mentioned.

How should the question be dealt with? I can tell you, Mr. Speaker. The amendment proposed by the right hon. Leader of the Opposition is the way to deal with it. The Prime Minister would be given great respect by all Canadians should he present his resolution as a request only for an opinion of the house rather than as a motion on which the government is prepared to stand or fall, to stake its life and the existence of this parliament. There are other ways. There is the matter of a joint committee of the House of Commons and the Senate. There is the question of examination. This is too important a matter to be relegated to the realm of partisan politics and decided on that basis. It is not fair; it is not right; it should not be done. There is no question about that.

I have some quotations concerning a plebiscite, which I would like to read. They are all in favour of a plebiscite, and the first one appeared in the *Telegraph-Journal* of May 23, 1964, written by Mrs. Jean Sweet, an outstanding woman of Saint John, New Brunswick. Her arguments favouring a plebiscite are so impressive that I would like to put them on the record:

> 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 loyalties—even misplaced loyalties—man is nothing but a drifting derelict.
>
> Millions of Canadians grew up as I did in the frendly 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 Col. 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'm 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?
>
> This is a matter not for one man, one party or one government to decide. This is a matter for a clearcut vote, a national plebiscite of citizens' votes—apart from any party affiliation whatsoever. It is a matter where every citizen has a right to cast his vote for the issue—and not for the party, the man next door, the boss or any dictatorial group with whom he must identify himself.
>
> Such a vote should be protected in every way possible from any pressures or interference. It should be most clearly stated on the ballot, beyond any possibility of misunderstanding or confusion.
>
> It seems certain that many of our new citizens, those who chose Canada and all it stands for—

—and a few minutes ago the hon. member for Yorkton referred to them as having taken the oath—

> —when they sought refuge from other lands, must favour the flag they chose and to which they have so recently sworn allegiance.
>
> As for me...I am just one unimportant citizen (there are millions of us unimportant citizens or there would be no nation)...but without the flag that I was taught to respect from earliest years, I should no longer "feel" Canadian.

I also quote from the Toronto *Telegram*, the Chatham *News* and the Moncton *Times*. The Toronto *Telegram* had this to say:

> The people of Canada should be allowed to decide whether or not they wish to live under the flag of their forebears or discard it in favour of a new emblem...Let Mr. Pearson ask the people by referendum whether they want to replace the banner that carries the symbols of our nationhood by one that is mounted on the colour of surrender and would be most suitable for an arboretum...

The Chatham *News* had this to say:

> Prime Minister Pearson, in announcing that he was prepared to place the life of his government on the line over the flag issue, has pulled off one of the trickiest political manoeuvres in Canadian history. The Prime Minister knows that no one—the opposition parties or the people—wants an election at this time. We agree with those who say "take it to a vote of the people."

The Moncton *Times* had this to say:

> There is only one sound solution: That is for there to be a national referendum embracing all voters, and possibly even the younger citizens of the country. The ballot should be a comprehensive document asking if a change is desired, yes or no; if so, which of several designs does the individual favour, first, second, third, and so on, or none of them. Only in this way can there be a clear and definite expression of the people's will. The selection of a new flag should be left to the people, and the majority choice should be accepted.

I quote what the Canadian corps association have to say:

We feel the supporters of the Canadian red ensign are more democratic in their viewpoint than the supporters of the maple leaf design for they are willing for this question to be submitted in referendum form to the people of Canada and to abide by their decision, where the maple leaf design supporters are reluctant to trust the approval of their proposed new flag to the people of Canada.

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.

I have an editorial from the St. Croix *Courier*, published in St. Stephen in the county of Charlotte, New Brunswick, which newspaper ran a survey of its readers concerning a referendum or a plebiscite. It asked the people to answer this question: "Are you in favour of a public plebiscite to determine the flag issue?" I am going to read the editorial which contains the answer.

When the time finally arrives in the House of Commons for members to cast their votes on the flag issue, or rather on the amendment as provided by opposition leader Right Hon. John G. Diefenbaker, regarding a plebiscite, we would remind Dr. A. M. A. McLean to harken closely to the voice of the people who sent him to Ottawa to represent them.

Although we cannot say the result of our local referendum by special form in the *Courier* was encouraging, it did give a broad and penetrating viewpoint of the feelings of the people who considered it worth while to fill out the form and mail it in as requested.

As of the writing of this editorial we had received a total of 307 forms all duly completed and signed.

Remember, these were answers to the question "Are you in favour of a public plebiscite to decide the flag issue?" And what was the result? Three hundred people said yes, and only seven said no. That was the result of this questionnaire put out in the county of Charlotte.

[Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton).]

Now I wish to quote an editorial which was published in *The Legionary*, the official organ of the Legion in Canada. This is an editorial in the July issue and the pertinent part reads as follows:

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.

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.

That is a quotation from an editorial in the official organ of the Canadian Legion. They say this would settle the matter permanently and for all time.

The amendment of the Leader of the Opposition specifically provides for consideration being given to this most important question. It provides that the people shall have the responsibility of making this decision. It allows this parliament to consider that the question has been dealt with, and the matter decided. It transcends ordinary partisan considerations and deals with the matter in a way which would be less expensive and more effective. I fail to see how any member can be other than impressed by this argument. If the house wishes to hear another argument as to the desirability of a referendum, just let hon. members look at the column by Bruce West in today's *Globe*

and Mail and see what this famous columnist has to say on the subject. He is warmly in favour of a plebiscite.

Now I wish to say something about the preference I have in a personal way for the Canadian red ensign. I do not wish there to be any doubt in this chamber as to where I stand. I propose to vote for the referendum because I consider that the fair way to deal with the matter before us is to refer it to the people of Canada for settlement. But as far as my personal opinion is concerned, I stand foursquare for the Canadian red ensign.

I have had much correspondence on this subject. I have talked with many people, especially to people in my own constituency. I suppose I have contacted 500 people, and so far all of them favour the retention of the Canadian red ensign with the exception of two, and only one of those favoured the design now being put forward by the Prime Minister. I have advanced my own views and they have met with approval. As a matter of fact I have received a telegram from a prominent member of the Liberal party, a resident of Fredericton—an official, I believe, of the Liberal association in the constituency of the hon. member who represents York-Sunbury in this chamber. Apart from his political views he is an outstanding man who has won honours for gallantry in action, including the Distinguished Flying Cross as a pathfinder pilot in world war II. Here is what he says:

> New Brunswick command of the Canadian Legion solidly in favour of retaining the red ensign as Canada's national flag.

Some hon. members have argued in this chamber that new Canadians favour the so-called Pearson design. I do not believe they do, at any rate to the extent they have been represented as doing. We have new Canadians in this house. I wish to quote what one of them said about the flag long before this controversy was injected into parliament by resolution. The words are to be found at page 382 of *Hansard* for May 28, 1963. This is what this hon. member had to say, and I will identify him in a few minutes:

> I was one of the more fortunate ones who succeeded in emigrating to another country, in my case to Canada, and I well recall stepping on Canadian soil and being able to see for the first time the Canadian flag which stood for principles quite contrary to those experienced under the flag of the hammer and sickle. I was also aware of the fact that under this Canadian flag thousands of Canadians had fought and given their lives to preserve freedom and democracy as we know them today, all symbolized in the Canadian flag.

Later on he said:

> I am not the only one who is concerned with this issue of the flag. Many new Canadians will also be concerned with the question of a new distinctive Canadian flag, since all of them at one time or another lived under another flag. Undoubtedly, the question will arise in their minds as to whether this new flag will be one which will stand for the same high principles, the same rights and privileges that have been afforded to Canadians of whatever race, creed or colour, as those which were available under the old flag, a flag under which Canada grew to the position of high esteem in which she is held by all the countries of the world. As a result of this national issue before us, all Canadians will search their hearts and souls in an attempt to find the right answer to the question of whether or not Canada should have a distinctive Canadian flag or retain the red ensign. An answer must be found and a decision must be made.
>
> As I said at the outset, perhaps I should have been the last man to speak about the Canadian flag. My purpose in speaking, however, is only to enumerate the high principles for which Canada stands now, and for which she stood in the past, all symbolized in our Canadian flag. However, should the time ever come when this house decides to adopt a new Canadian flag then, as one who believes in democratic majority rule, I would accept this decision and swear my loyalty to Canada under this new, distinctive Canadian flag of whatever design. At the same time, however, I should like to be around when the old flag, the red ensign, which to me is the free flag, is lowered for the last time. I should like to pay my last tribute to it, to touch it for the last time and then wipe away a tear or two because of my affection for the old Canadian flag, the only free flag I ever knew in my life and the flag by which Canada is known all over the world.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): Those were the words of my hon. friend for Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Rapp). May I add that it must be a matter of great encouragement to new Canadians when they come to a country like Canada and read of the career of our hon. friend who represents that constituency. It shows that an immigrant boy has been chosen after something like 30 years to represent the people of his constituency in the highest parliament in the land. It is privileges of that kind which are contained in the things for which the flag stands. We in this house have every reason to think that the hon. member to whom I refer, the hon. member for Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale, speaks for and represents the views of the new Canadians; we have no reason to think otherwise.

Since the Prime Minister is sensitive about election commitments I assume that he would consider them fulfilled when he presented his design to parliament. He said that he was under an obligation to present a design to par-

liament within two years. I would have presumed that when he presented it to parliament it was the fulfilment of his promise. He was under no compulsion or obligation to present his design to parliament as a government measure; that was not necessary. He was under no compulsion to have the fate of that resolution govern the life of this parliament, or to make the life of this parliament contingent upon the acceptance of his personal choice, or for that matter the acceptance of any other choice. I have never ceased to wonder who conceived the design. Whose opinion was it that the traditions of the past, emblematic of the history of this country, should be disregarded, ignored and discarded? Why should they be? Who decided to bring this design to parliament anyway? That would be a good question to have answered. The Prime Minister and his ministers apparently do not consider the question important enough even to justify their participation in this debate.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): Apart from the Prime Minister not one of them has stood up and said one word in this debate in defence of the resolution which has been presented and for which they are going to vote. I should like to know what are the views of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. McIlraith) who sits opposite me. Where does the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources (Mr. Laing) stand? What about the Solicitor General (Mr. MacNaught) who represents Prince Edward Island? Where does he stand on this?

Mr. MacNaught: Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): I am not yielding the floor.

Mr. MacNaught: I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): There is no question of order here.

Mr. MacNaught: A question of privilege.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cameron (High Park)): Order. I think the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton requested an answer from the hon. gentleman, and he should be given the opportunity to answer.

Mr. MacNaught: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): No, I am not yielding the floor; not because I do not want to, but because my time will soon be up.

[Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton).]

Mr. MacNaught: I have a question of privilege.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cameron (High Park)): I would ask the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton to resume his seat and bow to my ruling.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MacNaught: My hon. friend—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cameron (High Park)): Order. I recognize the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, may I speak? I was going to compliment you on being in the chair, and at the same time I would say to you there is no question of privilege here or any right to rise at all at this time, irrespective of the fact that it would be most commendable at least to have an opinion from one of the ministers.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cameron (High Park)): With all due deference to the Leader of the Opposition, and thanking him for his complimentary remarks, the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton did ask the minister who wishes to raise a question of privilege to state where he stood on this matter, and I have granted to him that privilege. When he has answered I think that will be sufficient.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the minister can make a speech later, or can answer the question later.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cameron (High Park)): With all respect to the hon. member I do not think that is a point of order.

Mr. MacNaught: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member who posed the question, the stand of the Solicitor General will be made abundantly clear when the vote is taken.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the answer that I expected. He is going to stand up and have his nose counted, and that is all he has to say about the matter. What about the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys (Mr. Benidickson)? Where does he stand?

Mr. Benidickson: I will vote, too.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): So, Mr. Speaker, they acknowledge that they are

going to yield to the crack of the party whip no matter what happens to the country.

An hon. Member: They do what the whip tells them. Trained seals.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): I ask the question, who brought this design to parliament? Who made the decision?

Mr. Diefenbaker: The hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette).

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): Was it the government or the caucus of the Liberal party? That is the question which I think the people of Canada will want to have answered in no uncertain terms and at the proper time.

Mr. Deschatelets: It is already answered.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): The ministers do not consider it important enough even to get up and try to justify—they could not, of course, but they do not even try to justify—their attitude. They make no attempt. All they say is that they are going to be counted and that they are going to count for one. That is wonderful. We cannot reconcile such an attitude in this parliament.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cameron (High Park)): Order. I regret to inform the hon. member that his time has expired, although I know we all regret that we will not be able to hear the rest of his speech.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I lost about five minutes by the interjections which were made.

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cameron (High Park)): Has the hon. member unanimous consent to proceed?

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): All right. They just cannot take the truth. They do not want to hear the truth.

Mr. Deschatelets: Mr. Speaker—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cameron (High Park)): Is the hon. member rising on a question of privilege or point of order?

Mr. Deschatelets: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member had not resumed his seat. I was about to ask him to resume his seat because his time had expired and he was still speaking.

Some hon. Members: Closure.

Mr. Monteith: Why? Do you want the floor?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cameron (High Park)): I was under the impression, when I asked whether the hon. member has unanimous consent to proceed, that he had it.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cameron (High Park)): If he has not I will have to ask him to resume his seat. Has the hon. member unanimous consent to proceed?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Churchill: Refused by the Liberals.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cameron (High Park)): I regret I hear a few noes, so I will have to ask the hon. member to resume his seat.

Mr. William Skoreyko (Edmonton East): Mr. Speaker, I find it very difficult to rise and follow an hon. member who has pleaded so eloquently with the Prime Minister to reconsider a problem of his own creation.

I must at the outset, Mr. Speaker, express my amazement at your most recent ruling, when Your Honour stood in your place and informed the hon. gentleman that his time had expired and he would not be heard further, without first asking the house whether they agreed to let him go on. It is a precedent that I am sure will be used in the future.

I rise to speak because the Prime Minister has again extended to all members of this house an invitation to participate in this debate. Some of the questions that I propose to deal with today are my views on how this matter could be settled without very much difficulty. First of all, I think we should try to understand that there are those for and those against the red ensign and the new flag. When we talk about the red ensign I think it has, more than any other emblematic device in Canada, an emotional and historic sentiment attached to it. I am speaking specifically of wives who lost their husbands in the last war, of mothers who lost their sons and daughters, of children who lost their fathers, and of those children whose fathers lie in our veteran institutions today, some crippled for life and others who will never again see the outside world. When you talk to these people, as I have on a number of occasions, you find that the red ensign is something very, very dear to their hearts.

I intend to quote from some letters I have received from veterans in the last week

or two, and I hope hon. members will then realize why I intend to pursue this argument a little further. When I pose my argument this afternoon I would like to point out some of the reasons why I know of so many who are opposed to the new flag, in its present form at least.

First of all, I think it was the Postmaster General who in a speech away from Ottawa, when asked what was his interpretation of the design, pointed out that he understood it to mean that one leaf represented the English, one leaf represented the French, and the third leaf represented the other ethnic groups in Canada. I think we should talk about that for a moment, because we have English and French members in this House of Commons as well as those who belong to other ethnic groups. I happen to belong to one of those ethnic groups; I am of Ukrainian parentage. My grandfather arrived in Canada when he was 17 years old. He married a young lady, years and years ago, who had also emigrated to Canada in her early years.

The press and the Prime Minister have on occasion tried to tell some of us in this house that the ethnic groups in this country desire a new national flag. I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that this representation was never made to me, and I am as close to the ethnic organizations in this country as any other member.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Skoreyko: Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the very suggestion that some day we might be flying a flag which has on it three maple leaves, each leaf representing a different group or faction in this country, will mean that my children and the children of every member in this House of Commons will ask, "I wonder what leaf on that flag I belong to". I think if the government has seriously in mind a national flag that is going to unite this country, we should take another look at the red ensign.

Why not be reasonable and accept the proposal that has been put forward to the Prime Minister? I know he has received this proposal because I have copies of letters that were sent to the Prime Minister of this country which contain specific recommendations in this regard, namely for a slight modification to the red ensign, which would not only please the people who at the moment support the red ensign as it is, but those who support having a new flag, if that is what you want to call it. It would also please those who are indifferent at the moment; and there are a great many people in the country who are completely indifferent to this flag issue.

Let us talk about this new flag. How was it chosen, Mr. Speaker? The leader of our party, Right Hon. John G. Diefenbaker, moved an amendment in the House of Commons which called for a referendum. There is nothing fairer than getting the majority of the people of Canada to decide on the kind of flag they wish to have flown. When we consider this new flag it is very interesting to go through one's files in search of some interesting comments. I have done this, and the first interesting comment I saw was dated May 20. It is an article headed "P.M. told newsmen of flag decision". Well, Mr. Speaker, on May 15 a question was asked in the house as to whether a decision on a new flag had been made, and the answer was in the negative. This article says:

> At a few minutes before 6 p.m. last Thursday, eight men—all members of the parliamentary press gallery—left their desks in various parts of town and made their way to the Sussex drive home of Prime Minister Lester Pearson where they had been invited to discuss the issue of Canada's national flag.
>
> The eight, all editors, reporters or magazine writers, were shown into the newly decorated, grey-green living room where the Prime Minister relaxed with a scotch and soda, waiting to try his hand at "kite-flying" or, as some who attended the session called it later, "news management."

This is how this proposed flag came into being. I wonder how many people in Canada are aware of the fact that this new flag was born over a glass of scotch and soda.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Caron: That is cheap enough.

Mr. Skoreyko: That is what the newspaper article says.

Mr. Caron: Well, that is cheap enough.

Mr. Skoreyko: Yes, it is cheap enough; it is a cheap way of introducing a flag into this house. The article continues:

> Kiting a news story is a long established political technique. Certain newspapermen are fed information from what they believe is a responsible source, and are encouraged to write it without attribution.
>
> Government or party higher-ups then can judge public reaction and take this into account when they decide to go ahead or withdraw from the course they are considering.

If the Prime Minister had heeded those letters—and I intend to put some of them on the record this afternoon—and the requests of those people who wrote and asked him to withdraw his flag proposal, we would not

be debating the question this afternoon. The article goes on to say:

> It is doubtful whether any of them anticipated the "hard" news they got—that Mr. Pearson had personally chosen a flag design; that he had sent a telegram to the Queen informing her; that the red ensign would not be on a new Canadian flag, and that he was going to lay the whole matter before the Royal Canadian Legion convention in Winnipeg the next Sunday.

What a Sunday, Mr. Speaker, to bring such news to veterans. I referred a moment ago to those wives, those mothers, those sons, those daughters, whose husbands and fathers lie on their backs in institutions today and may never walk again. It was to these people that the Prime Minister chose to break the news on that fatal Sunday. There was an editorial in one of the newspapers in the west hoping that the flag issue would not be pursued because it might turn out to be a drape for Mr. Pearson's political bier. I can assure you that editorial writer was not a veteran of the last war. He is much too young for that, but that was his feeling in this regard.

The other question that bothers me in relation to the flag resolution is that a normal resolution in the House of Commons will read along these lines: "That it is expedient that the houses of parliament do approve". But the flag resolution reads in this way:

> That the government be authorized to take such steps as may be necessary to establish officially as the flag of Canada—

And so on. What the resolution in fact says is that if anyone said no the government, if parliament approves the resolution as it reads at the moment, would have the power to declare war on anybody who might object to the flying of this flag. I think the motives behind such a resolution are worth considerable research.

Why do I suggest that a plebiscite or referendum is probably the solution to this dilemma? First of all, I think every individual as a Canadian citizen in a democratic country is entitled to express a point of view in a matter as emotionally charged as the flag issue. We must remember that the younger groups, particularly the school age children, have no historic attachment to the red ensign, but their fathers and mothers certainly have. I do not suggest for one moment that my boy, who is quite young now, is going to be particularly worried 20 years from now about what happens in the House of Commons today or whether it should or should not happen again. But I can tell you that even at his young age he knows and understands something about the red ensign and loves it dearly.

I should like to bring to your attention in this connection, Mr. Speaker, that the other day when I was walking from this building to my office in the west block I met a little boy carrying a red ensign. Two other little boys were walking toward him and I asked them what they thought of that flag. They said "Oh, it is beautiful; we love it". The mother said "Now, now, Tommy, you know you should not say that". So the young are being told how they should feel and what they should say when they are asked questions with respect to the new flag.

With regard to a referendum, which I say is the only solution to our dilemma, the *Gazette* of August 5 suggested that there should be some sort of compromise. I intend to deal with this editorial more fully, but it suggested that the leaders of all parties in the House of Commons should get together and arrive at an acceptable design. I do not need to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that such a procedure is probably one of the most unlikely to succeed. They say that the prime consideration so far as the government is concerned should be to unite the country and keep it from dividing further. With regard to a compromise the editorial goes on to say:

> The first of these is the objection to the flag in its present design. Even many of those who would favour a distinctive flag for the country have felt that the design offered—a design produced in conspicuous haste—falls below the standard of what might reasonably be expected. A more attractive flag—

They are suggesting other designs, but they are also suggesting that in the end surely there must be some way whereby all the parties, if they wanted to be reasonable, could decide on a modification of the red ensign to suit everybody no matter what their feelings on the matter. If we do not succeed in having our amendment asking for a referendum adopted, what is going to happen? Yesterday the hon. member for Lisgar spoke quite eloquently about what he thought would happen if we do not get a referendum. He made particular reference to an editorial in the *Globe and Mail* entitled "A Collision Course". It reads in part as follows:

> In his haste to give Canada a distinctive national flag Prime Minister Lester Pearson has set his government and the nation itself on a collision course. There is still time for him to alter it. But there is not very much time.

I suggest that is right, Mr. Speaker. There is not very much time. They go on to say that this is the time for statesmanship, and

that the Prime Minister should call in the leaders of the four opposition parties and thresh out the whole matter with them. They say that he should attempt to find agreement on a method of proceeding with the flag resolution and keeping the debate within bounds.

That is too much to hope for, Mr. Speaker, because the Prime Minister has indicated that the flag resolution has priority on his list of legislative matters, and he is determined to go through with the flag debate even if it costs the government its life. In an editorial on May 26 last the Edmonton *Journal* reviews the flag question and makes this comment:

> Mr. Pearson's haste, and his total commitment, on the flag issue are on the face of things inexplicable. With so many problems bedevilling our country—

They are many, Mr. Speaker.

> —why must he single out this issue and, in effect, stake the survival of his government, to say nothing of his own political future, on the result? It seems foolhardy and senseless...
>
> Ottawa is in some danger of ceasing to be the real capital of Canada. There is a danger, that is to say, that the federal power will lose control of Canadian affairs. If this happens, our country is obviously doomed; it will disintegrate into a number of fragments, none of which can, by itself, survive as a sovereign nation.
>
> The flag issue, as we see it, is therefore an attempt to do two things at once: to demonstrate the genuine desire of the Pearson government to reach a rational accommodation with Quebec, and thereby to re-establish Ottawa's power to control Canadian affairs.
>
> It is, as we say, perilous—more perilous because Mr. Pearson for obvious reasons cannot publicly explain what is going through his mind...
>
> There are more Anglo Saxons than French Canadians in Canada. Is it reasonable to ask them to abandon something which the vast majority of them hold precious?
>
> During the past few weeks, the question has caused much heartsearching in the office of this newspaper...
>
> There is, of course, no guarantee that a new flag will accomplish anything of the kind. But if parliament agrees to a new flag tomorrow—

This is a strong editorial, Mr. Speaker.

> —it should simultaneously be made clear to Quebec that this, as the Calgary *Herald* rightly pointed out a day or two ago, represents a massive concession. It should also be pointed out that Quebec can expect no more concessions of this magnitude.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister tries to make the people of Canada believe that the flag is being introduced for them, a nation of 19 million people. This editorial says the action is taken solely to satisfy Quebec. If this is the case, Mr. Speaker, why does the Prime Minister not stand up in this house and say so? Perhaps if he did make such a statement, then the rest of Canada might consider some of the better after effects of such a move.

[Mr. Skoreyko.]

The editorial goes on to say:

> The rest of Canada will be entitled to paraphrase some famous words of the late John F. Kennedy. We can properly say to French Canada: "Let us stop talking about what Canada should do for Quebec, and let us start talking about what Quebec is prepared to do for Canada".

Then again, Mr. Speaker, when I look at some of the reasons for the introduction of this flag resolution, I cannot help but think of Mackenzie King who always looked upon England as a country we should stay away from.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Of course that is not true.

Mr. Skoreyko: It is true, and I intend to read a document I have here which will satisfy the minister's curiosity.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): It is not my curiosity; it is my knowledge.

Mr. Skoreyko: Then, it will correct his knowledge. This editorial is entitled, "Republic of Canada", and reads in part as follows:

> During much of his political life Mackenzie King feared and fought what might be called the philosophy of the imperial commonwealth.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): That is different; so did the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Diefenbaker: We would like to hear a speech from the hon. gentleman on this subject.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I would be glad to make one.

Mr. Skoreyko: I continue quoting:

> He had a deep distrust of centralizers in London and an unswerving opposition to an empire approach to politics, economics, trade or defence. He was determined that Canada should be a sovereign nation in full charge of its own destiny at home and abroad. To Mackenzie King must go much of the credit for the events that culminated in the Statute of Westminster.
>
> But at times King's determination that Canada should be mistress in her own house became a suspicious obsession—

This could never be attributed to anyone else.

> —as incidents in Vincent Massey's recent book of memoirs so clearly reveal. Furthermore King imbedded both the determination and obsession in the Liberal party of which he was undisputed custodian for so many years.
>
> To the end of his life King did not seem to realize that his great battle to make Canada an independent nation had been won—at least as far as London was concerned. To the end he remained militant and wary. He bequeathed his attitude to

his party as a legacy when he departed. His successors continued to act as if the outcome were still in doubt.

I hope the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Martin) is satisfied with this article.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I say to my hon. friend, if he will permit me, that the views of Mackenzie King with regard to the commonwealth were precisely those of Sir Robert Borden of the Conservative party.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Not at all.

Mr. Skoreyko: I thank the minister for that observation. Were they the same as those of Louis St. Laurent? I continue to quote from the editorial:

Louis St. Laurent, when he was prime minister, adopted a deliberate policy of expunging symbols from Canada's past that were intimately connected with this nation's origins. The first indication was when the time-honoured designation "dominion government" disappeared from telephone directories from sea to sea. It was replaced by the phrase "government of Canada".

Then the designation royal mail was placed under a cloud and the term "Canada post" was accorded official favour. Then there was the deliberate policy of combing through federal statutes to eliminate the word "dominion". The fact that the word was scriptural and chosen by the Fathers of Confederation was overshadowed by the suspicion in certain quarters that somehow it denoted subservience. There was an attempt to force the dominion bureau of statistics to become the bureau of statistics and so on.

There seemed to be a deliberate policy of rooting out little by little distinctive terms and designations that bound the nation to its past.

Years ago Dr. Eugene Forsey asked: "Where is it all going to stop? Are we going to wake up some morning and find ourselves citizens of the republic of Canada? It looks like it. But I think there are a lot of people who don't want it."

Prime Minister Pearson's preoccupation with the flag issue and the manner in which he has brought it forward make these questions even more relevant and disturbing today. The arguments Mr. Pearson has advanced for getting rid of the red ensign could be applied with equal force to getting rid of the monarchy. Is this the ultimate goal of the policy and program initiated by Mackenzie King and carried on by his successors?

The people of Canada have a right to ask this question and to expect an unequivocal answer from Mr. Pearson and his advisers.

Then, the last line of the editorial reads:

Is the Liberal party dedicated to turning this country into a republic?

The minister of external affairs may like to answer that question. In so far as a distinctive Canadian flag is concerned, the previous speaker eloquently pointed out the reasons he felt there should be no change made. Every member of this House of Commons has received a small pamphlet, similar to the one I now hold in my hand, from the various Legions across the country. I cannot help but refer to one little paragraph in it. There is a reference to a statement made by General H. D. Crerar, the distinguished commander of the first Canadian army in world war II. In recording an incident of great historical significance for all Canadians he recounted an official welcome accorded him on August 8, 1945 by the wartime prime minister, Right Hon. Mackenzie King. He said that as they moved away from the central entrance of the parliament buildings Mr. King turned and looked up to the peace tower at the top of which the Canadian red ensign waved and said, "And that, General, is another problem which your Canadian army solved for Canada, the matter of our national flag". The previous speaker put on the record all the information necessary with reference to orders in council 588 and 134, and I will not do that at this moment because I have very limited time remaining and I want to deal with some of the opinions that have been expressed with respect to this resolution by people not only in my own riding but all across Canada.

At the outset I must say that of the 200 to 250 letters I received in the last month, two asked me as the member of parliament for Edmonton East to support the new flag. The others asked me to support the red ensign or a modification of it. A few minutes ago I noted with some concern the lack of interest shown in this flag debate by other parties in the house, and I was particularly amazed to see there was only one Social Crediter sitting in his place when the previous speaker was on his feet. I find this difficult to understand, since I have here a copy of a resolution sent to me by the Social Credit women's league of the province of Alberta, asking me to support the red ensign. I shall indeed communicate with these women and tell them the degree to which that party has participated in the debate.

I have here a short note from a veteran of the first world war, and clipped to it is a newspaper picture of the red ensign with the words written on it "our flag." There is also another newspaper picture of the three maple leaves and the appropriate note on it says: "Reminds one of a firescreen." The letter reads:

Enclosed is a picture of the only flag we need. It covers all ethnic groups and unites all Canada. While the maple leaf is good, it does not represent western Canada—

In fact the maple leaf does not grow in western Canada.

Mr. Mather: Yes, in B.C.

Mr. Skoreyko: You do not have the maple leaf that is known to eastern Canada. If the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Sauvé) were present he would be able to tell you there is no such thing as an eastern maple leaf west of the great lakes.

Mr. Douglas: Nobody said it had to be an eastern maple leaf.

Mr. Skoreyko: I said there was no maple leaf such as is known in eastern Canada, west of the great lakes.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Of course that is quite inaccurate.

Mr. Monteith: Get up and make your speech.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Have you made yours?

Mr. Monteith: Not yet.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Let me know when.

Mr. Skoreyko: The letter continues:

—and no one group should dictate what flag we fly as representing the whole of Canada.

We are sorry the people have no chance to decide the issue, and we hope our representative will use his vote and influence in retaining the only flag for Canada, the red ensign.

Here is one that says:

If that proposed flag of the Prime Minister's is accepted, then Canada deserves to be the wishy-washy nation that flag signifies. Canada will then deserve to be a spineless satellite of any nation on this earth. It will forfeit its heritage of being a nation. That is what absence of the union jack means.

Another one says:

God forbid that a Canadian flag should ever be designed which does not have the union jack on it somewhere.

A flag is more than a cloth waving in the breeze, with colour on it, and a design. It is a language; it stirs feeling in the hearts of men; it fosters leadership; it promotes loyalty; it engenders love; men give their lives for it; women weep and remain steadfast. A flag has no language barrier—it is understood by all.

The Edmonton Social Credit women's auxiliaries council sent the following resolution to the Prime Minister:

The Social Credit women's auxiliaries council of Edmonton, Alberta, is unanimously in favour of retaining the red ensign as our national flag; or incorporating the union jack in a new distinctive Canadian flag.

[Mr. Skoreyko.]

I can get little response from the Social Crediters here. Here is another one:

My parents are Russian born, my blood is Russian but I am a loyal Canadian Queen loving subject in spite of all that, and it breaks my heart to see Mr. Pearson giving Canada away.

Here is another:

I want to keep the red ensign as Canada's flag.

We have just returned from a trip to Europe, and it was always with pride we saw our Canadian red ensign flying alongside the flags of other countries.

What a wealth of history is told by the symbols on our flag. No one comments on the coat of arms it bears. This ties the history of our country into one. It represents England, Scotland, Ireland and France and then has the three maple leafs for the new land. The union jack in the left top corner tells the world we are a Christian nation. I don't think there is a flag anywhere with more meaning.

Please do your best to keep it flying.

Here is a man who says what he thinks:

For my own part I say, without equivocation, that whatever parliament may do I will neither recognize, acknowledge, nor pay tribute to any flag that does not bear the union jack. Moreover, while I can respect those who want to get rid of the union jack because they hate it, I can only feel unutterable contempt for those who are so flabby and limp, so devoid of manly sentiment, one way or the other, that they are willing to "go along with" anything at all that consists with what they conceive to be to their own personal advantage. And what claim has any flag—however aesthetically pleasing—to the reverence and affection of a nation, which flag is no more than the product of a transient politician's "hankering"—hankering, mark you.

Even if it had no other history, the red ensign has marked the rallying point for the men of Canada in two great wars. Not only men of British origin but Ukrainians, Norwegians, Danes and many other races because they thought it stood for those things they believed in.

It inspired men to face the test of "going over the top" in the first great war and sustained them when—stricken, grieved but proud—their sons—in many cases the only son—failed to return from some desperate sortie over enemy territory in the second.

This is what another letter to the Prime Minister says:

I do not suppose you will read the enclosed. My purpose in sending it is that you may know that I do not say things about anyone in a letter that I am not prepared to say to their face.

Your argument is completely fallacious and you know very well that it is. Your friends to the south have absorbed millions of newcomers to Canada's thousands, yet never has anyone suggested changing the stars and stripes. There is no reason why we should do away with our Canadain ensign. Add a wreath of maple leafs, yes. It would make it more distinctively Canadian. But that, Mr. Pearson, is not your real purpose.

I will not deal with any more of the correspondence I have received in connection with this matter but I should like to make

one brief reference to a cartoon which appeared in the Ottawa *Citizen* and a reply thereto by General Charles Foulkes, former chairman of the chiefs of staff. I think it is worth putting on record. The last paragraph contained these words:

> To have affection and pride for a flag and a symbol which was once a flag of battle seems to me to be misunderstood by some people. Perhaps it is because they never saw, or wanted to see, that emblem—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I apologize for interrupting the hon. member, but his time has expired.

Mr. Skoreyko: I have only a few brief comments to make before I conclude.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to the hon. member continuing his remarks?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Churchill: Liberal closure.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Vincent Drouin (Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes): Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of taking part in this debate which has lasted already long enough, but after listening to the remarks of some hon. members opposite, I thought it my duty to express dispassionately an opinion based on reason.

Our hon. friends opposite said that they already had their flag, that Canada already had a distinctive flag with the red ensign, a flag connected with our history and the traditions of our land. If so, I congratulate them and envy them because, as for me, I have never had a Canadian flag. And I say this without the least resentment. On the contrary, I envy those who were able to fly, in the front of their house, a flag which they considered as the flag of their country.

Mr. Vincent: Who gave it?

Mr. Drouin: Personally, I considered the red ensign not as a Canadian flag but as a sign that my country, Canada, was dominated by another.

England was a good colonizing power and I think we would not have fared better under France.

I never felt that the battle of the plains of Abraham was either a victory or a defeat. It was just something that happened in the history of my country. But the Westminster treaty has for me the importance of a victory because it was a decisive step towards my country's independence, and I feel that the adoption of a truly national flag will somehow complement that treaty and constitute a symbol of independence.

My family has been in Canada for 11 generations. My ancestor, Robert Drouin, came from France in 1649. He gave up everything to settle in a new country. He did so without any second thought; he came to a new country with a new spirit just like those who, every day, get their Canadian citizenship. In fact, those people have also left their country without looking back. They came to Canada, a country they believed to be independent.

Recently, a neighbour of mine came to my place to ask me if I could get him a small three maple leaf flag like the one I had on the radio antenna of my car. I knew that he was of English origin and that he had been living in Canada for a short while only. When I asked him why he wanted to fly the proposed flag he told me: When I came to Canada from England, my native land, some ten years ago, I left everything behind. I also left the union jack and I have come to Canada as to a new country.

And he said: "Now, I am a Canadian".

Mr. Speaker, why should we, who have lived here for generations, not be as Canadian as this man? Why are some of us more British than Canadian?

As far as I am concerned, I am proud to be French Canadian. I am proud to be linked with France by cultural bonds, but I do not want any political links with France. I do not wish to see either the fleur-de-lis or the tricolor on the future Canadian flag. I want, for my country, an essentially Canadian flag, a flag which will reflect Canada's independence. And I am certainly not the only one who thinks so.

I believe that others than Canadians of French origin, or people from Quebec, will share my views. We have heard the proof here in the House. There was not a single French Canadian member, nor even any member, whether French or English speaking, from the province of Quebec, who wanted to retain the red ensign as the Canadian flag, notwithstanding the respect and admiration he might have for that emblem.

On the other hand, there are, in the house, a few dozen English speaking or new Canadian members, who unreservedly support the three leaf flag.

Our friends opposite want a referendum, to submit the question of a distinctive flag to the Canadian people. Their argument is based on the fact that there was a referendum in 1942 to authorize conscription in

Canada. They say, moreover: "If this has been done in 1942, why not do it again in 1964?"

I would like to tell them that there is an essential difference. In 1942, the government submitted the conscription issue to the Canadian people by way of referendum so as to be freed of a promise made to the Canadian people.

However, in submitting its flag resolution before parliament this year, the government is not going back on a promise, quite the contrary, it is fulfilling a promise made to the Canadian people.

When I agreed, in June 1962 and in April 1963, to run as a Liberal candidate, I then accepted the plank of the party platform concerning the adoption of a Canadian flag within two years of our accession to power.

There were many items in the party platform, some of them, incidentally, not very exciting. But still, when I accepted to be a candidate, I went along with the whole Liberal party program. And those who voted Liberal in 1962 and 1963 were endorsing the program of the Liberal party, including the adoption of a distinctive Canadian flag.

Therefore, when this resolution is put to the house, I think I will be expressing the desire of those who returned me to the House of Commons by voting in favour of the three-leaved emblem.

Our Conservative opponents—I should rather say our Conservative friends, because there are no opponents in the House of Commons, at least I do not think so; there should be only men working as honestly as possible for the welfare of their country—our Conservative friends say that the three-leaved design is the project of one man, the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson). I may say that is wrong. It is true that the Prime Minister kept his word. My hon. friends opposite may not be used to such a way of doing things, but we on this side of the house are proud of our leader who had the courage to give leadership to his party and to the government of this country, not by treading the easiest roads, but who accepted the difficulties threatening his undertaking, to administer the business of the country with his well-known sincerity and ability.

I think that when the three-leaved flag is officially adopted as the Canadian flag, we can say that never, in any country, a flag will have been chosen after so much consideration and care.

[Mr. Drouin.]

You know, Mr. Speaker, how, in most countries, a flag was adopted or replaced. During the night following the revolution, some rag was picked up, a design was planned and the next day, that was the flag of that country and all were proud of their flag because it meant freedom and independence.

What has the government done? It did not impose, as it could have done, some flag through an order in council. The Prime Minister asked a group of experts to study the some 5,000 projects which had been submitted.

He asked those specialists in heraldry to make a selection.

He said afterwards, not on his own behalf but for the government which is charged with looking after the business of the country—he is not imposing it through an order in council—that he was submitting the proposal to the approval of 265 freely elected members of the House of Commons so that they would make it the Canadian flag, not at a moment's notice, for the Prime Minister is leaving to everyone the time to voice freely his opinions on this matter. He also gives newspapermen the necessary time to express their opinions, he gives every Canadian citizen the opportunity to write to his member to voice his views.

I think that under the circumstances the 265 members elected by the Canadian people are qualified to give a flag to their country, and that is what I will do, and I will feel that I have done my duty when I vote for the three-leaved flag.

[*Text*]

Mr. J. Chester MacRae (York-Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, I am entering this debate because I think the changing of a national emblem, such as the flag is so important that every member of parliament, regardless of party and how he feels on the issue, should express his opinion and the opinions of those whom he represents in this house. To say that any member who wishes to speak on an issue as important as this is obstructing the work of parliament, that he is filibustering because he wishes to express an opinion on the matter, is to my mind a complete negation of what parliament stands for and what our freedom is. To say that we who are the official opposition should meekly fold our hands and allow this resolution to pass reminds us, and I am sure reminds the country, of a previous Liberal administration whose arrogant attitude was: "We know what is good for you; now just be quiet and take it". We have a

right to be heard. Speaking out against this white flag is the only weapon we can use to register our opposition. It is not only our right but our duty to use it to the full.

The flags of the great nations of the world have over the years been the symbol, the rallying point in times of crisis. The stars and stripes of the United States of America, the union jack and the tricolor of France have been unifying influences under which people of various racial origin and creeds have stood as one. Now the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) of this country proposes to force upon millions of loyal Canadians a flag which has no tradition, a flag which has been shown by recent public opinion polls to have less public acceptance than the flag we now fly. It is not a unifying influence, certainly, but a divisive one at a time when Canada is already deeply troubled by unrest in one of its founding provinces: I ask hon. members to note that it is only one province. I would point out to the Prime Minister that nine out of the ten provinces of Canada have indicated that more of their people want the red ensign than want any other flag. I would point out to the government that there are many millions of loyal Canadians, such as those in the Imperial Order of the Daughters of the Empire, the Orange lodges, the women's institutes, the Royal Canadian Legion, the Canadian corps association and many other organizations who have gone on record as very strongly in favour of that flag which has been our recognized emblem for many years.

I would like to discuss the Prime Minister's so-called flag address at the opening of the Royal Canadian Legion convention in Winnipeg in May. I was one of those who were there that evening. Over the years I have been deeply interested in the welfare of veterans and have served on dominion and provincial levels of the Royal Canadian Legion. I was not one of those who in any way interrupted the Prime Minister. The feelings of the Royal Canadian Legion about the red ensign are well known. The Legion supports the red ensign. It supports a national plebiscite on the question. In my file, which is a very heavy one, of telegrams and letters of support for the red ensign, is one letter from the national president of the Canadian Legion supporting, on behalf of that organization, the red ensign. Another is from the New Brunswick president of the Royal Canadian Legion, an office which I once held. He is a close personal friend of mine and also supports the red ensign. The hon. member for Victoria-Carleton (Mr. Flemming) mentioned this gentleman. He is a decorated war veteran wearing the Distinguished Flying Cross and whose brother gave his life in world war II. He has been, as the hon. member said, over the years a loyal supporter of the Prime Minister and the Liberal party.

At the opening of the Legion convention more than 1,000 veterans were present, and I would say at the most 10 or 20 registered their objections vocally during the Prime Minister's address. I do not condone that type of behaviour, Mr. Speaker, but it is surprising to me that there were not many, many more who objected. Certainly the majority were deeply disturbed. Yes, they were deeply offended. It is a tribute to the delegates that they showed the admirable self-restraint that they did.

As the Legion points out in an editorial in the July issue of *The Legionary,* of which I think every member has a copy:

> No Legion officer on any level had been notified previously by the Prime Minister or any member of his staff that the main subject of his address at the opening ceremony would deal with the flag issue. That, in effect, he would use the occasion as a springboard for launching a national flag campaign.
>
> The Prime Minister had given no advance notice whatever of his intent to the Legion, though obviously the press gallery in Ottawa and other news media must have been tipped off because they were in Winnipeg in full force for the occasion.

Personally, I think, as do others, it was exceptionally poor taste on the part of the Prime Minister to issue this challenge to an organization of the high standing of the Canadian Legion at its national convention. A few days later one of the most vicious cartoons I have ever seen appeared in the Ottawa *Citizen.* This cartoon depicts two veterans, obviously members of the Canadian Legion, apparently intoxicated. Outside the window Mr. Pearson is running along with his three maple leaf flag, and the caption underneath is, "I guess we showed him, didn't we?" The inference in the cartoon is obviously that veterans and members of the Canadian Legion are drunkards, that they are boors. It is an uncalled for slur upon an organization which is the acknowledged spokesman of the more than one million men and women who, like the Prime Minister of this country, the right hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker), and many others, put on the Canadian uniform and offered their lives in the defence of that freedom which we enjoy today in this country. I have seen no apology in the Ottawa *Citizen* for this cartoon. I would say it is to

the eternal credit of the mayor of Ottawa, Miss Whitton, that she sent a telegram to the Legion convention apologizing on behalf of the city of Ottawa for this disgraceful cartoon.

It seems to me that we do not need a new flag to have a distinctive flag. Canada now has a distinctive flag, one that symbolizes its spiritual and cultural heritage. In 1921 the Canadian government requested King George V to order a new coat of arms for Canada. His Majesty instructed the royal college of heralds to design a suitable coat of arms, which was then placed on the red ensign. I wonder if some of those who are shouting for the end of the red ensign have taken the trouble to learn the significance of the design it bears. The couchant lion in the coat of arms was the symbol of William of Normandy—it originated in France. The red lion is the traditional emblem of the kings of Scotland, from whom it can be traced back by devious routes to the ancient tribe of Judah, which legend says founded the city of London 1100 B.C. Ireland is represented by the harp. The fleur-de-lis emblem was brought to Canada by the early French settlers. It is the emblem of a France which no longer exists—a royalist, not a republican, France. And, finally, there are the three maple leaves to symbolize the union of people of all racial origins in the new country of Canada. All our history is embodied in these emblems on the flag we now have. Since 1924 it has been the recognized emblem of Canada all over the world. Canadian troops fought under it in world war II, then in Korea, and are carrying it proudly today in Cyprus. Canadian Olympic teams carry the red ensign, and it flies over all buildings owned or occupied by the federal government or its agencies both in and beyond Canada. It has been the distinctive flag of Canada by official proclamation since 1945. Nothing can grow if it is severed from its roots. To try to cut Canada off from the roots of its traditions and its history can only have a withering effect, set province against province and culture against culture. We do not need a new flag; we need a return to the ideals and principles upon which our country was founded.

The matter of a free vote on this flag issue has been much discussed both within and without this house. A lot has been said about the freedom of members to vote as they choose, without regard for party lines. But how can it be called a free vote when the Prime Minister has stated unequivocally that he is staking his government's life on the outcome? How can members of this house who support the government vote against the flag measure, when they know that if the Prime Minister's flag is not adopted it will mean forcing another general election on the Canadian people? On May 19 the Prime Minister stated:

> 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 results of the decision of the house.

Arthur Blakely, writing on the subject recently in the Montreal *Gazette*, had this to say—and he said it very well—on the dilemma in which certain members must find themselves on this issue:

> If they vote one way, their consciences may be maintained in good working order, but their government may go down the drain. If they vote for the other side of the proposition, the government would survive while their consciences might be lost. So there it is. Liberal M.P.'s will be free to vote as they please: As long, that is, as they can resolutely ignore such considerations as the fate of their party and of their government. And all this, in the certain knowledge that they won't become candidates for immediate expulsion.

Unfortunately, we come back again and again to the all-important fact that imposition of this white flag on all of Canada will divide our nation further, and perhaps irreparably. It is true, of course, that a substantial majority of the people of the province of Quebec want the Prime Minister's flag. But I believe that what is happening in Quebec today is that a determined group of fanatical young French Canadians is attempting to erase from the history books what happened on September 13, 1759, and to rewrite the next 205 years to read, not as it happened but as they would have liked it to have happened. It is quite true that rural Quebec over the years has not progressed economically as have rural Ontario, the prairies and British Columbia. I can fully appreciate the problems, having been born in Quebec and having lived for most of my life in northern New Brunswick, where the problems are much the same although for different reasons. But I feel that much of the difficulty in Quebec over the past 200 years has been attributable to their educational system. It has been a system that trained able theologians, philosophers, lawyers and doctors; but at the same time it has failed in the sciences, mathematics, engineering and allied skills on which modern civilization travels.

What too many are attempting to do today in Quebec is to place the blame for this failure on English speaking Canada; and, Mr. Speaker, I for one—and I am sure many

others—do not accept that. Nor will we accept this attempt to destroy our British heritage. Why does the Prime Minister feel that he can ensure unity in Canada by appeasing one province and antagonizing nine others? The results of attempts at appeasement are evident to any student of history. From the Danegeld to Munich, appeasement has never worked. In my opinion it is not going to work now.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is an amendment to the resolution before the house calling for a national referendum on the flag issue. This would give every Canadian of voting age the right to express his opinion.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. May I be permitted to mention that there are conversations going on across the aisle, which makes it a little difficult for the speaker to be heard by the Chair.

Mr. MacRae: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Was this government elected solely on the promise it would give Canada a three maple leaf flag? I would say it was not. This was never mentioned in my constituency of York-Sunbury. I am afraid it was only mentioned in those constituencies where it was felt it could get a few votes. There are many factors that enter into the election of a political party. We must remember, too, that this government is not in a majority position in this house; it is in a minority position. It is here by sufferance of the splinter parties, who for the most part are like the mule, without pride of ancestry or hope of posterity.

Some time in the next four years there will have to be a general election. A referendum could be taken at that time with very little expense or cost to the treasury. Furthermore, this would provide a cooling off period for emotions and tempers to subside. The Prime Minister would not be put in the position of forcing his personal choice for a flag upon the Canadian people who for the most part do not seem to want it. Here is a sensible and workable alternative to an action whose only result can be to divide our nation further.

Much of the work of this parliament still remains to be done. The Canada pension plan is still only in its formative stages. Nothing has been done toward providing the promised 10,000 university scholarships. This promise has not been fulfilled. Nothing has been done for eastern agriculture, or in any event very little. These and many other urgent matters are awaiting consideration.

I appeal to the Prime Minister and to those who advise him, especially those from Ontario, the maritimes and British Columbia, to use their common sense on this matter to help to save Canada, not to destroy it, to keep it the great nation it has become over the last two centuries and to ensure the great future which could be in store for our children and for those generations yet to come.

Mr. Heber E. Smith (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, we have been constantly reminded in the last weeks by the newspapers and on radio and television and by our semi-silent friends opposite that we must instantly desist from discussing the flag and adopt Mr. Pearson's pennant as our national flag. I do not know what you would call this but it seems to me something like closure by public opinion or closure by public relations.

With my colleagues from the province of Quebec and with their people I can sympathize, and I hope I can understand their position. But to those zealots and others who think that they can instantly cure the imagined wrongs of the past by quick passage of this resolution I suggest that they could profit by listening a little longer.

It is quite true, I think, that the rest of Canada has in the past neglected Quebec, but I think too that our sins have been sins of omission rather than sins of commission. As long as the people of Quebec seemed to us to be content to be more or less hewers of wood and drawers of water, and as long as they did not make too onerous economic demands on the rest of Canada, we were content to ignore them. But now they are bursting into the highly industrialized second half of the 20th century and they cannot be shrugged off any longer.

Many of those in the rest of Canada who strongly support the new flag are doing so in the sadly mistaken belief that this action will quiet Quebec's economic aspirations. I do not think they could be more wrong. The flag controversy is only a symbol of much greater and deeper problems. But I think too that when we talk about this problem there is something on the credit side for the rest of Canada. Quebec's civil law, its religion and its educational system have been carefully protected by our constitution, and for the use or misuse which Quebec has made of this protection it is not the rest of Canada but Quebec and its people who must bear the responsibility.

But it is not only Quebec that is changing. All of Canada has changed. Until the end of the second world war political realities in Canada were based on an Anglo-Saxon majority and a French minority. True, the majority were probably careless of the feelings of the minority and tended rather to ignore them. But in our anxiety to right the wrongs we do not, I think, as the hon. member for Northumberland (Miss Jewett) and some other members opposite have suggested, have to apologize for being Canadians of Anglo-Saxon origin.

Anglo-Saxon Canadians have their own adjustments to make. No longer are Anglo-Saxons the prideful majority in Canada. With the influx of post-war immigration it is not now a case of the English majority and the French minority but an Anglo-Saxon minority, a French minority and a new Canadian minority. This is a great, and only now recognized, emotional shock to those of us who are Anglo-Saxon either by birth or heritage and we as well as our French compatriots need understanding and patience. For that reason I think those who are impatient must listen a little longer to this emotion charged discussion of the adoption of national symbols.

Getting a new flag is not like changing traffic signs. It has to be a symbol of unity and it must have the emotional support of a very substantial majority of our people. It must have meaning for them. Unless it has, it would be better to have no flag or no national symbols at all. A flag such as the one now proposed, with its lack of aesthetic appeal and having regard to the blatantly political auspices under which it has been introduced, will be absolutely repugnant to a very large part of the Canadian population, and will be so for at least a generation and possibly longer. I think the Prime Minister is sincere, and I say that honestly, but I think he is misguided. But if he is sincere surely we can get a better solution than the one that has been presented to us now.

A flag and a national anthem, as I have said, are matters not so much of reason and logic but of emotion. Many people passionately believe that Canada must have a distinctive flag bearing no indication of either British or French heritage. Many people just as passionately believe that the union jack must form a part of any official flag. Smaller groups have equally strong views as to other designs and conditions acceptable to them.

Mr. Speaker, I notice it is five o'clock.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

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

Ottawa, 13th August, 1964

Sir:

I have the honour to inform you that the Honourable Wilfred Judson, a puisne judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, acting as deputy to His Excellency the Governor General, will proceed to the Senate chamber today, the 13th August, at 5.45 p.m. for the purpose of giving the royal assent to a certain bill.

I have the honour to be,
sir,
Your obedient servant,
A. G. Cherrier,
Assistant Secretary to the Governor General

Mr. Deputy Speaker: 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 (papers), public bills.

Mr. Churchill: Before we proceed, Mr. Speaker, may I on a point of order draw the attention of the government house leader to the fact that this is the third time in succession, I think, that private members' hours have been interfered with in order to attend in the other chamber. I think it would be fairer to the private members of this house if those occasions occurred during government time and not private members' time.

PRIVATE BILLS

SECOND READING

Bill No. S-38, to incorporate Congregation of the Marist Sisters—Mr. Dubé.

BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY OF CANADA

The house resumed from Thursday, July 30, 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.*

Mr. Brown: Mr. Chairman, I thought perhaps I should say a word or two in answer to some questions asked by the hon. member for Timiskaming. In the debate on this subject two weeks ago I stated that I was sorry the hon. member was not present when this bill came before the committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines, to which it was

referred. The president and some of the directors and officials of the Bell Telephone Company of Canada were present to answer all questions. I am sure they would have been only too glad to answer the hon. gentleman's questions. I understood from his speech that he was not a member of this committee, but a representative of his party was present. Of course, the hon. member could have been present and asked any questions that he wished.

As sponsor of this bill I should like to deal with his main point. He desired to know if one of the new directors would act as a liaison officer to deal with points of view and complaints of subscribers. The views of subscribers or any complaints they may have are handled by the various employees of the company. If a complaint is very important and far reaching, it will eventually come before the board of directors. It would be unrealistic, Mr. Chairman, for the directors or any director to rule on every point of view and every complaint that is received. I refer particularly to the one that was dealt with by the hon. gentleman. This was a complaint respecting a girl receiving a bill from the telephone company which she thought should have been paid by another girl who had placed the phone call. If this particular matter had come before a crown corporation, for example, I submit it would have been dealt with in exactly the same way as it was dealt with by the officials of the Bell Telephone Company. The question of how the Bell Telephone Company of Canada or any crown corporation would handle matters of this kind, I suggest is scarcely germane to the subject matter of this bill.

With respect to the question of whether additional directors, appointed pursuant to the provisions of this bill, would cause any change in the policy of the company, I would unhesitatingly say no. I believe it to be only reasonable, as has already been stated in the house and before the committee, that the growth and development of the Bell Telephone Company of Canada since its incorporation is reason enough for the company's desire to be allowed to increase its directorate from 15 to 20 members. It is only natural, Mr. Chairman, that the company after all these years might desire to be enabled to increase the size of its board of directors. The Bell Telephone Company of Canada was incorporated not long after the first long distance call ever made in the world. This call was made between Brantford, Ontario, and Paris, Ontario. The company's record and development since its incorporation speaks for itself. I take pleasure in submitting this bill to the consideration of the committee.

Mr. Temple: I should like to speak on this bill because of the fact several references have been made to Northern Electric Company and the fact that there has been a lack of competition in so far as Northern Electric is concerned. Allegations have been made that Northern Electric pretty well have things their own way. The reason I take an interest in this matter is that we have a plant of Northern Electric Company in Belleville. I make it a habit to go through my riding as often as I can and visit the various manufacturing plants in order to ascertain their problems and find out as much as I can about matters pertaining to these various industries. I have come to know something about the operations of the Belleville plant of Northern Electric.

As I have said, there has been some talk in this committee about the lack of competition which Northern Electric has, as a subsidiary. I want to talk about something Northern Electric does in connection with which they have a great deal of competition in the United States market. The Belleville plant of this company has manufactured and sold to the United States two items which alone have brought in over $2 million worth of sales. This is good for Belleville and it is good for Canada. One of these items is a television routing apparatus which was designed by Northern Electric in Canada and supplied by the plant in Belleville in competition with other United States electronics firms. It was sold to the Columbia Broadcasting System and installed by Northern Electric in New York city. I might add that this year the company is selling more of these items in various United States centres.

The other item is the parametric amplifier, which again was designed and manufactured by the Belleville plant. These amplifiers are used in tropospheric scatter systems. They are exported to the United States for incorporation by Radio Engineering Laboratories into their scatter systems, which are sold on a world wide basis. Tropospheric scatter systems permit multichannel telephone, teletype and data transmission without line of sight restrictions. Now, this is the sort of thing which Canada needs, and it is somethng that Northern Electric is doing. We all know, Mr. Chairman, that we need more exports, we need more United States dollars to help with our balance of trade problems. These things

are being provided by Northern Electric. They are imaginative; they are scientific; they are going ahead; they are doing a good job, and also they are creating a great deal of employment at home. I myself know, so far as the Belleville operation is concerned, that it is a very good one. They are entering into competition, and with some insight and ingenuity they are coming out on top.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to support the bill presented by my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Brown).

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, we do not object to Bill No. S-27 being passed, as the hon. member who has just resumed his seat said; however, I think he is wrong in saying that the Bell Telephone Company, a private enterprise, has competition in Canada or in our province.

The Bell Telephone Company is now a monopoly and when we hear a very dear friend of the hon. member, Hon. René Lévesque of the province of Quebec, saying that the Bell Telephone Company has to be nationalized in order that the control of that public service be eventually resumed in our province or in Canada, I think the hon. member should consult his bosom friend, Mr. René Lévesque, before making such statements.

We do not object to the Bell Telephone Company having 20, 25, 35, 50 or 1,000 directors—a request for 20 directors is now being made—we have no objection to their number being increased to 1,000 or 10,000 it matters little to us, but we must understand the reason for the existence of the Bell Telephone Company. We, of the Ralliement Créditiste, are undoubtedly in favour of private enterprise and we necessarily want to give it full freedom, as long as there is competition to safeguard the rights and the interests of consumers and of people in need of its services. However, we are against trusts. There is federal legislation against trusts that might be set up or be in existence in this country. This act has not been enforced, not only in the case of the Bell Telephone Company, but in many other cases also.

Mr. Chairman, Bill No. S-27 comes to us from the Senate.

Earlier, at five o'clock, the private members' hour, private bills were called. At that time it was said that such and such a bill was allowed to stand at the government's request, and finally we came to Bill No S-27.

Mr. Chairman, all those bills come to us from the Senate, from the other place. I believe that we should not, as responsible members elected by the people, accept any bill from the Senate.

The Senate is a place made up of gentlemen, former politicians, from one party or the other, who are not elected by the people, who have never represented the people since they were summoned there. And yet, they are now trying to rule the roost so far as selecting the legislation to be presented to the House of Commons is concerned.

A little earlier, a bill to incorporate a bank and another to incorporate the Congregation of the Marist Sisters were allowed to stand so that we could finally reach Bill No. S-27 entitled: An Act respecting The Bell Telephone Company of Canada.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know what is going on between the Senate and the government—besides there are not many ministers here now and I do not know what happened. However, we firmly intend to stop the passing of all bills that will come to us from the Senate as long as the bill of the premier of British Columbia to incorporate the Bank of British Columbia is not passed by the Senate.

I solemnly declare that we do not intend to let the Senate tell us what to do in the House of Commons, because not a single senator has been elected by the people whereas we and you, Mr. Chairman—

The Chairman: Order. The hon. member for Villeneuve will surely agree that his remarks go far beyond the scope of clause 1 of Bill No. S-27 under consideration.

His comments are interesting, to be sure, and hon. members are no doubt listening to them with great attention, but under standing orders, the hon. member is not allowed to go beyond the scope of clause 1 of the bill now under consideration.

Mr. Caouette: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Once again I will abide by standing orders which forbid my going beyond the scope of clause 1 of Bill No. S-27. I just wanted to point out that since the senators, for whom I have a great deal of respect, are not elected representatives of the people, we will object as long as necessary to any bill from the Senate submitted to the House of Commons.

[*Text*]

Mr. Basford: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Caouette: Definitely.

Mr. Basford: In the position he has just announced that his party is taking, I am wondering whether he has had any agreement with Premier Bennett to take this viewpoint?

The Chairman: The question asked by the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard (Mr. Basford) is also beyond the limits of the bill and out of order.

Mr. Caouette: You asked whether Bennett let me do this or—

The Chairman: Order please.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, I was not out of order, but a Liberal member was. As usual, all Liberal members, as well as the Minister without Portfolio, are out of order.

Mr. Chairman, Bill No. S-27 says:

Whereas The Bell Telephone Company of Canada has by its petition prayed that it be enacted as hereinafter set forth and it is expedient to grant the prayer of the said petition: Therefore Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:—

I shall now read clause 1:

The business of the company shall be managed by a board of not less than five nor more than twenty directors, as may from time to time be determined by resolution of the shareholders, and each such director shall be the proprietor of at least ten shares in the capital stock of the company, or such other additional number of shares, not exceeding forty additional shares, as the shareholders shall by any resolution passed at any annual general meeting, or special general meeting, from time to time determine; and the said board of directors shall be elected and hold office as hereinafter provided; and a majority of the said directors shall be residents of Canada."

Mr. Chairman, this concerns the operations of the organization of the Bell Telephone Company of Canada, within the boundaries of Canada.

It is all very fine to read in the bill that a majority of directors shall be residents of Canada, but nobody is or will be surprised to hear that the Bell Telephone Company of Canada is a subsidiary of the Bell Telephone Company of America, a branch of that American company. Even if we have a Canadian majority of directors, officers and shareholders in the Bell Telephone Company of Canada, this corporation is, nevertheless, under the control of a parent company, a master company, in the United States. This means that our telephone system, in Canada, is still under American control.

Mr. Choquette: Hear, hear.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Lotbinière says: Hear, hear.

Why try to mislead the public with bills like this one? Why do the hon. senators—most of them former politicians accept to submit to us a bill like Bill No. S-27, to make people believe that the Bell Telephone Company of Canada will, henceforth, be controlled by a Canadian majority, which is untrue, because the Americans still control that company?

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that I have absolutely nothing against Americans. But let us stop making believe that by moving bills as insipid as the one now before us, we shall take over control of our economy, of our administration and of our assets, etc. It is absolutely false to pretend that the Bell Telephone Company of Canada will be controlled by a Canadian majority, even if it had 20 directors, or even 1,000 of them.

Mr. Chairman, I will now conclude my comments on Bill No. S-27 because other hon. members intend to say a few words about it.

However, I wish to say that bills coming from the Senate do not interest us any more and that we will do our utmost to prevent their passing because we do not want to be told what to do by people who are not elected by the people.

Mr. Choquette: Will the hon. member for Villeneuve allow a question?

Mr. Caouette: Yes.

Mr. Choquette: The hon. member seems to be against companies controlled by Americans. As a good car salesman, could he tell me who controls the Chrysler Corporation of Canada?

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, it affords me great pleasure to answer the question of my hon. friend from Lotbinière. The Chrysler Corporation of Canada is controlled by the Americans, like Ford and General Motors. He probably owns a General Motors car.

The Chairman: I do not think the question of the hon. member for Lotbinière is in order.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, may I point out just the same, on a question of privilege, that I have been advocating for over ten years the establishment of a wholly Canadian automobile factory? If we do not have such a truly Canadian company at the present time, the Social Crediters are not to blame, but rather the Liberals and the Conservatives

who have never done anything to develop our own resources.

Mr. Choquette: I rise on a question of privilege—

The Chairman: Order. There is no question of privilege.

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Chairman—

The Chairman: Order. I cannot recognize the hon. member. If he wishes to speak, he must in the first place resume his seat.

Mr. Choquette: May I have the floor?

The Chairman: The hon. member should take his seat. He has expressed the wish to speak on a question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Villeneuve. Before he does so, I wish to point out that the Chair is of the opinion that there is no question of privilege. If the hon. member wishes to take part in the debate, he will be recognized in due time.

[*Text*]

Mr. Peters: I am grateful for the intervention of the hon. member for Villeneuve, for whatever reason, because it gives us an opportunity to say something about the affairs of the Bell Telephone Company, and if the situation continues a good many more members will probably have the opportunity to say something on this subject.

The sponsor of this bill mentioned the fact that I am not a member of the committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines but that I have the right to attend the meetings of that committee and ask questions. I believe this could only be done in exceptional circumstances; it is not the normal practice of committees to allow people who are not members to raise a number of questions at committee meetings.

The sponsor has been very fair in saying that the directors would be willing to answer a number of questions. My objection to this bill would be removed if a suggestion made by my hon. friend from Comox-Alberni last week were taken into serious consideration. Although there has been a change over the years, the New Democratic party still has an interest in seeing that government control is exercised where a public utility is involved. This does not always mean nationalizing particular industries, though it is believed that in the field of communications, as in other fields of public utility, this is desirable. The suggestion put forward by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni was that the five new directors should be appointed by the government rather than by the company. This would take account of the fact that the public has not always been well represented on the board of directors of the Bell Telephone Company. I believe this situation would be remedied, provided the government were to appoint the new members. I do not believe it is necessary for us to control this company, even thought it is a public utility, but I think it is necessary for the people who use a monopoly utility to have some voice in its operation.

I know the government has often been accused of being a bit socialist—of adopting some of the policies of the N.D.P. To some extent it is tarred with the same brush as the N.D.P. If this is true to some extent, and if members of the Liberal party are willing to accept the accusation, it seems to me this is an excellent occasion upon which to do so, and if the mover of this motion before us would rise and assent to this bill being sent back to the committee, with his blessing, for the purpose of having the government negotiate with the company with regard to these five new directorships, it would I think meet my requirements.

My objection is that these five new directors do not seem to be in a position to guarantee that the reforms I have previously indicated will be achieved. The sponsor, in rising to reply to previous questions, referred to the case I mentioned of a young lady living in Ottawa. I do not think she would object to my using her name, but there is no point in doing so. Suffice it to say her member of parliament is a lawyer who has been interested in this case, as have other lawyers. This claim No. 29159-707, was before the board of transport commissioners in 1962, and no reply has been received to the legal arguments which were put forward. I am of course not a lawyer and cannot tell the committee much about this case, but it is headed:

> In the matter of the application and complaint of... concerning the general regulations governing the furnishing of telephone service and equipment by the Bell Telephone Company of Canada and further concerning certain wrongful and unlawful acts and omissions by the company in furnishing telephone service and equipment to her.

Then reference is made to sections 34 and 35 and section 353(1) of the Railway Act and it continues:

> An order declaring that rule 31 of order 81007, of the 11th March 1953, as amended, which provides, "31.—If objection in writing is not received by the company within thirty days after a statement

of account is rendered, such statement shall be deemed to be correct and binding upon the customer".

And so it goes on. I will not abuse the privileges of this house by reading it all, but I am sure that those who have been applying for this extension of the number of directors are well aware of this case. The law being what it is, and lawyers being what they are, I can appreciate the delay. But what I cannot appreciate and what the hon. member sponsoring the bill should be highly indignant about is that these principals have asked him to make the explanation which he made this afternoon without fully informing him about this case before the board of transport commissioners and of the fact that they had done nothing about it.

This complaint has been made in a proper manner and I think the hon. member has been imposed upon and denied a courtesy which should have been afforded him. He should feel very indignant about the matter, and so should all of us. I think the company are being deceitful by not replying and have not been very frank with the hon. member sponsoring the bill, as well as with other members of this committee. They are abusing the very rights they are asking for by being unwilling to give the proper information. If a member is asked to reply he should be fully informed of the facts. I think that the principals should look at this claim, because it personifies the problem I am raising.

I have received many complaints from areas which are served to the effect that the individual subscriber's rights are not being honoured and that he is not being given a fair shake by the Bell Telephone Company. If more directors are to be appointed we should know why they are asking for additional members. We should also consider that the government itself has a responsibility in the matter. I know the Liberal government is not going to nationalize the Bell Telephone Company or the telecommunication services of this nation.

Mr. Caouette: The banks want it.

Mr. Peters: I do not care who wants it, they are not going to do it. This should be carried out not only on a national scale but a provincial scale. This has been accepted in Saskatchewan and in Alberta, and I think it has also been accepted in Manitoba. We are not asking for anything nationally which has not already been accepted by many provinces with assistance given in others.

Rather than asking a private member to sponsor a bill which affects the economy of many citizens in Canada and eliminates rights which should be those of every subscriber to a public monopoly and particularly where an individual is denied the right to complain to the board of transport commissioners, it would be more acceptable if the government were to finance the appointment of these five new directors so that the government itself would have some say in the operations of the Bell Telephone Company, which for the present at least would satisfy me and many of the people I represent. If the hon. member wishes to rise and say that this is so I am perfectly willing to accept it. If he or any of the ministers wish to refer the matter back to the committee for further consideration, I am happy to suggest that that action be taken.

It is interesting to note that one of the problems which will have to be considered by the board of directors, a problem which you and I should also be considering, is the situation which develops between the Bell Telephone and Northern Electric Company. In the act establishing the Bell Telephone Company the company was limited to a 6 per cent profit. But are they limited to that profit? I'll say they are not. Northern Electric comes along and says they need some more money from Bell, and that money is transferred. Then that money is distributed to the board of directors of the company, who are the same as those of the Bell Telephone, which company we said could not obtain more than 6 per cent profit. This is a violent abuse of the law.

The Chairman: I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member, particularly in view of the fact that there are only a few minutes left before his time expires, but he, and other members before him have referred to the relationship between the Northern Electric Company and the Bell Telephone Company. I wonder if the hon. member would enlighten the Chair on how this is encompassed by clause 1 which is now before the committee.

Mr. Peters: The board of directors in the Bell Telephone Company are identical to the directors in Northern Electric Company. Northern Electric Company is a wholly owned subsidiary of Bell. What is done by the directors in the parent company appears to be almost the same as what is done by the directors in the subsidiary company. I really do not think you can separate the two. In effect they are the same body.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out some of the things the subscribers will

be turning to the board of directors to decide. This has reference to the fact that we decided by law this company was not to make an exorbitant profit; yet it has done this by its ownership of Northern Electric. Do they charge the subscriber a reasonable rate? A letter written by a member to the dominion bureau of statistics just recently, on July 31, elicited the reply that the Bell Telephone Company in Montreal charges $6.46 for a private line; in Ottawa, $5.46; in Toronto, $6.03. What about the provincially owned telephone companies? In Winnipeg the charge is $3.90; in Regina, $3.90; and in Alberta, $3.50.

Mr. Chairman, I am not suggesting money is not being made by the provincial telephone companies, but I am suggesting that the subscribers of Bell Telephone Company are paying twice as much for the service they receive as are subscribers of other systems of public utility. We attempted to deal with this by providing in the original law for a limit of 6 per cent on the profits of this company. This was to provide a monopoly, utility service at a reasonable cost to the subscribers—and this has not been accomplished. I am in complete agreement with our increasing the board of directors by five; I would agree that we should increase the board by 15 if necessary, provided we stipulate that the new directors are appointed by the government. If this is done, Mr. Chairman, I think we will be able to support wholeheartedly the motion that is before us, because the motion will carry out the intention of the original act in regard to the limitations that were provided therein. I suggest that anything less is unfair, unreasonable and should not receive the support of members of the house.

The mover of the motion has suggested that this matter should have been discussed in committee. I will therefore resume my seat, with the expectation that the hon. member will move that this subject be referred back to the committee for discussion of the matters that obviously were not before the committee when they considered this bill previously. If this is done, I think it will allow the company to provide the answers that they may well have to some of the questions we have raised.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Chairman, on this occasion I have some pleasure in supporting the hon. member for Timiskaming. He did refer in rather unkind terms to my profession, but I know we are not sensitive and I forgive him for that. I am not prepared at the present time to support this bill, for a number of reasons. I am not a member of the committee but I have read the proceedings of the committee very carefully and I do not think the reasons given for increasing the number on the board of directors carry any weight whatsoever; so much so that I wonder whether they are the real reasons for presenting this bill.

This bill, as hon. members know, is to permit an increase of the board of directors from 15 to 20. Mr. Vincent, the president of the company, gave evidence before the committee and was asked a question by one of the members of that committee as to the reason for requiring a greater number of directors. He asked whether 15 was not sufficient for the entire administration. Mr. Vincent replied:

> We should have a little more leeway. We should be able to do things.

The hon. member for Quebec East then asked, "What things?", and Mr. Vincent replied:

> Things we want to have.

He did not at any time specify clearly what he wanted to have. He did go on to say:

> We might want—I would personally like to have a seat on the board so that our vice presidents could take turns on the board for a period of six months, for instance, so that the directors could have an opportunity to get to know our officers.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, the Bell Telephone Company is able to arrange that its vice-presidents and directors become acquainted with each other without the necessity of coming to parliament and asking that the board be increased in number to this extent.

Mr. Cowan: They could have phoned each other.

Mr. Brewin: I think that problem could have been looked after in some other way. Then Mr. Vincent said:

> So there would be one seat for the vice presidents who would be appointed director in turn for a period of six months so that they would have an opportunity to get to know our people. It is a good thing, it would be a good thing if our vice presidents could know the people who are there.

But there is no explanation given as to why some other method could not be found, rather than coming to parliament with this bill in order to achieve this objective. Mr. Vincent said they should have a little more leeway. Leeway for what, Mr. Chairman? I am assured that there are a number of large, very well managed companies in this country, with boards of directors of 15 or less, which handle a tremendous amount of business. I

think an hon. member put on the record earlier in this debate the business connections of the present directors. They were very, very extensive. Mr. Vincent suggested that some of these directors might not be there all the time; but I think we all know that a group of perhaps eight or nine people sitting down can do quite as much business, and as efficiently, as a group of 17 or 18. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, no particular reason was advanced for the necessity for this bill in the evidence presented to the committee. The hon. member who introduced the bill did not take any great pains to tell us why it was necessary, either. He said, "Well, the Bell Telephone Company has grown in size since 1927, when the number of 15 was first established".

Mr. Brown: Mr. Chairman, I might remind the hon. gentleman that it was 1880.

Mr. Brewin: I am afraid the hon. member is wrong. I am relying on the evidence given by the president of this company, and at page 421 of the evidence given before the standing committee Mr. Vincent said the date was 1927. The hon. member for Quebec East asked:

You were allowed 15.

Mr. Vincent: We have had 15, from 1927 on we have had 15. Before 1927 there were not always 15.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member would have to acknowledge that Mr. Vincent, the president of the company, probably knew what he was talking about when he gave this evidence to the committee.

Mr. Brown: What I meant was that the number of 15 directors was made allowable in 1880 on the incorporation of this company.

Mr. Brewin: It was made allowable, but they did not seem to find it necessary to have 15 until 1927. In any event, Mr. Chairman, it does not really affect the basis of my argument, because they got along up to 1927 without this number of directors, although as we have been told their business was increasing all the time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I am informed that a messenger is on his way from the other place.

Progress reported.

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. 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 to provide for the revision of certain fiscal arrangements with the provinces and to provide adjustments of fiscal arrangements and taxation provisions consequential upon the provision of youth allowances to parents resident in certain provinces.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED UNDER ADJOURNMENT MOTION

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to the provisions of standing order 39A, it is my duty to inform the house that the question to be raised at 10.30 o'clock this day is as follows:

The hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan): Airports; Toronto; meeting respecting monopoly of taxi service.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

CANADIAN FLAG

OFFICIAL ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW DESIGN

The house resumed consideration of the motion by Mr. Pearson:

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 the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Diefenbaker.

Mr. Smith: Mr. Speaker, at five o'colck I was discussing the differences of opinion between the various groups who are proponents of one form of national symbol or another, and I was pointing out that there are two large groups in Canada who are deeply involved in this matter.

There are those who say a flag must be completely distinctive and there are those, almost equally large in number, who claim that any national symbol must bear some evidence of our history and, if possible, our British connection. Having regard to the controversy that has raged, these two groups may at this time seem absolutely irreconcilable; but I am not so sure of that. However I am sure of one thing, and that is that to impose absolutely the wishes of one of these groups on the other is not an act of unity but an act of disunity.

Emotions cannot be controlled by legislative fiat. The losers in such a decision could be just as opposed and as bitter as ever to the adopted design, and Canadian unity, which after all is presumably the reason for our adopting a national symbol, would suffer a disservice. Discussions on the flag are not new. They have been going on for many years, but during those years conditions in Canada have changed, and changed greatly.

No longer does the cry that was sometimes heard, that an Anglo-Saxon majority was imposing its will on a French Canadian minority, have much validity because Canada, much like this House of Commons, is now a country of minorities; and this will be, whether we like it or not, a continuing fact of Canadian life. Other conditions are changing too—

Mr. Caouette: That is not right.

Mr. Smith: It is right. Canadian developments in these days of rapid communication, no matter how much some of my friends might not like to know it, have been and are being greatly influenced by our giant neighbour to the south. Economic patterns are changing and changing rapidly, and this is affecting our cultural lives. It is no longer just a struggle to protect French Canadian culture or English Canadian culture, but it is going to be a struggle to maintain a Canadian culture and identity; and in this struggle, whatever our racial origin, we must try to be together and work together. We must not further divide ourselves unnecessarily over a question such as is involved in the selection of a flag or an emblem; and all Canadians, in parliament and outside it, have a share in the responsibility for not facing these problems earlier.

If the matter brought forward by the Prime Minister had been introduced in a less partisan political way I think most of the bitterness that has now arisen could have been avoided. Perhaps it is still not too late to repair some of the damage done to Canadian unity, but I know it is possibly too late for an ideal solution. It is possibly too late for a long drawn out solution, or for a conference of the type that would be long drawn out, but surely it is not too late for a compromise that will leave feelings less embittered than they are now.

I am sure that if a small committee of the house were appointed it could quickly produce some formula for national symbols that would bring together, rather than divide further, the Canadian people because, make no mistake and have no illusions, we are being divided over this issue. However I am sure something can be done that will repair some of the damage and avoid further damage.

In closing I would like to commend my proposal to the Prime Minister and to the leaders of the parties that they try earnestly to consider some conference method, some quick conference method, or some alternative similar to a conference, that will solve the problem and get Canada off the collision course on which it now seems to be.

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (Queens-Lunenburg): Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I rise to participate in this debate on the invitation of the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson), and I welcome the opportunity to place on the record my views, and the views and opinions expressed to me in recent months by my constituents, relative to the flag proposed by the Liberal party as a national flag of Canada. I also wish to present my views on the proposal made by my leader that a plebiscite be held to determine this issue. In my opinion this is the only method that will guarantee that Canadians have a voice in settling this problem.

This afternoon I thoroughly enjoyed the remarks of the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. MacRae), a holder of the Military Cross for outstanding bravery beyond the call of duty in world war II. He speaks with the courage of conviction earned on the battlefield, and in my opinion he made an outstanding contribution to the debate.

I have received numerous letters and petitions on this controversial subject, and without exception all these letters have requested me to endorse the retention of our present flag, the Canadian red ensign, or a modification of the ensign containing the union jack in the corner. I have not received one letter from my entire constituency, which totals some 50,000 people, requesting my sup-

port of the white flag containing red maple leaves proposed by the Prime Minister. I therefore believe it is only proper that I take this opportunity to raise the objections of my constituents, especially of those who have written to me, outlining their concern over the flag that is proposed by the administration.

So that my own position will be abundantly clear, I stand for the retention of the old symbols, the distinctive Canadian red ensign which today flies from the peace tower. The day may come when in the course of unity we may be required to accept some change, but I would always hope our flag will contain some symbols of our past traditions.

I cannot help but ask the question, why is the Liberal party introducing this divisive symbol to parliament at this time? No doubt in reply some Liberal member may say it was an election promise to be carried out within two years of taking office. But surely this administration, which has made so many wild promises in order to regain power, has some sense of responsibility to the electorate. I would like to know the yardstick used by the Liberals to measure the priority of their promises. Mr. Speaker, the promise to bring in a distinctive national flag is only one of many promises which were made during the last election campaign. What about the promise to institute a medicare plan, the promise to improve unemployment insurance and the promise to establish portable contributory pensions? The Liberals were going to promote freer trade by co-operating with other free world countries to reduce trade barriers. The Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson), speaking in Milford, Nova Scotia, undertook to improve trade between Nova Scotia and the West Indies, but to date no action has been taken. In co-operation with the provinces, the Liberals were going to see that more low rental homes were built; they were going to improve retraining programs and pay supplementary benefits in cases of long term unemployment. The Liberals were going to review our civil defence policy, too. However, the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Hellyer) had other ideas and today the militia, which was to have been the nucleus of our civil defence force, is seriously weakened in numbers.

The Liberals promised to establish scholarships to help young people obtain a university education. They were going to introduce a national health plan. All these and a score of other promises were made, but to date no action has been taken. It is therefore not the real answer to this question to say that a promise is being implemented. We must look for a deeper meaning if we are to understand the Liberal motive for the course which is being followed.

In my opinion Canada's flag should be a symbol of unity. But the proposed flag or design presented on the resolution now before the house has already created widespread disunity and discontent throughout Canada. The reason is easy to understand. First of all, many Canadians have raised objections to the three maple leaf design, on the grounds that it bears no relation to the history and culture of our past and contains little promise for the future. In the second place, they raised strong objections to the method used by the Liberal government in bringing this issue before parliament.

This government has no clear mandate to provide Canada with a new flag and it is not being brave or courageous by endeavouring to impose its wishes upon the great majority of Canadians. The hon. member for Argentueil-Deux-Montagnes (Mr. Drouin) speaking this afternoon, said his leader showed courage in bringing in the maple leaf design. If this is courage, then it is a courage born of despair. I would remind this government that it is still a minority government with the right to rule only as long as it commands support in parliament. The government undoubtedly has a right to introduce this type of resolution, but when doing so it should have stated clearly that the vote, when taken, would be a free vote. I say this because what we are considering now is an issue of the heart, not of the head. If there were a free vote, members of parliament, who are elected to represent as closely as possible the viewpoint of their constituents, could express themselves freely in debate and vote according to the wishes of their constituents. This would be for the parliament of Canada its finest hour. This would be representative government in the best sense of the term.

However, that is not the policy of the government. I would like to think that at one time it was the intention of the Prime Minister to allow a free vote. In support of this statement I would refer to *Hansard* of May 12 where hon. members will see the following recorded on page 3164:

> Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland): Will the right hon. gentleman give an assurance that when the design for the proposed new national flag is presented to parliament all members of this house will have a free vote, and that the defeat of the design would not be considered a vote of non-confidence in the government?
>
> Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): When the time comes to submit the decision of the gov-

ernment 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 would be no question of confidence or non-confidence in a party sense.

Later the Prime Minister had second thoughts about this. Some of his image makers said: You cannot do this; it will result in another defeat; you must put on the whip; you must get out the lash; you must cram this down the throats of the Canadian people whether they like it or not; if you don't, you will be charged with another retreat. In any case, when the leader of the New Democratic party (Mr. Douglas) raised this question again on May 19, as recorded on page 337 of *Hansard*, he had changed his mind. This is how the exchange reads:

Mr. Douglas: I want to ask the Prime Minister whether he considers a free vote to be one in which the members have an election pointed at their heads like a gun.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, 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.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Crouse: You are happy about it, are you?

Then, to continue quoting the Prime Minister:

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 decision submitted by the government, would not be read out of the party for so doing.

Well, hon. members opposite have at least that much to go on. They know that if they stand up and vote as their consciences dictate, at least they will not be voted out of their party. But let me return to what the right hon. gentleman said:

This is a matter of policy...the government must stand or fall on the result of the decision of the house.

The Prime Minister has presented his flag design and he has indicated that unless the resolution before us receives majority support he will consider the vote as being one of non-confidence in his government and plunge this country into another federal election. Only the Prime Minister has this power. He is the only one who can call an election at this time. If he were to do so it would, in my opinion, be nothing short of an election of frustration. If he had a majority of members to back him up in the House of Commons, regardless of the size of the Conservative following it would be our responsibility to bring the request of the people of Canada before this house. It would be our responsibility and we would have to discharge it; there would be only one course open to the Prime Minister if he had a majority, and that would be either to implement closure or to close down the house and call another election. But in his present minority position any election he may call would be nothing short of an election of frustration.

This is the threat. This is the club held not only over the heads of government supporters but also over the head of each member who holds a seat in the House of Commons: Either vote for this resolution or there will be an election. In my opinion no vote on the proposed resolution regarding the flag can be called a free vote, nor will it give a clear indication of what any member is thinking, regardless of where he sits in the house, if he is threatened by the Prime Minister with another federal election should the motion fail to carry.

This is nothing short of political blackmail. Some Canadians are asking us as a responsible opposition to do everything in our power to prevent another election. At the same time they are asking us to do everything in our power to prevent the Pearson pennant from passing the house. I ask the Prime Minister: Is he not aware of the necessity to improve understanding among our different racial, religious and cultural groups as quickly as possible? Is he not aware of the serious cleavage in Canada today which threatens to pull up by the very roots the tree planted by the Fathers of Confederation almost 100 years ago? By introducing this flag resolution at this time the Prime Minister has stirred up racial differences between the two great founding races of the country which will set back the clock of national unity by at least 50 years. I ask the house, is this the price the Liberal party is prepared to pay for its flag? It is evident to me that the Liberal party has not realized that it cannot pull down the Canadian red ensign without men rising to its defence.

By order in council dated January 26, 1924 the red ensign was dedicated as the Canadian flag, the distinctive emblem of Canada. That was over 40 years ago and it served as a distinctive flag for our Canadian forces during

the second world war. During this 40 year period Canada has earned a place of esteem among the nations of the world. When you visit foreign countries in which the Canadian government owns property the Canadian ensign flies over that property reflecting the prestige which is enjoyed by Canadians everywhere. Man's roots go deep. We cannot arbitrarily destroy the symbol which represents our loyalty and affection, not for the Queen of England but for the Queen of Canada. She is our Queen as well. We cannot arbitrarily destroy the symbol of old France, the fleur-de-lis which is on the red ensign at present. We cannot arbitrarily destroy a flag which in toto represents our membership in the commonwealth of nations.

We are not being presented with a new flag, Mr. Speaker, because Canadians generally are demanding a change. When speaking with my constituents they ask me: "What does the Liberal government and the Liberal party find wrong with the old flag? Why do they want to pull it down? Why do they want to destroy the symbol that truly represents our varied traditions and cultures?" I could bring into this house, as I am sure every other hon. member of the Conservative party could, thousands of letters received from our constituents in support of the red ensign. I have brought only a few. I should like to read into the record one written by Mr. J. D. Dexter to the editor of the Halifax *Chronicle-Herald* on May 25. He says:

> Just about everything has been said concerning the Canadian flag by the two sides, those of us who would keep the union jack in at least part of the design, and by those who would be satisfied with anything except the union jack. It now seems that "a banner with a strange device" will be forced upon us.
>
> One thing that should not be forgotten, however, is the shameless impudence of those "representatives" who would undoubtedly vote servilely as their government tells them; many must well know that this will be against the wishes of the great majority of their constituents. They are perfidious toadies, allied with a lunatic splinter group from Quebec.
>
> Is there none in the Liberal party with the courage and honesty to vote as his conscience tells him? It should be an honour to be read out of this particular government, and is the only way to be respected and remembered.

That is one of the mild letters which I have received, Mr. Speaker. I have received others. One from Mr. Norman Swain says this:

> May I add my vote to the millions of Canadians who favour retention of the red ensign as Canada's national flag.
>
> Being ex-air force like yourself, I can look back on many sad and also happy moments when the red ensign proudly flew to make us mindful of just why we were waging the war. Let's not simply kick it aside like a worn out shoe.
>
> It's high time we called a halt to concessions to the one province in ten.
>
> You know the breed of the people on our south shore better than I. It will be a long time, if ever, when you can tell those mothers who lost sons in the war, those hardy fishermen who sailed under the ensign, that in order for them to be true Canadians it is necessary to change our flag.
>
> Get on with the business of the country and stop fooling around with matters like the flag issue, designed to appease one province, and which is making Canada the subject of cartoons throughout the world.

This is a telegram I received:

> Strongly urge you stand for referendum or national plebiscite on flag issue. No matter what outcome such high handed action by minority government although brave not to be tolerated.

Finally, one from Mr. Lee Crooker dated July 28, 1964:

> The proposed destruction of our Canadian flag is the greatest crisis since confederation. It is greater than confederation. It will bring shame on every one of us and destroy all national consciousness.
>
> Canada expects that the official opposition of which you are a member will take whatever steps are necessary to prevent this outrage.

This, Mr. Speaker, is our responsibility. We must present these views on behalf of our people who are calling out to us. They cannot come to Ottawa. They cannot stand up in this house and speak what is in their minds and what is in their hearts. They have charged us with this responsibility. And not only us in the opposition; they have also charged hon. members opposite. But they sit silent and will not portray the true thoughts of the people who elected them and sent them here. I hear a remark from the other side and I sincerely hope that an opportunity will be provided for the hon. member to make a contribution on his feet.

An hon. Member: One of the trained seals.

Mr. Crouse: Quite frankly I find it difficult to answer these questions which have been raised by my constituents because it seems that the Liberal party has designed a new flag in an effort to create a following among those who dislike the Canadian ensign because it reminds them of our connection with Great Britain. We cannot destroy the past through legislation, but we can through the passage of this flag resolution make our future progress as a nation more difficult.

Some of the Liberal supporters have said that we have a need for a distinctive flag, and that this is why this resolution was presented. Canada adopted the red ensign with the dominion badge for its merchantmen in

1892, just 25 years after confederation. The arms of the four provinces that united in 1867 formed the great seal of the dominion. The present arms, which date from a royal proclamation of George V dated November 21, 1921, include a shield containing the traditional emblems of England, three golden lions on a red field; of Scotland, red lion rampant on a gold field; and of Ireland, gold harp on a purple field. It also contains the emblem of France, three golden fleurs-de-lis on a purple field, thus incorporating into the flag that still flies here the one French flag that in ancient times flew over Canadian soil.

From its use on merchant ships, the Canadian red ensign moved, with widespread international recognition, to the position of our flag abroad, superseding the union jack. This was written into law in 1924 when parliament enacted legislation providing for the wearing of the ensign on any Canadian building abroad. At home the ensign is the national flag by authority of an order in council dated September 5, 1945. This order says it is appropriate to fly the ensign on any occasion when it is desired to mark its Canadian significance.

Now, what did General H. D. G. Crerar, the distinguished commander of the first Canadian army in world war II, say when recounting an official welcome to him in Ottawa, as put by the Canadian Legion magazine for March, 1963? He stated:

> As we moved away from the central entrance of the parliament buildings, Mr. King the then prime minister turned sideways in the car and looked upwards to the peace tower where, at the top, the Canadian red ensign waved. He then said, "And that, general, is another problem which your Canadian army has solved for Canada—the matter of our national flag".

The Canadian ensign was suitable for prime minister King, and I would like to ask, why is it not suitable for Prime Minister Pearson? What does the Canadian Legion have to say about our present flag? They say:

> The Canadian red ensign has grown out of Canadian history. Why now reject that history? All the parliamentary votes at Ottawa cannot blot out the truth that it was under the red ensign in two world wars that Canadians of all racial origins risked and gave their lives for those values which the red ensign symbolizes.
>
> The great Edmund Burke warned that a people who ignore their past, will have no future. Those who believe that maple leaves alone, or other symbols related merely to geography, are sufficient for a Canadian national flag, are suggesting that Canadian nationhood has been determined by purely materialistic factors. It is true that the Canadian physical environment has affected the development of Canadian nationhood and Canadian characteristics. But Canada's soul is rooted in the flow of history which came out of western, Christian Europe. Spiritual and cultural death is the end of a nation cut from its roots. And the Canadian red ensign does symbolize those roots.

[Mr. Crouse.]

I believe that epitomizes the thoughts of many Canadians and I am glad to have this opportunity to place it on the record. I ask the Prime Minister to look upon Canada as a great tree having twin trunks that represent our French and British ancestors. Our tree has many grafted branches representing Canadians of other national origins, and as an entity I believe it can grow larger and stronger and provide shade and comfort for those less fortunate than ourselves. I ask him, and I ask the house, what could be more distinctive for a Canadian flag than one representing the two great founding peoples of Canada? On this issue the Prime Minister has been given a golden opportunity to provide leadership, to show evidence of his statesmanship and establish unity throughout the entire length and breadth of this nation. In my opinion, it is not too late to make the changes that are necessary.

While I honour and revere our present flag, the Canadian ensign, I believe it could be modified to give more reasonable representation to Canadians of French origin. The easiest way to accomplish this change would be to remove the shield in the field of the red ensign and replace it with a large, gold maple leaf on which there was superimposed the fleur-de-lis. I am convinced that a flag containing these symbols would be accepted as a flag of good design and as a reasonable compromise by most Canadians. This would not be just a flag of maple leaves, which I understand are found in greater numbers in the states that border us to the south than in some of the provinces in Canada; in fact, there are provinces in Canada in which there are no maple leaves. This would be a flag that all of us could proclaim as a symbol of our unity, the ideal flag for a country like ours.

Tonight, Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but wonder, where are the supporters of this maple leaf design? Where are the two members for Halifax, Nova Scotia? Why have they not spoken on this issue? They receive the same mail as I receive, and certainly this must indicate to them that their constituents want them to speak out in favour of our present flag. When are we going to hear from the Minister of Labour (Mr. MacEachen), the hon. member for Inverness-Richmond? When are we going to hear from the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough (Mr. Stewart)? Is their contribution to this important issue

going to be one of silence, which is all we have had from them to date?

I wish to take this opportunity to challenge the Prime Minister to carry out at least one of the promises he made to the Canadian electorate during the last election campaign. He promised 60 days of decision and a bold, decisive government. Well, his 60 days of decision were a bitter disappointment to many Canadians; but he can still provide bold, decisive government. I challenge him to stand in his place today, or tomorrow, and free the Commons from the sword of Damocles that is hanging over its head in the threat of a general election if the flag resolution fails to pass.

I challenge him to tell the House of Commons that the vote on the flag resolution will be a free vote, with members in all parties voting as their constituencies and their consciences dictate, without fear of a general election if the flag resolution is turned down. I approve of a plebiscite on this issue and predict that if a plebiscite is held the results will be most surprising to the Liberal party. It is perhaps the only way that Canadians who feel they have been robbed of their right of expression on this issue can have their views properly presented as members of this great nation. The selection of a new flag design could then be a choice made of the people, and I believe the majority view should be accepted. However, Canadians will have had their plebiscite right here in the Commons, through their freely elected representatives, if the Prime Minister would give us a free vote. Should the maple leaf design submitted by the Prime Minister be approved under these conditions, then I am sure Canadians generally will accept—they will be forced to accept—the rule of the majority.

However if it is rejected I hope the Prime Minister will seriously consider the proposal I have put forth for a distinctive national flag, which I believe Canadians generally would accept since it would satisfy every desire of our multiple religious, racial and cultural background, and it would eliminate the confusion and disunity which is created at present by the two flag resolution.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale).

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Some hon. Members: Quack, quack.

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to this debate during the past two days, and it seems to me it is strangely reminiscent of the atmosphere that prevailed on the government side of the house back in 1956. It was a Liberal government in those days, too—during the famous pipe line debate. I was a member of the House of Commons at that time. The situation was different inasmuch as the government of that day had an overwhelming majority and it used that overwhelming majority like a steamroller to subvert the basic rights of parliament. When I rose to speak during that pipe line debate I was received in much the same way as I was received tonight, with cries of "Carried" from the government side of the house—and the government side of the house today is again occupied by the Liberal party. There is a difference, however; it has not the great big steamroller majority that it had back in 1956. But it still seems to be saturated with the spirit of complacency, indifference and arrogance which prevailed during that tragic pipe line debate which brought such disastrous results to the parliament of Canada.

There is something else in the atmosphere of that time which is reminiscent of the atmosphere that prevails tonight. The government backbenchers were dedicated to a conspiracy of silence. The very word parliament means to talk and discuss. Yet the supporters of the government sit in silence, do a little jeering from time to time, shout "carried" from time to time, but make no constructive contribution to this important subject which is not only dividing the parliament of Canada but is also dividing the people of Canada from sea to sea. During the rape of parliament back in 1956 I could not understand how the government backbenchers could sit in silence on that occasion, and neither can I on this occasion when a subject is under discussion that is loaded with emotion and concerns the basic values and ideals, the symbols that are identified with our traditions, with our parliamentary institutions, with freedom and liberty, which are at stake at the present time.

I want to spend the few moments at my disposal tonight discussing the amendment to the Prime Minister's motion. There is a fundamental purpose in the amendment. As has already been indicated, it is to provide an opportunity to the government and the Prime Minister in particular to find a convenient face saving device to get them out of the difficulty into which they have stumbled. I cannot believe that a man with the international background of the present Prime Minister of Canada could have de-

liberately set out to deal with this controversial and divisive issue in the almost absentminded fashion in which he has proceeded up to the present time. I believe he has stumbled into this difficulty in much the same manner as the government stumbled into its problems with the budget, stumbled into difficulty over the Canada pension program and generally have stumbled along in an unplanned, haphazard fashion which I do not have to emphasize during this debate tonight because it has been commented on by many of Canada's leading journalists as well as by the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Fisher), who also doubles as a journalist.

I think it results from a lack of firm leadership on the part of the Prime Minister and I think it results too from the fact of his diplomatic training. In the world of diplomacy you almost have to be a chameleon. You have to be all things to all people if you are going to bring about the kind of reconciliation that he has been so successful in achieving during his years as a diplomat representing the Dominion of Canada. I think too of his background, as it was pointed up the other day in a little exchange between the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition, when he indicated that the Leader of the Opposition had once been a Liberal and the Leader of the Opposition shot back that the Prime Minister had once been a Conservative. I think his difficulty results from the fact that he has fallen into bad company. He was once a Conservative. I am sure those Conservative instincts must still be there, but he is surrounded by bad company at the present time. It is interesting to note that a convert to a political party is always more extreme than those who are born into that party.

As another illustration of this point I would refer to the present Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill), who spent most of his formative years in the province of Manitoba and was a Conservative, but now has become an extreme exponent of the worst aspects of Liberalism. I am also reminded of Sir Winston Churchill, that great parliamentarian, who changed parties twice. He was a Conservative, became a Liberal and then in his more mature years he returned to Conservatism and wound up his parliamentary career in a blaze of glory.

The reason I interject this thought is that what the Liberal government is doing in dealing with this important issue is typical of their attitude toward Canada and confederation down through the years. It is the old divide and rule formula. As a western member I have been subjected to this right from the days I first entered parliament. At that time—and they are great sloganeers—they used the slogan: A vote for Dinsdale is a vote for Drew, is a vote for Bay street, is a vote for duplicity. This is the sort of divisive tactic that they pursued in my early experience in politics, and they are still using it today. I have an advertisement here which goes back about 10 years in Canadian politics. It reads in part as follows:

> Manitoba now receives $23 million yearly under the dominion tax agreement. Drew would scrap this to fatten the money bags of Ontario and Quebec.

This is the old divide and rule formula which has been used with such a devastating effect on national unity in this country. At the bottom of the advertisement you are urged to vote Liberal. This formula, applied by the sort of company the Prime Minister finds himself in at the moment, found expression in a rule or ruin policy during the period when the Liberals were in opposition, at which time they downgraded Canada in the eyes of the world for the sake of political expediency. I read recently an interesting speech by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp) which was delivered on Friday, June 26, to the British-Canadian trade association at the Seignory club in Montebello. On page 7 of his speech there is this interesting paragraph:

> Shortly thereafter I visited Britain to discuss with the government a number of trade matters, and also to try to break down the psychological barrier that seemed to have been created by giving some reassurance about the underlying trend of conditions in Canada and the growing opportunities for sales in this market.

Who created the psychological barrier? The hidden persuaders of the Liberal opposition of those days. And so I could go on with the campaign gimmicks, the party slogans imported from the United States such as "get the country moving again", the comic books, the pigeons, etc., etc. These tactics are being repeated in the government's handling of the very delicate issue of the flag. They have resorted to the same divide and rule tactics.

They have attempted to destroy the opposition leader in a personal assault. They have allowed themselves to become the representatives of the extreme forces in this country, and I shall be dealing with that in a moment. They have brought in the flag with typical Liberal arrogance, without having it passed upon by a parliamentary committee and without any referral to the other groups or other parties in this House of Commons. Even worse than that, it was never even dis-

cussed by the members of the house supporting the government. It is a personal flag, it is a party flag.

The only political parties that have had personal party flags were parties like the nazi party, which had its personal party flag. This flag is a complete break with Canada's past. Again, the only countries that have resorted to this tactic in adopting a flag have been Soviet Russia, nazi Germany, and more recently Dr. DuValier who is in charge of the new government of Haiti. They have adopted a flag which has completely repudiated their past because they have emerged out of a revolutionary rather than an evolutionary process.

I believe these tactics have been deliberately designed to irritate the House of Commons. We have had no Easter recess—the first time that I can recall in the 14 years I have been here that parliament has not been granted a recess. We have not had any summer recess. If there is any procedure that is designed to irritate and disturb the House of Commons, it is this procedure of forcing parliament to operate under pressure on controversial issues. Perhaps, sir, it has been done deliberately to keep members of parliament out of touch with their constituents, because in this Ottawa hothouse experience we sometimes live in an Alice in Wonderland environment. Of course, it makes it more difficult for members who come from the more remote parts of Canada. We have not been able to get back to our constituents in order to feel the pulse at the local constituency level, particularly on an issue like this. It is political expediency of the worst kind which almost borders on the political philosophy espoused by Machiavelli of the middle ages.

An hon. Member: It is renaissance.

Mr. Dinsdale: No renaissance here, I assure you.

The Prime Minister's attitude has been one of political provocation right from the start. As the *Globe and Mail* has said, and this has been quoted many times, it was deliberately designed to set Canada on a collision course. There was a challenge issued for the opposition to bring in a want of confidence motion on this issue. Some have been interpreting the flag debate as an attempt on the part of the opposition to precipitate an election. This is the last subject which should be used as a basis for an election in this country. This is why the opposition is introducing an amendment for a referendum to make it possible for the government to get out from under the impasse in which it finds itself, and to avoid the collision that has been referred to by many commentators in this nation.

The attitude, the belligerent attitude if you will, with which this subject has been introduced by the government suggests that it hopes that the present house of minorities, this divided house, will split on the issue. They will capture one province in toto and then press ahead to divide the rest of the country in a desperate attempt to get an overall majority. This is why I say we are dealing with Machiavellian politics on this issue. Hypocrisy is also involved because it was said this was an election promise. This aspect has been dealt with adequately. Many silly things are promised during an election campaign, and this is a quotation from the Prime Minister himself. It certainly was not in my campaign. My campaign dealt with the propaganda issues like deficit financing, wheat sales to China, Diefendollars and all the other gimmicks with which we in the Conservative party had to wrestle. The very fact that a two flag resolution has been introduced too is indicative of hypocrisy. We are being given a flag that repudiates the past on the one hand, and on the other hand we are going back to the union jack, which is directly concerned with Canada's colonial period. This is hypocrisy. This is political subterfuge of the most despicable kind.

It reminds me of the tactics that were used in South Africa where, in response to the extreme element in that commonwealth country the government decided to bring in a distinctive flag. They could not decide on a distinctive flag, so they brought in a two flag resolution, a distinctive flag plus the union jack denoting connection with the commonwealth. It was not long before someone moved in the house that there was no longer a necessity for the union jack. The prime minister agreed and that was the end of the symbolism denoting the connection of that country with the commonwealth. We know the story of South Africa only too well since that time. You cannot appease extremism by this sort of tactic of appeasing the extremist viewpoint.

The suggestion that this is extremism is not my idea at all. It is not the first time this subject has been up in the House of Commons. I am going to quote from an editorial appearing in the Winnipeg *Free Press* back in 1954 when a Liberal backbencher introduced a resolution for a distinctive flag. The government very wisely withdrew itself from

any connection with the private member's bill. Here is what the *Free Press* had to say about that particular period in Canadian parliamentary history:

> 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. 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 the editorial in the Winnipeg *Free Press* said back in 1954 when this issue was before that parliament.

We are catering to the extreme elements on both sides of this question, on one hand repudiating our past by bringing in the maple leaf flag with no symbols of our heritage, and on the other hand going back to the union jack. It was a two flag resolution. Now it has been split into two resolutions which I think is symbolic of the split in our country on this issue.

The Kingston *Whig-Standard* of Saturday, May 16, had this to say:

> As recently as February of this year Prime Minister Pearson said publicly there is more to this flag issue than simply satisfying the desires of those who make the most noise. It now appears that the noisy faction has got to him.

The final paragraph is this:

> Mr. Pearson has issued a challenge to Canadians. He is betting on the weakness of parliament to sustain him in his decision to sell us out. This is a bitter day for Canada.

I know this is a device that has often been resorted to in parliament. Members of parliament in their desire to get home in the withering heat of July have often left their places of responsibility in the House of Commons, particularly those of us from remote parts of the country, but not on this basic issue. We are here to discuss it in all its important aspects.

The fact that the government has capitulated to the extreme viewpoint in Canada is also revealed in the way this matter was initially introduced to Canadians, not through the House of Commons but by an insult to the Canadian Legion. I used to be the parliamentary secretary to the minister of veterans affairs, and in that capacity it was my privilege to attend the opening ceremony, on Sunday evening, of the biannual national meeting of the Royal Canadian Legion. It was always understood that was not an occasion for a political speech, that it was a semi-religious, dignified ceremony.

I can understand the response of the legionnaires on that occasion. Some of them indulged in booing, and a good many of the papers said it was a shame to boo Canada's Prime Minister under these circumstances. Mr. Speaker, I was in England at the end of the war in 1945 and I followed the post-war election there. I heard Sir Winston Churchill speak in Wembley stadium. I heard that great man, who led the free world through the holocaust of world war II, booed by a large section of the audience. They were not booing him; they were booing the domestic policies that he represented.

Was Winston Churchill vexed? Did he stand on his dignity and say, "You should not boo the prime minister of the United Kingdom?" No. He turned to the section of the audience booing him and he said, "Let's get it over," and he led them in a great booing chorus, and he won the meeting from that point on.

A journalist, Mr. Bill Smiley, had this to say about that particular episode in Winnipeg:

> By the way, I think the Canadian Legion has had some pretty shoddy treatment from the daily press because of its espousal of the ensign, and it's less-than-enthusiastic reception of the Prime Minister, at the Winnipeg convention.
>
> What's wrong with an organization standing up for something it believes in? Everybody else does it, from hog producers to folk singers. But the Legion was suddenly made the butt of a vicious and slanted attack in certain dailies.
>
> The men who did the dirty work in two wars were suddenly catalogued as a group of reactionaries, or as one daily put it, a "bunch of old soldiers", trying to tell the rest of Canada what flag it should have.

I must congratulate the Legion for its responsible response to the attack made on it in sections of the press and in some other circles in Canada. In its own publication, *The Legionary*, it showed a great sense of responsibility—this is in its July issue—when

in a special editorial the editor said, in reference to the number of letters it had received:

> Most of the letters, about 85 per cent, are in favour of the retention of the Canadian red ensign as our national flag. Practically all of them, however, whether pro or con, are of a highly emotional and critical nature, and in the interest of national unity *The Legionary* refrains from printing any of them.

I think it would have been much better for national unity if this issue had never been precipitated into the arena of public discussion under the present circumstances. It was done in the presence of a group of Canadians who, above everything else, must be aware of the significance of symbols. It was the sacrifices of these men and their colleagues in world wars I and II which made the ensign Canada's distinctive flag. Surely the flag that has been the symbol of the values and ideals that made this nation great, having gone through the bloodshed in two world wars, should have received the kind of distinction that is demanded by the resolution put before the house by the Prime Minister?

Just briefly I want to indicate what the ensign stands for. We have had its history outlined. It became Canada's distinctive flag after the sacrifices of two world wars. In 1919 Canada discovered its soul at Versailles where the then Prime Minister, Sir Robert Borden, insisted that Canada be represented as a separate nation. This came about, I think, because of the upsurge of reasonable nationalism that had been contributed to by the influx of a great wave of immigrants who came to this country in the early part of this century, immigrants such as the hon. member for Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Rapp), who was quoted this afternoon by my colleague from Victoria-Carleton. These immigrants came to this country to get away from the narrow nationalism that was turning Europe into a bedlam, and they appreciated the positive nationalism that was afforded to them under the aegis of the ensign and all that it represents.

I could quote the late prime minister, the Right Hon. Mackenzie King, who made a specific promise that any flag in this country would contain the union jack. I could quote the Right Hon. Louis St. Laurent, and I heard him speak in this house whenever the issue came up when he was prime minister. He would say, "I am in favour of a distinctive national flag, but unfortunately some of my fellow Canadians are not of the same viewpoint, and so long as I am prime minister I will do nothing that will divide this nation." That is the responsible attitude that any leader must adopt if we are going to evolve to our full stature of national unity.

Why is this such an important issue? Before I go into that I can also refer back to the parliamentary committee of 1945 which made a specific recommendation for a distinctive flag, the ensign with the golden maple leaf in the fly to which might be added a superimposed blue fleur-de-lis, recognizing the traditions of our past. We do not have to be adamant on this point, because if we are to resolve this matter at all it will be on the basis of typical Canadian compromise. As a westerner from Manitoba, the home of No. 1 Northern Manitoba wheat, I think the gold maple leaf would be a symbolic reminder of the golden prairies which are contributing so much to the well being of the Canadian economy at the present time. Certainly a maple leaf has little symbolic significance to us.

This is a vital issue, because flags symbolize those values and those ideals which undergird the spiritual life of this nation. The heart craves some tangible expression of the intangible and this always emerges out of the past. Why are flags kept in cathedrals? It is because peoples of all nations recognized their importance as symbols of underlying values.

The ensign could not be more representative of those values because it comes about—particularly the union jack in the corner—by bringing together the crosses of St. George, St. Andrew and St. Patrick. St. George was a Macedonian, a symbol of chivalry; St. Andrew was a Jew who became the patron saint of Scotland; St. Patrick was a Roman who went to Ireland as a missionary to spread among the Irish the civilization he had learned in France. These men were not chosen because of their racial or national backgrounds. They were chosen because of the ideals they represented and the deeds they had accomplished. Britain was a melting pot made up of Angles, Saxons, Picts, Scots, Normans, French and many others. Unity came out of diversity because of a dedication to common ideals. Canada, too, must evolve unity out of diversity and this can only be done by dedication to the spirit of tolerance, the spirit of fraternity which was referred to by Cardinal Léger recently when he spoke in support of the ecumenical movement which is now sweeping Christendom. These values and ideals are symbolized by the crosses in the jack—and the very name "union jack" derives from the fact that James VI of Scotland who became James I of England loved to sign his name

Jacques, French being the language of the court at that time.

There is something of deeper significance in this attempt to destroy the symbols of our past. I think it is associated with the materialism of the nineteenth century. The intellectual movements which came out of the nineteenth century counted many which gave rise to a distortion of scientific principles. The science of eugenics, for example, was blown up into the theory of the superiority of certain races which has plagued the twentieth century. The fact that we keep talking about the founding races and bringing race into this discussion is I think, a reflection on this age; it is something we should have long grown out of in this country. Someone has said that man attempted to destroy God in the nineteenth century as a result of which, in the twentieth, he is in great danger of destroying himself. If you destroy the symbols, if you remove the symbols which go back to the foundation of western civilization, which go back to the crusades, which are identified with the slow evolution of our political institutions, how long will it be until the facts upon which those symbols are based are also destroyed in this country?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Dinsdale: I do not intend to deal with the maple leaf as a symbol. It has its place on buttons, badges and other things of that kind where it has been used to good effect. Dr. Eugene Forsey has placed the matter in proper perspective. He says: "A government which is firmly committed to the absolutely bicultural character of our country is yet proposing a flag which contains not the slightest reference to any culture whatsoever—not even agriculture."

An hon. Member: Very funny.

Mr. Dinsdale: Someone across the way says "very funny". It is not funny. It is tragic.

Mr. Bigg: You fellows speak better sitting on your rear ends—why not stand up and make a speech?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Dinsdale: The Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Dupuis) says it is very funny. It is tragic that a government should adopt this hypocritical approach to such an issue. I try to be as charitable as I can, but there is only one explanation: It hopes to split the country and get a majority.

Mr. Sharp: It has split your party, though.

[Mr. Dinsdale.]

Mr. Dinsdale: The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp) talks about splitting parties. He and his friends have been trying to split the Conservative party, east against west, using divide and rule methods.

My time is running short and I must bring these remarks to a conclusion. The Liberal party has talked about a new approach to politics, one without partisanship and all the other nasty things which are identified with our political system in Canada. I say that in their approach to this issue they are attempting to re-open all the old divisions. They are playing party politics with a vengeance. Ramsey Cook, who gave the public a little book last year entitled "John W. Dafoe and the Politics of the Manitoba Free Press" had this to say:

> Based on the careers of Arthur Meighen and Mackenzie King it would appear that something other than honesty and integrity is required for success in Canadian politics.

An hon. Member: Agreed.

Mr. Dinsdale: I agree wholeheartedly with that. As a westerner, I know what the Right Hon. Mackenzie King did to divide that part of Canada.

It is not good enough to deal with this matter from a narrow, partisan standpoint. You may win Quebec, but you divide the rest of the country. That is obvious, so why proceed on a collision course, on a headstrong, partisan course which will have such a divisive effect on the progress Canada has made toward national unity? Our traditions and our history are not a private preserve for the Prime Minister and the Liberal party to exploit or repudiate as their whim or fancy may dictate.

Mr. J. C. Munro (Hamilton East): In one sense this seemingly interminable debate on the question of a distinctive Canadian flag possesses pathetic undertones. That this question could and does engender such seeming fervor can only be interpreted as a manifestation of our frustrations as a nation. As a nation, in recent years, we seem to be floundering. We have not found a sense of direction.

This observation would not, I think, apply to our French Canadian compatriots. One often hears of the so-called mistrust of English speaking Canadians towards the new ideas, aims and aspirations of the Quebec renaissance, of Quebec revolution, if you like. I believe all too often this mistrust is mistaken for simply envy. Quebec seems to have emerged from the morass. They seem to have acquired a sense of direction. They seem

to have a destiny to realize. The new vitality of Quebec is one of the most encouraging signs indicating that perhaps our apathy has run its course. The destiny of French Canada is inexorably interwoven with ours and cannot be realized alone. How else to explain the repercussions of this movement in Quebec upon the rest of Canada?

The strange paradox is that many of our English speaking commentators on and observers of the political scene who would extol the virtues of the Quebec development often are the very ones who would deplore an extension of this movement on similar terms to the rest of Canada. The Canadian body politic is starting to flinch, to rid itself of its complacency and apathy, a complacency and apathy albeit more apparent than real. If one welcomes this change, then English speaking Canada can in no small measure owe its new awareness to the sometimes rude jabs emanating from Quebec. Perhaps the rest of Canada has decided to set aside any niggardly resentment and take the development in Quebec as a cue to the initiation of our own re-thinking. True it is that the glamour of the new direction in Quebec should not mesmerize us to the point where we are unaware of the possible damage and repercussions which would arise. However, the attempt to equate the flag resolution with a desire to accede to the desires and aims of Quebec—a very questionable hypothesis in any event—is a telltale sign of an underlying resentment on our part, a feeling we can ill afford to indulge any longer.

Mr. Hamilton: Tom Kent should write more legibly.

Mr. Munro: This tedious and often exasperating discussion—I am sorry, I did not hear the comment of the hon. member.

Mr. Hamilton: I was just asking the parliamentary secretary to tell Tom Kent to write more legibly.

Mr. Munro: This tedious and often exasperating discussion of the flag is fast becoming a great Canadian Preoccupation. Standing alone this question does not deserve such great attention. That there is something of far deeper significance behind this resolution no one will now deny. Perhaps it is our collective desire to go to our own internal brink for one last time, with the desperate hope that the exercise will either kill or cure us as a nation. Does not the whole debate as it is waged here and throughout the country have a fatalistic quality that is unmistakable? Those who would champion the red ensign instinctively know that they have lost. But lost what? Lost the debate in the commons? Lost a great Canadian controversy? Lost just the battle but not the war? The fact that such champions are forcibly arguing for at best a referendum and at least a general election is perhaps one of the great examples of internal political and moral brinkmanship in our Canadian experience.

Let no one misunderstand me. I am not attributing any base motives to those who would champion the cause of the red ensign. They feel deeply. Theirs is a course of action to which they are totally and utterly committed. After all, was it not this side that brought this issue to the forefront by advancing the flag question in the form of a government resolution at this time? No, I am not being critical of those who would fight for the retention of the red ensign, but rather I agree with those Canadians who think that another trip to the brink is precisely what this country needs.

Alas, one thing all this has proved is that the flag debate has unquestionably debunked the theory of those Canadians who would insist that we as a people no longer desire to indulge in introspection, no longer desire to deal in terms of a Canadian identity. To state that Canadians are not deeply troubled over the question of a Canadian identity, Canadian aims, Canada's role, Canada's destiny as a nation, is to be oblivious to the facts.

There are those who say that the discussion of the scope and direction of a Canadian nationalism is a futile and wasteful thing, outdated in this age of international co-operation. This line of thought has been forcibly advanced by many of our leading scholars and intellectuals.

May I refer to a remark made by a man deserving a great respect, Professor Frank Underhill. He said:

> I think we are heading, wherever you look now, towards a rather mean, petty, parochial nationalism.

It is true that Professor Underhill expressed this sentiment in the context of his expressed concern for foreign control, but I feel his statement is no less applicable here. I expect that this flag question will after much turmoil be resolved. I expect we will have a distinctive flag. I believe that during this current process of resolving the matter, and irrespective of the outcome, it can be taken that Canadians have once more served notice

on their political leaders that they desire a policy of enlightened nationalism.

Any discussion in the political arena of nationalism, especially a Canadian nationalism, leaves the politician open to immediate ridicule. Such activity on his part is seen as nothing more nor less than that action of a rather ruthless political opportunist, succumbing to the irresistible temptation to seize a time-tested weapon in order to reap rich political rewards.

On the premise that the best defence is attack, may I say that the constant refrains by many of the commentators on the Canadian political scene are distastefully smug, an ego-satisfying device to identify oneself with the conventional wisdom of the so-called intellectual elite, to identify oneself with the enlightened. The answer to a more definite scope and direction of a Canadian nationalism must be found. If it is to be found it undoubtedly lies between the two extremes. The important thing is we must try to find it. The flag issue is simply another price we Canadians would pay to be Canadians; just another hesitant step in our cautious groping to find a truly national purpose.

Of the many Canadians who are prepared to take this step, are there not those who wish that they were more aware of its direction? How much more so, then, must this feeling sway those Canadians who are not as yet prepared to take that step, who desire knowledge of where the step will lead us.

Can we be too critical of those who before depriving themselves of a cherished possession would desire to know that with which it is to be replaced? To say that the replacement will be a distinctive symbol, three maple leaves on a field of white bounded in blue, is an answer too patently superficial. If it is to be replaced with something new let us have a general idea of the dimensions of this newness, of its fundamental meaning. Many surely will acknowledge how much more readily those Canadians who still resist the implementation of this resolution would accept it if they but knew the real ingredients of its substitute.

Our caution, as exhibited in this issue, brings to mind a point made by Professor Kilborn in his book "The Firebrand", a point he seems to have made more as an afterthought. When our country's only armed rebellion, in the early part of the nineteenth century, ignominiously suffered humiliating defeats, it left an indelible mark on our Canadian character. This is the point Professor Kilborn makes that I think is of considerable interest. This, he claims, left us a cautious people, suspect of any emotionalism; a people resolved to settle its problems by travelling the safer road of pragmatic compromise. No ringing declarations for us; no high sounding protestations of faith and allegiance for us.

Does not this present resolution somehow disturb this pact we have made among ourselves? This resolution would squarely confront and challenge this historic legacy. Nor, as some unhappily believe, does it lend itself to solution through the good old Canadian way. We are boldly dealing with a matter on the order paper which is not subject to our typical Canadian treatment. Too slavish adherence to the device of compromise has left Canadians with a festering sense of unfulfilment. Like a bandage too hastily applied, it covers up the wound before the air gets in and often as not the wound never properly heals.

I am not extolling the virtue of soul searing, emotional orgy, but rather the necessity of seeing this debate on the flag as it is encompassed by the many other problems and circumstances we face as a nation; problems of which we are now at last aware; problems that all too often are given the old Canadian treatment, that of burying them in our subconscious and hoping against hope they will fade. They have not faded; events have nurtured them; they are bursting their enclosure; they are stridently emerging into our consciousness. Any further attempt to entice them back into the recesses of our national soul are attempts we undertake at our peril.

What are some of these encompassing problems and circumstances that reflect so strongly on this question of a distinctive flag? We know that no modern industrial country has ever allowed so large a portion of its industry to fall into foreign hands as we have. I would include in this our natural resources, owned by non-residents to a frightening degree—a type of foreign ownership which to all intents and purposes is irredeemable. Predicated upon this premise that Canadians cherish their independence, dare we delude ourselves that such a development has not imposed severe limits on that independence; that it has and will cut drastic inroads into our sovereignty; that it constitutes a constant pressure area to prompt ever greater economic and political assimilation to our southern neighbour?

One striking thing about this flag issue is the bitter ironies that it has pointed up. One such bitter irony is now evolving; that is the thought that so absorbed will we become in

our internal wranglings, in nourishing our resentments—resentments that are invariably the aftermath of the application of the old Canadian treatment—that we will ignore the real threat to our over-all sovereignty, the threat of foreign domination. I fear that this type of reaction feeds on what is our legitimate desire for a vent for our collective frustrations. We are in a somewhat similar position to the wife beater. He picks on his own because the boss gave him a bad time at work; but he does not change his job.

Another bitter irony is the current attempt to becloud the issue by the effort of many to convince the Canadian people that any manifestations of nationalism on their part are not only belated but are primitive expressions of a backward people. So elevated do we regard ourselves in the hierarchy of sophisticated nations that such an observation is particularly galling to our self-esteem. It would not be inaccurate to say that such a suggestion has found a fairly wide acceptance in our country today. The really unfortunate thing is that it has little merit. The ironic connotation is that its most ready proponents would seem to be among our corporate leaders and our heady left-wing intellectuals. At last they have found a sentiment which they can espouse in common, and apparently with equal enthusiasm. A galling aspect of this particular irony is the fact that the common sentiment would have to be the very sentiment that would undermine those national aspirations that some Canadians may at last be ready to express. I think in this context I can do no better than quote the thoughts of Michael Barkway on the subject some years ago when he undertook to deal with this problem:

> One (argument) is the pose of sophisticated realism which asserts that the conception of national independence is out of date in this nuclear age, and, therefore, Canada should not worry about preserving its independence from the United States. All that needs be said about this slippery bit of semantics is that the premise, in any sense in which it is true, is also trite; and that the conclusion does not follow from it. It is true that the growing interdependence of the world in the world in the nuclear age necessitates increasing limitations upon the sovereignty of all nations. But the chance of getting such limitations universally accepted will not be increased, but reduced, if Canada surrenders its independent voice to one of the superstates.
>
> The same offence against logic invalidates the argument when it is presented in its alternative form under a cloak of superior idealism. In this form the premise is that national barriers must yield to a universal community of man and a world government. Its false conclusion is that Canada can hasten "the day of the Lord" by sacrificing its independence, not to a world authority, but to the one superstate which happens to be very powerful, very rich and very near. This merely confuses Canada's absorption by the United States with an ultimate kingdom of heaven where all lambs will be cherished by all lions and there shall be no night.

He goes on:

> I don't want to labour the elementary and obvious confusions but so much Canadian thought about independence is so confused that they cannot be ignored. We cannot begin to talk sense until we get rid of the half-baked idea that it is somehow vaguely immoral to assert Canada's will to independence.

Later on Mr. Barkway brings back to our memory a prophecy made many years ago by Henri Bourassa when he stated that if a movement toward annexation ever started in Canada it would be led by "the imperialists of Toronto". This line of reasoning leads one to the historic note that has been drawn to our attention by Douglas V. LePan. In one of his papers, Mr. LePan was warning that Canadians are prepared to pay some price to preserve their national independence but there was a limit to what they are prepared to pay; and then he reminded us of the somersault performed by some of the signers of the annexation manifesto in 1849, signed by many of the very people who had been most vocal in defending Canadian independence and who suddenly became most anxious to exchange it for union with the United States.

The third ironic element that has emerged during our discussion on the flag debate is the often repeated criticism being levelled at the Prime Minister to the effect that his timing was exceedingly bad in bringing in the flag resolution at this time.

When, I ask, could there be a more propitious time? Twenty or even 10 years ago? Surely not. Those were times when we still basked in that affinity with the United Kingdom, arising from the close attachment during world war II and for many years thereafter. To bring in this resolution in those times would have provoked near havoc.

If the argument is that the timing was premature, then would it have been more appropriate to have delayed this resolution to say 10 years from now? I think not. If I may appropriate a phrase uttered by the leader of the New Democratic party, the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas), it would seem that perhaps 10 years from now the more suitable Canadian flag would contain "the insignia of a beaver clutched firmly in the claws of an eagle". Would not a resolution such as the one before us today if brought in at such a time be

well accorded that widespread mockery which it may have richly earned and deserved?

Even now the bald fact that many of those who oppose this resolution are rather resigned about the whole thing has an ominous ring. The mere fact of the relatively peaceful discussion of such a resolution now taking place would indicate that to many of our people it is not regarded as a bold new step in the context of a Canadian awareness but a quiet acceptance, an acceptance based on that feeling that perhaps it does not much matter anyhow. What irony, that we Canadians are determined to take a step, for many years regarded as inevitable, only when the taking of such step would be devoid of much of its meaning.

If one of the motivations behind the design to establish a distinctive flag for Canada is the hope that it will stimulate a national pride, one wonders whether the timing is not perhaps too late. Is there not in this country a concurrent discussion generating much heat over the issue of federalism versus sectionalism? Right at this moment are there not many Canadians gravely concerned that the increasing demands of the provinces in jurisdictional matters are sapping the strength of our federal authority? One cannot help but wonder whether the cries of the provinces for more autonomy are not in some degree a reflection of that instinct for survival that tells us to get out of a burning building while there is still time.

Perhaps the reason that the aspirations expressed today are more of a parochial or provincial nature is akin to the feeling that a home owner has when his house is overencumbered. Why needlessly spend the energy in bringing about extensive changes? Is it not more practical to get out and build a new one from the ground up? Perhaps some of this discussion on my part is unduly pessimistic. My only personal hope and prayer is that it is.

I for one wholeheartedly endorse the resolution without amendment and respect and admire the Prime Minister for bringing it in at this time. I support it more for what it can mean than what it is.

Mr. Enns: Would the hon. member permit a question before his time expires?

Mr. Munro: Certainly.

Mr. Enns: During the course of his very learned observations, which were listened to with much care on this side of the house he made the statement that this was really an excellent time to introduce discussion of a flag and asked why we should postpone it for 10 years. There has been no suggestion by anyone that it should be postponed for that length of time but rather just for a matter of months. So I would ask the hon. member why he should want to make that kind of remark.

Mr. Munro: In the over-all history of the Canadian nation I think we must deal in terms of years. When we consider what an appropriate time is, surely we consider that in the context of this year or next year. Surely we do not consider it in terms of two or three weeks or two or three months from now. The fact of the matter is that we have gone this long without a flag. The fact remains that I think it has been injurious to our national aspirations to have gone this long without a flag, and my only point was to establish that now is as good a time as any other, if it is not too late already.

Mr. K. H. More (Regina City): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak at this time in this debate I want to make it clear that under any circumstances I would have sought to speak on a matter of this importance to Canada and its future. The fact that we are in the month of August and have not had the normal holiday period does not compromise my views in any way. It does not compromise me in my desire to do the duty which I feel I was elected to do by the people of my constituency.

I have had to fight not only serious illness but economic challenges in order to make my way in my lifetime, and in some years I had no holidays. I forwent them to meet the challenge facing me at that time. Equally as much as in the case of personal experience I believe there is a challenge to this parliament and to the people of Canada in the flag debate, and I forgo any hope of a holiday and sympathize with no one for having to forgo a holiday so that debate in this parliament, which is what this parliament is for, may take place.

I do not intend in my remarks to belittle anyone who has spoken in the debate, and there have been members on the other side who have spoken. I do intend to put forward my views on why this debate is taking place now, and on the serious misjudgment of the Prime Minister in having it take place now and forcing it to a conclusion in the dictatorial fashion in which he has started out. I think this is responsible criticism. Although there are those who differ with me and ap-

plaud the Prime Minister for bringing the matter forward, I think I have justified criticisms to offer with regard to his conduct in bringing it forward and imposing it on parliament in this fashion. I hope I will be given a hearing as I express, without any malice, my criticisms in this regard.

The debate before the house arose out of a motion proposed by the Prime Minister, which motion was proposed in one part and has since been divided into two. The motion now before the house is in these words:

> 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.

I know that the matter under consideration before the house is the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker). Mr. Speaker, the levity I hear on the other side indicates to me the attitude of many over there who choose to sit silent, not use parliament for its intended purpose and belittle those who feel it their duty to take part at this time.

In my experience or in my reading of parliamentary history of Canada, I do not know of any serious proposal that had to do, not with the economics of this nation or any subject upon which you normally pass judgment as a result of full consideration, but a matter dealing with emotions relating to the background of the people getting together to form confederation, that has been brought forward in such an arbitrary fashion as the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) has seen fit to do in presenting this resolution. It is claimed by the Prime Minister and those who speak for the government that the Liberal party had a mandate from the people of Canada. I ask where and when that mandate was given. Certainly I have taken part in four election campaigns during recent years. If a mandate had been indicated at all it would have arisen from the presentation the Liberal party made to the country in the general election in 1962 and again in the general election of 1963.

In both of these election campaigns the Liberal forces of this country did all they could to defeat me. They had the hierarchy on the front benches in my constituency. They were there between elections and they were brought back in the 1963 election campaign. I do not boast about the results. They have been a deep satisfaction to me because I have lived in this community for over 30 years. The results were substantially in my favour. I think under the circumstances in which the election campaign was conducted I can, in all humility, feel very gratified indeed that the community in which I have lived for that period has seen fit to give me its support. I say the Liberal party had nothing to do with it. They marshalled their forces at the federal level. They were going to win Regina City. They had all their forces in Regina City, but at no time during the election campaign did any one of them mention the Liberal party stood for a new, distinctive Canadian flag which contained no symbol related to the past. They did not say that they would, if they were given a majority, introduce a distinctive Canadian flag. The Liberal candidate in the constituency never mentioned it, and certainly I never offered it to the electorate in any way, shape or form. I believe there are other constituencies in Canada in which the Prime Minister spoke, and in which members on the front benches spoke, in which they did not mention that one of the major planks in their platform was a distinctive Canadian flag. They did not mention that one of the major items with which parliament must deal in a particular session, regardless of the period of the session, would be the distinctive flag. What I have said cannot be repudiated.

It is passing strange, too, that the throne speech that was to herald the great 60 days of decision when everything the Liberal party had promised the electorate was going to be achieved, made no reference to the flag being introduced in this session of parliament. This fact gave heart to some of the people who stood for the Canadian red ensign. Members of the Legion, as pointed out in *The Legionary,* were given hope that this matter would not suddenly be forced into the realm of politics and partisan action. What changed the Prime Minister's mind? What brought on this sudden haste? What compelled him to make this a major issue in this session and completely disrupt the affairs of this parliament? We would like to know. I think the people of Canada would like to know.

I wonder if it is because of the extremist voice of Quebec? I wonder if that is what it is? I suggest this because in a speech delivered by the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Dupuis) he made a reference to this subject. I am sorry to see that he has left the house because I do not like to refer to remarks made by other members if they are not present. I hope the hon. member will

forgive me. The Minister without Portfolio made a speech outside this house referring to the flag and praised the Prime Minister for his courage. I do not intend to quote him, but he can correct me if I misinterpret one of the remarks he made. He said: Let us get on and settle this flag business, when we get the new, distinctive flag the Prime Minister has put before parliament, we will hear no more of extremism in Quebec, we will stop the saboteurs, these bombers, these disrupters. What utter nonsense to say that a new flag, a piece of cloth, will settle them. Is this the reason for the sudden change? The Prime Minister had a reputation for sound judgment, and I do not challenge his services to Canada. What changed the character of this man all of a sudden? On what basis does he thrust this issue into this session of parliament at this time and say: You do this, or else? What has happened to this man? If the reason is the one suggested, then it is utter nonsense. This is no basis for choosing a flag for a country, because that problem appears to have some depth and the very strong feelings of the extremists cannot be settled overnight.

Is this a message that the Minister without Portfolio thinks the people of Canada can accept as the true reason for this flag issue being brought before parliament at this time? No, my friends, I do not accept it and my mail indicates that hundreds of thousands of people in Canada do not accept it. I was born and raised in Canada. I have lived more than half a century. I was raised in a little town in the west. My roots and my family's roots are deep in Canada. My people pioneered the west. We lived in a community in Saskatchewan that had no great services and did not have all the amenities of life that we enjoy today. We lived in a mixed community. Predominantly it was Protestant. We had only two churches, a Methodist and a Presbyterian. We had some Roman Catholic families—not many, but two that I can remember very well, because we were close to each other and played together. We had a Jewish family and we had a Chinese family. We had no problems of separatism, no problems of prejudice. These people joined us at our churches at times because they were Christian people and the Christian message coming from whatever source was interesting to them. Their own church was not available and transportation was not easy. On occasion, they joined with us.

I remember well as a lad going to the Orange celebrations on July 12. I remember how I fully misunderstood things because we used to have some speakers coming from Ontario. I could not understand why one Canadian would say the things about other Canadians that some of these people said. It was particularly embarrassing to me in my early youth when I was forming opinions, because we took one of the Catholic families with us to these celebrations. They came along readily because the celebration took in the whole community. In spite of these messages, no prejudice existed or developed in this community. I am glad to see it has been reduced here. Perhaps, as a result of those speeches, I can understand the feelings of my French Canadian compatriots. They have never been expressed in my family and I hope the time will never come that they will be expressed by anyone. We all want to be Canadians and to get along together as Canadians, but if the Minister without Portfolio is correct, that this flag is an appeasement of an extremist element, no matter on what side of the fence it is, then it is a shame it is being thrust on this parliament at this time.

During my lifetime we have had only one flag in Canada, the Canadian red ensign. I grew up under it. It flew from every building in my little home town when the occasion demanded it. I have seen it flown throughout Canada, and I never knew there was any feeling that Canada did not have a flag.

Today when I see the efforts being made by the government I wonder what it has in mind as the aims and objectives of Canada, and how far it has departed from the original intent of the Fathers of Confederation. I listened to the last young speaker with great interest. He belittled the efforts of those of us who want to maintain something of our traditions and carry them forward in the building we will do in the years ahead.

I entered public life actively as a candidate late in life. I may say I was active throughout my life because I was brought up to consider this part of my duty; but in 1957 I had a challenge thrown to me and I entered public life as a candidate. I certainly did not enter it to come to a parliament to take part in and witness the dissolution of the aims and objectives of the Fathers of Confederation, and of the nation we have built during our first 97 years. Because this seems to be the trend that is being followed by this government, I intend right now at the start of it, on the question of the flag issue, to fight it with all the strength I possess, not because I think a flag should be maintained at all

costs but because I think Canada should be maintained at all costs. The intent of the Fathers of Confederation should be in all our hearts, should be what we are here to work for and to which we should honestly seek to contribute.

No superficial symbol, a piece of bunting or anything like that, will contribute to the building of this great nation unless in our hearts we have an understanding, with prejudice removed, and unless we have one aim and objective, whether we are of French extraction, Irish extraction, British extraction, Ukrainian extraction, or whatever. We should have one purpose in mind—to work to build a new nation that will enhance the respect of the individual and increase the freedom he enjoys and has enjoyed in this country under the present flag.

A symbol should firmly express the determination in the hearts of the people of the country to work towards a common objective. I say that this determination is in the hearts of the Canadian people as I have met them, sought conversations with them and discussed amicably the problems we jointly face. It is there now, but it will be destroyed in large measure by the implementation of this resolution which the Prime Minister has so arbitrarily forced on this parliament, and demanded that it deal with on the basis that if it does not accept it there will be an election.

I think I have proven beyond possibility of defence or repudiation from the government side that at no time during the campaigns of 1962 and 1963 did the Liberal party offer, in a manner that would impress Canadians in all parts of Canada, a platform that contained this great plank of this new flag. There were other things it did offer in all parts of Canada that all Canadians understood, and though the Liberal party did not receive the majority of votes or return to office with a majority of members, similar proposals were made by other parties whose combined votes indicated the majority of the people supported them.

In particular I remember the Liberal party's undertaking that it would immediately seek to negotiate with the United States a way out of our nuclear commitments, to remove nuclear weapons from Canadian soil and Canadian military operations in every sphere. This was a plank and platform offered to Canadians in every part of the country. It was a plank which was supported by the majority of Canadians. It is a plank the government should be dealing with now in honouring its commitment to the Canadian people.

The Liberal party has been loud in its criticism of other governments and people for commitments it said had been made, but it has never found or produced any evidence in this house that such commitments had been made. I say it is a shame that the government delays carrying out this undertaking to the Canadian people. If there was one single item of priority in the Liberal platform, on which it got votes in the election of 1963, it was this plank and platform to negotiate a way out of the so-called nuclear commitment. However, as revealed in answers given to questions on orders of the day, we know that no negotiations are taking place and that the government is doing nothing about the matter at this time.

On the question of priorities, we have got a flag debate, even though the government has no mandate from the people to proceed with its flag. No selling job was done by the Liberal party to show it would take this action which today has such priority. Now we are going to be bludgeoned into facing a decision on it. You smile over there, but you cannot deny this. I doubt if you ever said to the people in your constituency that you stood for a plank and a platform that would do away with the Canadian red ensign in two years, and replace it with this proposed design.

The hon. member who preceded me referred to remarks made some time ago by a certain writer relative to foreign domination. Well, we have got foreign domination in the acceptance of the United States demand that we arm ourselves with nuclear weapons. I do not understand the hypocrisy and nonsense in this regard. To me the Minister without Portfolio may have spoken the truth, and I think it should be made known to the people of Canada.

I go further and say there can be only one reason for the haste with which the Prime Minister is demanding a final vote on this question of the flag, and that is to use it as a red herring, to try to get the people to forget that the Liberals' 60 days of decision resulted in a further 120 days during which practically all their decisions were repudiated, not by the people of Canada but by the government itself, because it made them in haste and without full consideration of their consequences. I believe time may yet demand some changes in the distinctive Canadian flag we have had for over 75 years. But I be-

lieve the need for such changes will be made evident, not by managed news leaks but by natural developments.

I am receiving a tremendous amount of correspondence on this issue—more than 1,700 individual pieces of mail along with the usual flow of lobby material which all members of parliament receive on every subject. Of all these writers, there were only seven who wanted the Canadian red ensign dispensed with. There were 13 who indicated that their preference was for the union jack alone. The remainder all asked that the Canadian red ensign be retained—the flag of their lifetime, the distinctive Canadian flag which has been recognized on no fewer than three occasions. Although this correspondence cannot represent everybody in my constituency, I am sure Mr. Gallup would consider that it is an overwhelming indication of what the people in my area, at least, desire. Perhaps this situation has come about because the Prime Minister did not say clearly to the people during the last election that this was one of the planks of his platform. Perhaps the people were taken somewhat by surprise and were unprepared for this confrontation. I do not know.

I might take up a great deal of time by reading some of this correspondence. I have listened to many of the speeches which have been made in this house and I have heard other hon. members reading from the correspondence which they have received. All I need say in this regard is that I have had letters from wives of servicemen, from mothers of sons who were killed in action, from ladies who have lost not only their sons but their husbands as well. And the tenor running through all these messages is this: Please stand up and fight for our flag, which is the only reminder that we have of the sacrifices made by members of our families in two world wars. I am ashamed that those who seek to have their way with regard to this flag question should seek to demean the opinions expressed by those who do not feel as they do. I think this indicates the weakness of the whole argument put forward by those who say that the majority of the Canadian people want a new flag with none of our traditions attached to it. I cannot understand anyone taking part in a debate if his proposals are so negative that his only contribution must be to demean opponents who put forward ideas different than his own. I think the caricatures of the Canadian Legion for its stand on the flag question will take Canada many years to live down. I do not think it is proper to joke at the expense of people who have made sacrifices and who have offered to make the supreme sacrifice. I do not think people who have honestly made their views known to the government should be demeaned by a cartoon such as the one published by the *Citizen* with regard to the Legion's stand on this question. Those who for their own purposes laugh and scoff at letters written by sincere and honest people, members of whose families have made the supreme sacrifice as members of the armed services, and who wish to retain the red ensign for that reason should be ashamed of themselves. We may not agree with them, but if they honestly feel that way, and have so expressed themselves, they do not deserve to be scoffed at.

An hon. Member: Who is scoffing at them?

Mr. More: It has been done in this house.

An hon. Member: Nonsense.

Mr. More: It has. If the hon. member wants to make a speech, let him get up on his feet and not sit silent and refuse to carry out his obligations to his constituents and to parliament. There have been quite a few occasions on which members opposite have given me the odd lecture on conduct in this chamber, but I will stake my conduct against the conduct of those who have sought to lecture me and bring me to order. I had a little experience in conducting business and taking part in public meetings before I came to this house, and I have not been given to interruption. I have been given to listening to members while they advance their arguments in this house and taking what they say into consideration, because I believe that is what this house is for. All I ask in return is that I be given the same consideration in return. And if the hon. member, or any hon. member, disagrees with the arguments I am putting forward or the position I am taking, he will have at least an audience of one when he rises properly to make his own observations here in this house.

I say it is a shame to this nation that the opinions of people who have given everything to this country should be demeaned. I should also like to refer to the I.O.D.E. because I believe this organization also has given great service to our country. Its members, too, have taken a position which honestly expresses their views and, while it may not be the opinion of others in Canada, it should be recognized as an honest and sin-

cere expression of opinion, and as such it should be given consideration.

I think there has been a mistake in judgment in bringing this issue before the house at this time. I will go no further in criticism of the Prime Minister, because of his distinguished services to this country, services which I recognize. But I believe that whoever advised him, whoever put him in the position of making a one-man decision on a matter of such great importance as putting forward a flag design of the nature now before us, and forcing it upon parliament, has placed him in a most unpleasant situation.

As I say, I have had over 1,700 personal letters on this matter. I do not dare to stand here and say they represent 65,000 voters in my constituency, but I have tried as far as I have been able to find out the views of my constituency. This matter was brought in at a time when the press and radio and television of this country were full of the news of bombing in Quebec, death in Quebec, destruction in Quebec, the burning of the flag in Quebec, the destruction of a monument to a historic figure in Canada. This resolution, brought before parliament at a time when these messages from Quebec were received throughout Canada daily, has not found very fertile ground, to say the least. Under the circumstances, this effort by the Prime Minister and by the government has been interpreted widely throughout Canada—I think I am being fair although I do not want to emphasize it—as nothing but further appeasement of a minority in Canada, even though that minority is one of our founding races. I think this was most unfortunate and was not to be desired. However, this I put forward as being the truth, and I am afraid that nothing that can be said will cover up the fact that the extremists have seized the public limelight and given the matter great publicity across the country. The action by the Prime Minister and his government has not brought forth the spirit of unity which is desired.

Surely any change of this nature can only be justified on the basis that this would result. First of all, I challenge every hon. member of this house to remove prejudice from his heart and to come forward and work with but one desire in mind, a desire to build a better Canada. Having done that I think that many of these other things will come in due course.

However, not having done that, and that not being the case, I believe the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition is the only way this present situation can be resolved, so that whatever final solution this parliament adopts it would be one of permanency and one accepted by the Canadian people. I have heard it said tonight that this flag is a must with this government; that it is something they must do; that it was an obligation they had. I should like to ask, does that make it permanent? Knowing of the divisions in the country and the voices of many thousands of people, I wonder whether in the near future there might not be a change of government and some other government might have an obligation to change the flag. Is this the kind of solution we want to a problem of this nature? I say no. I say that in the matter of the heart, not of the head, in the matter of emotions, not of statistics and dollars and cents, a solution, to be permanent, even with parliamentary action taken, must be a solution that the Canadian people have determined upon by their own voice. To me, that voice can only be heard through a referendum.

The words of the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition are as follows:

> "As the proposal to change Canada's national flag will affect the unity and destiny of Canada now and for years to come, the government be authorized to take such steps as may be necessary to conduct a plebiscite prior to any further action being taken by the House of Commons, in order that all Canadians may be given their rightful opportunity to declare their choice concerning a national flag."

I believe this is the form of action which must be taken to bring unity to this country and to have a flag that we know that the people of Canada accept. I am not in my own mind completely satisfied with the wording of the amendment that we have before us. I think we need to have further clarification. We need to know what the plebiscite would be on. Therefore, at this time I wish to suggest a subamendment. I wish to move, seconded by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Stefanson):

> That the amendment be amended by adding thereto the words:
>
> "and that in such a plebiscite among the questions to be placed before the people should be the following:
>
> 1. Are you in favour of the Canadian red ensign?
> 2. Are you in favour of the Canadian red ensign with changes made thereon to show the main heritages of both founding races?
> 3. Are you in favour of the three maple leaves design?
> 4. Are you in favour of a one maple leaf design?

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it would have been better had a plebiscite been taken before

this question came to parliament to determine the desire of the people for a new flag. I believe that at that time the plebiscite could have been one which would not have aroused any emotions or been a political football or party matter. It would simply have asked: "Are you in favour of a new Canadian flag?" But because the government has taken action I believe this opportunity has gone past the board.

I submit that having now selected a design which has been put before parliament further action by parliament should not be taken, but that this plebiscite be held. I suggest that it is important that the questions I have suggested be placed on the plebiscite in order to determine which design the people want.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Perhaps before the hon. member's time expires—it has just about expired now—and before we reach 10.30 I should read the subamendment as proposed by the hon. member. It is moved by the hon. member for Regina City (Mr. More), and seconded by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Stefanson):

That the amendment be amended by adding thereto the words:

"and that in such a plebiscite among the questions to be placed before the people should be the following:

1. Are you in favour of the Canadian red ensign?
2. Are you in favour of the Canadian red ensign with changes made thereon to show the main heritages of both founding races?
3. Are you in favour of the three maple leaves design?
4. Are you in favour of a one maple leaf design?

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under provisional standing order 39A deemed to have been moved:

AIRPORTS—TORONTO—MEETING RESPECTING MONOPOLY OF TAXI SERVICE

Mr. Ralph Cowan (York-Humber): Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I had occasion to address an inquiry to the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Transport in connection with the monopolistic ground service for passengers that is rendered at Malton airport, primarily into the city of Toronto. On June 22 the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam made a number of inquiries of the Minister of Transport, and I myself had a 12-part question addressed to him bearing on the subject of this service from and to Malton airport as it affects the city of Toronto. The burden of our complaint was that taxicabs were not allowed to render service to and from Malton airport, despite the fact that the monopoly now existing and which refers directly to taxi service is held by a company that does not own a taxi, does not render taxi service and is not licensed as a taxi service.

The matter was brought up today deliberately because of a large advertisement which appears in today's *Globe and Mail* as well as today's Toronto evening *Telegram* and the Toronto *Daily Star*. This advertisement has been inserted by Air Terminal Transport Limited, operators of this monopolistic service. They have written the advertisement in such a way, full of inaccuracies and innuendoes, that I considered it a matter of privilege; but rather than raise the point this afternoon I thought I would discuss it at this time.

The remarks I made here on July 31 are quoted in this advertisement. In those remarks I pointed out that I do not expect to have transportation service available to me if I arrive at a railroad station in a distant city, or if I arrive at a bus terminal in a distant city, or if the car should break down at the city limits; and I could see no reason why an air traveller should expect to have such service waiting for him upon arrival. Are our airplane travellers a favoured few, that the government must provide them with taxicab service immediately they set foot on the ground? Air Terminal Transport Limited have quoted accurately enough from the remarks I made on July 31 when I pointed out that I had taken taxi service in Boston, Kansas City and New York city at various times; but they have quoted me completely out of context, as though I was complaining of the taxi service that was rendered. I do not think their case can be very strong if it is necessary to mislead the readers of the three great Toronto newspapers in this manner.

Another interesting point in connection with the advertisement these papers carry is the fact that in it there are four different mentions of "bus" and "limousine" service, but not once do they use the word "taxi". It is this very word "taxi" that is the cause of all the complaints at the present time, because in the agreement entered into secretly by the Department of Transport, under the Hon. Léon Balcer, and this company the word "taxicab" or "taxi" appears 11 times. We

have been complaining that when there is a contract which mentions the word "taxi" 11 times, there should be some taxi service involved. The company evidently realizes the inaccuracy of their actions in not operating taxis when they hold a taxi exclusive franchise from the government, and in this advertisement which appears in today's papers they do not use the word "taxi" in referring to their own operations, but refer exclusively to "buses" and "limousines". They also state that they have an agreement with the Department of Transport that stipulates "we must provide ground transport 24 hours a day".

I would like to point out that the agreement does not require that service whatsoever, in connection with ground transport. The agreement, in clause 10, says:

> That the lessee shall maintain at the said airport a sufficient number of buses, limousines and taxis, 24 hours each day, to accommodate passenger traffic to and from the said airport.

Yet the president of this company, in a statement made to the Toronto *Globe and Mail* following a meeting with the council of the township of Toronto, made the statement that his firm is living up to its contract with the federal government. I point out that they are not living up to clause 10, which states that they must maintain a sufficient number of buses, limousines and taxis, and they are not living up to clause 13. Clause 13 of the agreement requires:

> That the lessee shall keep records of the number of passengers carried to and from the said airport in the buses, limousines and taxis of the lessee and, annually within 15 days after the first day of December, shall furnish to the minister a statement, certified by a responsible officer of the lessee, of the number of such passengers carried in the buses and limousines of the lessee, and a similar statement of the number of passengers carried in the taxis of the lessee.

They do not furnish any statement of the number of passengers carried in the taxis of the lessee, as is proven by the fact that in answer to my question of June 22, when I asked how many passengers were carried by bus, by limousine and by taxi, as required by clause 13, the reply came back, as will be seen at page 4542 of *Hansard*, giving the number of passengers carried by bus, the number of passengers carried by car, and absolutely nothing under the heading of taxi. When this president says they are living up to their contract with the government, I state flatly that they are breaking clause 10 and clause 13 continually and have not yet been checked up by the Department of Transport.

They make the further claim that the opposition to the present monopoly is being engendered by a taxicab operator falsely claiming to represent all of Toronto's taxicabs and that there is only one company objecting. I make the statement to the house that on three different occasions I have met with representatives for 1,100 taxicabs in Toronto involving seven different firms.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I must interrupt the hon. member as his time has expired.

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member may I say I will be very glad to bring his remarks to the attention of the Minister of Transport on his return.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.38 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, August 14, 1964

The house met at 10.30 a.m.

BANKING AND COMMERCE

Seventh report of standing committee on banking and commerce—Mr. Pennell.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

CYPRUS—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON PRESENT SITUATION

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, could the Secretary of State for External Affairs tell the house whether Canada has received a request from the secretary general of the United Nations to provide additional troops for the UN Cyprus force, and what has been the reaction thereto? Furthermore, is he now in a position to advise on any developments that took place at the meeting of the nine participating countries with the secretary general? Would he at the same time give his observations to the house as to what he believes will be the effect on the already delicate negotiations for a peaceful settlement in Cyprus of the appointment of the guerrilla leader, General Grivas, as commander of the Cypriot national guard, especially in view of the fact that the United Nations commander has stated that General Grivas regards the United Nations peace force as "a bloody nuisance"?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have no comments to make at this time on the reported observation of General Grivas. With regard to the first part of my right hon. friend's question, there has been no formal request made to Canada for the supply of additional troops, although I believe General Thimayya has indicated he would like to see the United Nations forces brought up to the strength contemplated by the permissible limits under the security council resolution. At present Canada has 1,125 military personnel in Cyprus. Ours is the largest contingent in the United Nations force except for that supplied by Britain which is only slightly larger.

A meeting of the contributors took place yesterday at the United Nations. The Canadian ambassador expressed the view of the Canadian government that all possible measures should be taken to enhance the authority of the force so it would be in a more favourable position to carry out its assigned task. There will be further consultations, and I am confident that the position taken by the Canadian government is being urgently considered by the commander of the force.

In addition, Mr. Galo Plaza, a former president of Ecuador and a man of considerable experience in and outside the United Nations, is returning to Cyprus to carry on negotiations as the representative of the secretary general in discussions with the force commander as well as with the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot authorities. Admittedly the United Nations force, as the secretary general has publicly stated, is working within fairly circumscribed limits. Failing agreement in the security council and in addition the formal agreement of the Cypriot authorities, an extension of the powers of the force need not necessarily be expected. What we are doing is to maintain our representations to the United Nations authorities to ensure that all possible measures are pursued to enable the force to operate effectively within its present mandate.

From the report we received from our ambassador this morning I can say that the secretary general is determined to see that the principle of freedom of movement, as embodied in the exchange of notes between himself and the government of Cyprus, is established. To this end Mr. Galo Plaza as well as General Thimayya will be engaged in consultation with appropriate authorities.

Mr. Diefenbaker: May I ask a supplementary question. In view of the use of the words, which I took down, that the augmentation of the powers of the force "need not necessarily be expected", may we take it that is a diplomatic way of saying there is going to be no increase in those powers? This expression is strangely reminiscent of the phrase "conscription if necessary, but not necessarily conscription." Do the words so carefully enunciated by the minister indicate that the force will continue to operate under

powers that have proven insufficient for that force to properly discharge its responsibilities?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I would agree as to "insufficient", but it could not be argued that as a result of this insufficiency the United Nations is not playing a very important role in these very difficult circumstances. No; my hon. friend should not read anything into my language that was carefully conceived before being uttered. It simply means that we cannot, in this house, take unto ourselves powers which belong to the security council and which in turn can only be given effect to following agreement with the government of Cyprus. These are limitations that exist, and we will not further our objectives in this situation by failing to recognize them. Within those limitations I think my right hon. friend has now been informed of our intentions.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): May I ask a supplementary question in the light of reports that the secretary general of the United Nations is requesting the participating countries to supply additional troops for the peace keeping force in Cyprus. In the event that Canada is asked to do so, will this matter be referred to parliament before the request is complied with? Second, would the Canadian government make the supplying of additional Canadian troops contingent upon some amendment of the agreement of status to include provision for disarming guerrillas?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I would not agree to such a condition, myself. This might be a desirable condition to impose in normal circumstances; but if it is not attainable, and if we were faced with the alternative of either having this condition accepted or of making no contribution to a situation that requires an international force, I would not be prepared to accept it even though this would be the easiest position to take.

With regard to the position of parliament concerning an increase in the numbers of the Canadian force, the resolution of this house authorizes the government to provide up to 1,200 men. If there were any disposition to go beyond that figure then of course we would have to come back to this house. I have pointed out that the Canadian contribution now is greater than that of any other of the participating countries except Britain. The secretary general and General Thimayya are undoubtedly giving consideration to the possibility of additional contributions of forces from others of the participating countries. I have suggested that they might give consideration to the inclusion of countries not now participating.

Mr. Douglas: As a further supplementary question, in view of the fact that the obstacle does not seem to lie with the security council of the United Nations but rather with the government of Cyprus, would the minister not agree that if additional forces are to be requested to protect the people of Cyprus, the very least Canada has a right to expect is the co-operation of the government of Cyprus in amending the agreement of status so as to make that force effective?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Of course Canada has the right to expect, and not only Canada but the whole world, that there will be this measure of co-operation; but this is something that depends on the government of Cyprus and possibly as well on other governments. However, I am sure my hon. friend did not intend to dismiss, as he did so summarily, the position of the security council. The force could not I think be augmented beyond the present 7,000 figure without the approval of the security council. There may be some hesitation in confronting the security council because of attitudes that could conceivably be taken by other countries. I am not saying that this situation would arise, but this may be in the mind of the secretary general.

Mr. Douglas: As one final supplementary question, has the security council at any time opposed the extension of the powers of the United Nations force in Cyprus?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): My hon. friend and I are talking about two different things. He is talking about the extension of powers and I was talking about the increase in the numbers of military personnel. No, Mr. Speaker, there has been no public opposition by any member of the security council with regard to extension of the powers of the force, but it should be noted that the powers of the force were not specifically established by the security council. The secretary general himself was given the authority to negotiate for the powers which were required by the force.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): I was intrigued by the distinction the minister has made with regard to the limitations on the powers of this parliament. I agree this parliament has no control over the security council as to the size of the force, but surely the minister would also agree that Canada has been the prime mover or the initiator or

the catalyst in setting up this peace keeping force, and that the views of this parliament as expressed in recent times with regard to its powers should certainly impress themselves upon all those concerned.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): The hon. gentleman and I are in full agreement about the role of parliament with regard to the force.

[*Later:*]

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs related to the earlier question concerning Cyprus. I am asking simply for information. What methods or means are open to the minister to put before the security council Canada's desire with regard to strengthening United Nations force on the island, or extending its powers? Are we helpless in this regard even though we are the largest participant?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I would not agree that our views have been disregarded by the security council because, as I indicated earlier, the security council has at no time dealt with the question of the extension of powers or the principle of freedom of movement. These were matters involved in an exchange of notes between the secretary general and the government of Cyprus.

In any event, for some time Canada along with other countries, and particularly the participating countries, has been endeavouring to improve this situation by representations, together with the officials of the United Nations and with the commander of the force, all of whom have shared our concern. These are the limitations, but notwithstanding them we shall continue with these negotiations. The meeting yesterday was part of this effort, and the meetings that will be held within the course of the next few days with some of the participating countries have the same objective in view.

Mr. Churchill: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The minister has gone a bit beyond what I was asking. What means are open to the minister to make direct contact with the members of the security council in order to present the views that are held by this parliament on this question?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Of course, Mr. Speaker, there is open to the government direct contact with all the countries represented on the security council, where some of these negotiations have been carried on and appeals have been made. There is the opportunity for discussion open to our ambassador at the United Nations with his opposite numbers representing the members of the security council. Very active discussion is now going on between our ambassador, the ambassadors of the participating countries and the secretary general.

Mr. Churchill: One final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I take it, then, that there is no opportunity for, say, the minister himself, with his persuasive powers, to appear in person and sit in with the security council and present his views?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I am sure my hon. friend was not serious, because, if that were so, the minister would have been there.

Mr. Douglas: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the minister whether some of the misunderstanding is not partly due to to the statements which he made in this house on Wednesday, as reported at page 6716 of *Hansard,* when he pointed out that the extension of powers depended on two things; the security council, where the power of veto exists, and the agreement of the government of Cyprus. It is for that reason that these questions have been raised?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I do not want to defend myself, Mr. Speaker, but I do not think questions arise in that way; because any increase in the total force could only come as a result of security council action. Any increase in the existing powers of the force, apart from personnel, is a matter that would arise out of negotiation between the secretary general and the government of Cyprus.

CANADIAN FLAG

DISCUSSION OF DESIGN AT MEETING OF PARTY LEADERS

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Maurice Côté (Chicoutimi): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister.

Would the Prime Minister tell the house whether he is still determined to hold on to his project for a three leaf flag in spite of the opposition of some members who still believe that they are living in the 19th century?

[*Text*]

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): A discussion on this matter is going on now, and the position of the government has been made known.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Arising out of that, I read in the press with interest that the meeting on Tuesday which has been convened by the Prime Minister is for the purpose of offering the Leader of the Opposition and the leaders of third parties an alternative plan on the part of the government. What has been reported in the press gives all the indications of a well directed leak, and I ask the Prime Minister whether that is indeed the purpose of this meeting, and whether he intends to set aside the three maple leaves in favour of one leaf and to substitute the red ensign for the union jack in the submission he will be making at this meeting.

Mr. Pearson: The request or the suggestion that this meeting be held was first made by an hon. member on the other side.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Who was he?

Mr. Pearson: One of the right hon. gentleman's friends on the other side, the hon. member for St. Mary. I acknowledged that request and thought it would perhaps be useful to continue the discussions we had with the Leader of the Opposition and others the other day. At that time, as the right hon. gentleman will remember, it was agreed that there might be a further discussion. That discussion will take place on Tuesday. As far as I am aware there has been no leak at all as to the nature of the meeting.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I take it, then, the Prime Minister is telling the house that the information which has appeared in the press in this regard has no foundation, as far as his mind is concerned, as he addresses himself to the subject of the discussion.

Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker. Not having read all the press comments on the meeting I am not in a position to confirm or deny what has been said in the press, but I hope the meeting will be a useful one and that we shall be able to consider the parliamentary situation in the light of the discussion now going on.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That shows it was a leak.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Georges Valade (St. Mary): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the right hon. Prime Minister?

Would the Prime Minister tell us whether, in the course of those discussions, the question of the flag design, the choice of design itself, will come up?

[Mr. Pearson.]

[*Text*]

Mr. Pearson: I have no idea what my colleagues the leaders of the other parties will bring up for discussion at this meeting.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Eric A. Winkler (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister in respect of the suggested meeting next Tuesday in relation to the flag debate presently before the house. Does the Prime Minister have in mind the suggestion that a joint committee of both houses be formed to study the matter and make recommendations to the House of Commons?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I have in mind the idea of listening to any proposals brought forward by my colleagues, the leaders of the other parties.

PUBLIC WORKS

OTTAWA—LEASING OF SPACE IN UNFINISHED BUILDINGS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Public Works. In view of rather disturbing reports about the government's leasing of space in unfinished buildings at rentals that will pay almost the entire cost of those buildings in a short period of time, though the government is taking only part of the space, would the minister care to make a statement regarding this matter?

[*Translation*]

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I am very glad the hon. member gives me this opportunity to make a statement following the report published in yesterday's newspapers.

I can now say that, for the first time in the history of space rental by any government, public tenders have been called. In the case of the two buildings concerned, a call for tenders was made and was published in the local newspapers, following which some 20 contractors showed interest in the two contracts. Six of them made bids and we selected the two lowest.

That is the only information which, to my mind, was missing in yesterday's newspapers, but I believe it to be the most important.

[*Text*]

Mr. Knowles: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. If it is costing that much to

rent these buildings at the lowest tenders, would it not be better for the government to build their own?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Deschatelets: Mr. Speaker, the price is not the only factor to take into consideration. It may be that if you look at the rent over a period of ten years, you find out that it amounts to nearly the price of the building or even a little more, but other factors have to be taken into consideration, such as repairs, etc., to arrive at an adequate price.

Furthermore, I must tell my hon. friend that for at least 25 years—and I also refer to the former government—the same situation arose and gave the same results, but there was never a call for public tenders.

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister a supplementary question. In undertaking to rent buildings which are not yet built, does not the minister think that he is encouraging unfair speculation?

Mr. Deschatelets: Not if we call for public tenders, Mr. Speaker.

And at this stage, for the information of hon. members, I must say that we are at least 15 years behind schedule in our renting program for all the services needed.

The time factor is extremely important, as is also the price factor. That is why we are now calling for public tenders, and inasmuch as this rule will be adhered to rigidly in the future, I fail to see how we would be encouraging speculation.

[*Text*]

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister whether he would consider it exorbitant to pay over $6 million over a ten year period for all the space except the ground floor of a building that cost $4 million, and to pay $5,750,000 over a ten year period for half the space in a building that costs $6 million?

Mr. Deschatelets: No, Mr. Speaker, not necessarily; and I am sure if my hon. friend makes any investigations here in this area of Ottawa he will admit that the $3.25 or $3.50 per square foot is the lowest price we can get in respect of any building of this type.

Mr. A. B. Patterson (Fraser Valley): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister a supplementary question about this matter. In view of the rent that is being demanded in this particular situation would it not be advisable for the minister to follow the example of another government and advise these gentlemen to sharpen their pencils and bring in more realistic figures?

Mr. Deschatelets: Mr. Speaker, in these two particular cases, of course, we departed from the former practice. That is the reason we asked for public tenders. I should like my hon. friend to keep this fact in mind. All contractors were invited, through public advertising, to submit tenders, and this is the result.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, would the minister table these tenders so we may see them?

Mr. Deschatelets: Mr. Speaker, of course I would be delighted to table all documents for the examination of my hon. friend.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Just table the ones in question.

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Gérald Laniel (Beauharnois-Salaberry): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Would the minister inform the house whether her department is considering the possibility of publishing a press release containing the facts and details surrounding the decision of the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Morison) to give up smoking for 30 days, and about the eventual penalty for a breach of promise?

RESEARCH

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO BASIC MEDICAL RESEARCH

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, notice of the following question has been given to the Minister of National Health and Welfare, and the urgency of my question arises from the discontinuance of private funds from outside Canada for assistance to medical research in Canada. Is the government about to announce a new policy for assistance to basic medical research in Canada, or will we have to wait for a further study to be made of the Hall report before such policy is announced?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the matter is not specifically related to the Hall report, but the question of assistance

to medical research, which is not only within the responsibility of the Department of National Health and Welfare, is, as always, under urgent consideration.

POWER

TORONTO—FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION TO COST OF NUCLEAR PLANT

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Industry, I wish to put a question to the Prime Minister. Would the Prime Minister tell the house under which authority or powers the federal government was able to justify its contribution of about $80 million for the construction of a nuclear energy plant in the suburbs of Toronto in order to supply electricity to that area?

[*Text*]

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this is a very important and complicated question which can hardly be answered on orders of the day. When the estimates are before the house for consideration I am sure a full explanation will be given.

AGRICULTURE

WHEAT—CHANGE IN ALLOWABLE MOISTURE CONTENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reynold Rapp (Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale): Mr. Speaker, I notice the Minister of Agriculture has returned from the west. Can he inform the house what results he obtained at a meeting with the farmers' union in respect of the contentious question involving the moisture content of grain? Can he also tell us whether he held a meeting to discuss the handling charges?

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, in connection with moisture content, as the hon. member is aware as of April 1 this was reduced from 14.5 per cent to 14 per cent. The farmers' union was concerned about this reduction. When it was explained to them that we were merely bringing this moisture content in line with the moisture content in grains of competing countries, I believe they were quite satisfied. Most of the countries with which we are now competing have a lower moisture content.

[Miss LaMarsh.]

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

QUEBEC—PRESSURE FOR APPOINTMENT OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rémi Paul (Berthier-Maskinongé-De-Lanaudière): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Justice. Does he intend to yield to the pressure exerted upon him by the government of the province of Quebec for the appointment as judges of the Quebec superior court of Mr. René Hamel, attorney general of the province of Quebec, and of Mr. Gérard Cournoyer, minister of transport?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, no pressure has been exerted upon me on this matter by the government of the province of Quebec.

Mr. Paul: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister of Justice tell us whether pressure has been exerted by the premier of the province of Quebec?

[*Text*]

BRITISH COLUMBIA—REQUEST FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNTY COURT JUDGE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. V. Pugh (Okanagan Boundary): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Justice. Can the minister advise me whether a county court judge has been appointed as yet for the county of Yale, B.C.?

Hon Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I have in mind for recommendation the name of the future appointee.

ALBERTA—REQUEST FOR INVESTIGATION OF TREASURY BRANCHES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice. It has been alleged that Bill Dickie, M.L.A., the Liberal member for Calgary, has written the Minister of Justice asking that the Alberta treasury branches be investigated by the Senate committee on banking and commerce in view of alleged improprieties.

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice.

LABOUR RELATIONS

POSSIBLE IRREGULARITIES RESPECTING S.I.U. ELECTIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour regarding elections being held by the seafearers international union. I wonder whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that two of the candidates, Andre Bansept of Quebec, and Gilbert Johnson of Montreal, have met with some misfortune in that one has been fired and the other transferred. I wonder if he could make inquiries as to whether the board of trustees is looking into this matter to see whether these two incidents are in any way related to the union election, and whether this is an attempt to rig the election and reduce it to a farce.

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have noticed these reports and I will make inquiries to assure myself and the hon. member that there is nothing sinister.

CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENT METHOD AT DOMINION-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. I asked him yesterday whether any amendment to the Canadian constitution having to do with making it a Canadian document would be enacted in another country or here in Canada, and the Prime Minister said he would like to look into the matter and say something about it today. Is he in a position to make that statement now?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have this morning received a memorandum on this matter from the constitutional and legal experts of the department concerned and I should like to study it before I make a statement, which I now hope to be able to make on Monday. I am sorry it is not available this morning.

SUPPLY

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

Supply—Citizenship and Immigration

DEPARTMENT OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

1. Departmental administration, $1,130,500.

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Chairman, I am pleased indeed that my estimates are to be studied by the committee today. I know the great interest taken by hon. members and the public at large in this important department of government, and I am pleased to be in a position to again set forth the policies of the government in this regard.

I am taking this opportunity to make certain important announcements to the house. I have a fairly long statement on the three branches comprising my department, the citizenship branch, the immigration branch and Indian affairs. In order to expedite matters I propose to deliver my statement in French, but the translators have been provided with the material so there may be simultaneous translation.

Mr. Skoreyko: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether you would ask for order. I find it very difficult to hear the minister.

The Deputy Chairman: The point of order is well taken. It is very difficult to hear what the minister is saying. Possibly we could have a little less noise in the chamber.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, I take it that there has been distribution of this statement to the press. Would it be possible for the minister to extend the courtesy of letting me have a copy of the statement so I can follow it?

Mr. Tremblay: Yes.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chairman, the Canadian Citizenship Act came into force on January 1, 1947, and for the first time provided for the legal status of "Canadian citizens". The act is administered by the Canadian citizenship registration branch, which has an establishment of 96 at headquarters in Ottawa, and 64 in the citizenship courts situated in various centres in Canada.

Courts have been established at Toronto, Montreal, Hamilton, London, Vancouver, Edmonton, Winnipeg, Moncton, Windsor and Ottawa.

These courts along with the regularly constituted courts provide facilities for persons wishing to apply for Canadian citizenship. There are in addition 56 persons who have been appointed courts for the purpose of the Canadian Citizenship Act in areas in Canada remote from regularly constituted courts.

Four similar appointments have been made overseas to assist servicemen who wish to become Canadian citizens.

Persons applying for citizenship through courts must first satisfy the court that the several statutory requirements set forth in the act have been met before the application may be processed by the branch headquarters in Ottawa.

I am pleased to inform the hon. members who have expressed an interest in the qualifications which must be met by an applicant for Canadian citizenship, that a review has been made of the standard required of applicants and that certain amendments to the citizenship act are to be introduced into parliament shortly that will facilitate the acquisition of citizenship. This is in keeping with the policy of the Liberal party. At the same time, it will be recommended that provisions which now discriminate between naturalized and natural-born Canadians be removed from the act. The regulations to the Canadian Citizenship Act have been amended to include a provision to schedule B that will permit veterans of the armed forces of Canada who were on active service during time of war and who have not previously been naturalized, to be exempt from the payment of the fee of $10 required under item 3 of the same schedule. I am also endeavouring to establish uniform criteria for the use of courts in the administration of citizenship across Canada.

In 1963, 69,468 persons became Canadian citizens. This is fourth highest number for any one year; the highest was in 1957 when 95,462 certificates were granted. From January 1, 1947, to December 31, 1963, a total of 723,847 persons have been granted citizenship in Canada. In addition, approximately 460,000 certificates were issued to persons who wished to have proof of their status as Canadians.

The number of applications fluctuates from year to year, but it is known that about 40 per cent of the immigrants who entered Canada during the past ten years who were eligible for Canadian citizenship have became Canadians.

It has been found that fitting and appropriate ceremonies for the presentation of certificates of citizenship can focus a great deal of attention on the benefits to new Canadians of the acquisition of Canadian citizenship. I am therefore encouraging more participation by voluntary organizations in citizenship ceremonies. For the same reason, an item has been included in the estimates to provide for the expansion of the jurisdiction of some of the present courts and for the opening of a new court of Canadian citizenship in Calgary, Alberta. At the same time I shall give continuing study to the opening of courts in other areas not yet serviced by a court of Canadian citizenship.

The Canadian citizenship branch could be described as the extension arm of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration. It will be appreciated that much of the work of my department is concerned with the fulfilment of the hopes and aspirations of special categories of persons. A civil service, no matter what their number or dedication, cannot replace the personal interest that needs to be shown by the average citizen if the goals I seek are to be attained. In carrying out its responsibilities, the citizenship branch encourages and assists individuals, groups and agencies that are interested in immigrants, Indians and general citizenship to play a more effective role.

The data from a survey of language classes for immigrants, which I am reviewing at present, will be used in discussions with various agencies offering English or French language instruction, with a view to improving the courses offered and rendering them as attractive as possible to immigrants. I have directed the officials to intensify their efforts in order that more citizenship courses are offered in conjunction with language classes. Such courses will enable applicants for Canadian citizenship to become more familiar with Canadian institutions and traditions, in preparation for the court examination which non-British subjects must take when applying for Canadian citizenship.

Hon. members are aware of the public interest evidenced in recent years, most dynamically, in the organization of Indian friendship councils and centres in a large number of communities across Canada and in the emergence of two national organizations, the national Indian council and the Indian-Eskimo association. The citizenship branch will increase its activities in this field in co-operation with these organizations, which add security that Indians need to feel when off their reserves and which make it easier for them to live in communities that offer the type of work they would like to have.

In respect of general citizenship, the branch will be asked to play an active role in encouraging and helping Canadians to participate fully in centennial celebrations. It is our hope that 1967 will be an occasion

for all Canadians to become more aware of the historical development of our country and the cultural heritage that has accumulated during the past 100 years.

May I take this opportunity to offer some observations on the subject of immigration as it affects Canada. This is the first opportunity I have had to acquaint the committee in any extensive manner with my views on this subject which is one of paramount importance to all of us.

Because of limitations of time I shall not deal at length with the contribution which the new Canadians have made to the general Canadian welfare. It is a study well worthwhile in itself. I could not make this statement, however, without saying that the Canadian economy and our culture simply could not have advanced either quantitatively or qualitatively to their present state without the very substantial contribution of these thousands of immigrants. We owe thanks to those who have come to us in the period under discussion.

We come now to the question of where we stand at this moment in the matter of Canada's domestic concern with immigration and the need for policy in this field to meet the needs of 1964 and the years beyond.

Mr. Chairman, before proceeding with this question I should like to explain what I mean by the term "skilled" which I shall be using in this statement from time to time. In my view this is a fairly broad term which includes a variety of persons. It includes those with a reasonably good level of education sufficient to permit a range of mobility and adaptability required in most occupations today. These persons should also have qualifications in their particular fields. In terms of the trades which are common in Canada, these qualifications would normally mean the possession of journeymen's papers or certificates of competency. The term "skilled" also includes those with more advanced technical or professional training, as well as those with successful experience as managers or proprietors of commercial, industrial and agricultural activities.

While in years past there was a need for the immigration of unskilled and semi-skilled workers in large numbers, this is no longer the case. The Canada of 1964 is not the Canada of 1913, 1946 or even 1954. Machines now aid manpower in many areas of activity. In some fields, such as agriculture, fewer workers actually produce far more than ever before. Technological advancements are causing sweeping alterations in the pattern of employment.

This committee does not need to be told that the greatest handicap of the majority of our unfortunate unemployed is a lack of education or skill. Our government has committed and spent substantial funds for the training and re-training of those who lack the necessary skills for today's employment market. This year's budget, in providing for family allowances for children in school beyond 16 years of age, emphasized certain aspects of our concern today about those who leave formal training inadequately prepared.

At the same time, there is a very substantial demand and need for skilled individuals in many undertakings across Canada. The presence of such workers provides a stimulus to the enterprise and the economy of this country. Unfortunately, these persons are not always available from within Canada or, if here, are not sufficiently mobile to fill particular opportunities. Then too, in this country—as in any country—there is abundant scope for managerial talent, as well as for those with the experience, ability and funds to establish their own enterprises.

The competition we must meet in today's world is a competition of brains, skill, ability and initiative. Despite our best efforts and whatever our virtues at this moment, we cannot claim a surplus of any of these features. We must overlook no opportunity to encourage additional people who can assist us, to come to this country.

To this end, and as a first principle of this government's immigration policy, we shall endeavour—through adequate promotion and recruitment—to bring to Canada the well-skilled on a substantial scale. This is to be a positive program. It will help to fill the gaps in our industry, commerce, and other areas of economic activity here. Increased activity across the board will aid in absorbing the unskilled amongst us.

At the same time, the infusion of skilled people will assist in developing further the better balanced and even more dynamic economic structure we will need to absorb the greatly increased entries to the labour force from Canadian sources which will soon take place, due to our own rapidly expanding population, a feature that will be even more important in the next six to eight years.

It is impossible to make any valid predictions of the exact numbers of immigrants during a period ahead of, say, a year. This

is increasingly the case in present circumstances. On the one hand, our economic capacity to absorb skilled, educated and otherwise well-qualified immigrants is virtually unlimited. On the other hand, this type of person is in demand in many countries these days. We must obtain these immigrants in competition with other countries and there is no great surplus of qualified people anywhere in the world.

To help establish a more positive immigration program our government has taken the following steps:

(a) We have provided for an interdepartmental committee composed of senior officials well versed in economic, labour and social problems to assess our needs, and our absorptive capacity, for migrants in Canada's economy. This committee, which will serve in an advisory capacity, should help the government in its objective of developing fairly long term programs not subject to the turning on and off of the immigration tap which has had such objectionable results in the past.

(b) We are embarking on a considerably increased promotional campaign abroad, particularly in Europe where the greatest number of likely immigration applicants are to be found. Additional funds for this purpose are contained in the estimates before you.

(c) The government recently approved a new establishment structure for immigration personnel abroad. This is a first step in our plans to ensure better classifications for our personnel in order to implement a really productive and positive immigration program.

(d) The existing organization, served as it is by many hard working and capable people, is not such as to get the maximum results from our immigration efforts. The organization must be made fully responsive to today's immigration requirements. It is very short of staff, particularly in its overseas service. If the effort to secure adequate numbers of immigrants with the skills Canada needs is to succeed, we require more and better trained personnel and we must see that they are employed to maximum advantage in posts for which they are best qualified. We must hold open the opportunity to pursue a career for these employees, a career satisfying to the person concerned and as fully rewarding as any comparable posts in the public service. A complete re-organization in immigration, both at home and abroad, is overdue. It is now in the course of development.

(e) Not only are changes in organization required with appropriate staffing, but so also are changes badly needed in the picture Canada presents overseas in so far as its immigration offices and facilities are concerned. These have been too often dull and unattractive. Every effort will be made, consistent with good and efficient management, to secure office locations and quarters that will do Canada justice, enable our staff to work effectively, and promote a favourable reaction among potential immigrants. Such steps will enable us to compete on more equal grounds with other countries which are also making strong efforts to secure the immigrants they need. Let me say that in our efforts to promote immigration abroad, this government will welcome the participation of the provincial governments wherever they feel they can be of help. In addition, it is the intention of the government to discuss immigration matters with certain foreign governments in the hope we can achieve a better understanding of our operations and ambitions in the immigration field.

[Mr. Tremblay.]

We come now to the second principle of this government's immigration policy. It has to do with the social—and in some respects—the humanitarian aspects of immigration. I refer to our intention to do what we can to assist in the reunion of families—with particular regard to the immediate family, that is, the head of the family and his dependents—and to assist refugees.

In the past the department has received criticism from some quarters where sponsored immigration is concerned, on two main points. First, the length of waiting period in some countries has been unduly long before relatives can be examined for immigration purposes. Second, there has appeared to be inconsistency on the part of immigration offices within Canada, in assessing the adequacy or otherwise of the reception arrangement which can be provided by the sponsor here.

With regard to the first point, the waiting period for examination in Hong Kong for example has been reduced from nine months to three. We hope to effect even further improvement in this respect not only with regard to that area, but in connection with the selection of immigrants everywhere. This, of course, is not the end but the beginning.

I am very conscious of the desirability and even the necessity of re-establishing families, of bringing together again a man, his wife and their dependent children, without avoidable delay. All the procedures and practices within the department are under my systematic and critical review. The procedures governing our operations in this particular area are being dealt with on a priority basis.

Furthermore, the moves being made for more qualified staff and better facilities which I have already mentioned, are under way with this problem very much in mind. Within a reasonable period I hope to be able to report to this committee that waiting periods for examination of immigrants have been reduced to an absolute minimum.

I should like at this time to say a few words on my visit earlier this year to Hong Kong. Several important conclusions and decisions have resulted from that trip which will be of interest to hon. members. I also visited Japan where I had the pleasure of very informative and fruitful discussions with officials of the Japanese government.

This was the first of a number of inspection visits which I hope to make, as minister, to learn first hand the facts on which to base a development of new immigration policies and programs. Early in September I expect to leave for an inspection trip of immigration offices in Europe and while there, I plan to consult with government officials in the various countries. I chose Hong Kong for my first visit because I was deeply concerned about the complex problems involved in Chinese immigration and complaints I had received that our Hong Kong operation was inefficient and discriminatory.

I found Hong Kong prosperous and thriving. It is a model of efficient administration for which the British authorities deserve great praise. The flow of illegal immigrants from mainland China has declined to a trickle, and the population situation is now more stable. You will note that I do not use the term "refugees" in relation to those persons leaving mainland China. The British maintain, and I agree, that these people are not political refugees at all, but are simply seeking a better economic life. This is proven by the fact that once they are accepted as Hong Kong residents they flock back to China to visit by the hundreds of thousands, apparently without fear of persecution.

I also learned in Hong Kong that the British authorities do not regard mass emigration as a solution to their population problems. They feel that if it becomes known that Hong Kong is an easy stepping stone to Canada or the United States the colony would receive hundreds more migrants from the mainland for every immigrant who goes to North America.

Therefore, while Canada can offer a better future to some individuals from Hong Kong, any large scale program of resettlement here would do more harm than good as far as Hong Kong is concerned. Therefore, my first conclusion was that we must look at immigration from Hong Kong in ordinary immigration terms rather than as a special refugee problem.

Even though Chinese from Hong Kong are not to be given any special refugee status, I must emphasize that the ordinary immigrant admissible classes, as they affect Chinese, are broad: they permit the admission of the immediate families, parents, grandparents and fiancées of Canadian residents, as well as unsponsored immigrants who have sufficient education or skills to become established in Canada.

In addition there is another less well-known admissible class, of which even many of the Chinese seem unaware. This permits Canadian citizens to sponsor the admission of such non-dependent relatives as adults or married sons or daughters, along with the spouse and children of such sons and daughters. These non-dependents are sponsorable in the usual way subject to appropriate educational and occupational standards.

It can be seen, therefore, that the legal admissible classes do not create any impossible barrier to the reunion of Chinese families in Canada. However, the law does require that each immigrant, whether of Chinese origin or not, be examined to find out if he qualifies for admission, to ensure that he is not a criminal or subversive and, in the case of sponsored persons, to ensure that they have the relationship claimed to the sponsor in Canada.

The greatest problem we face in examining immigrants from mainland China is the difficulty in verifying their identities. Such immigrants arrive in Hong Kong with virtually no identifying documents. There are no official records available which can be used to verify the statements of the individual. This situation has given rise to extensive abuse in Chinese immigration with which present and past Canadian governments have attempted to cope.

There is evidence that many Chinese immigrants to Canada are in this country illegally. During my stay in Hong Kong I personally discussed the problem of illegal immigration with the immigration officials of other countries. All these countries experience the same problems that Canada does. They agree that there exists a well-organized and highly efficient illegal Chinese immigration system involving forged documents and photographs,

schools that coach immigrants in false identities, persistent use of false statutory declarations, and other abuses.

Some Canadians are relatively unconcerned about illegal Chinese immigration. They feel that past discrimination has forced Chinese to use illegal means to get their dependents to Canada.

Our investigations have satisfied us that frequently relatives and friends, no doubt largely influenced by ties of blood and sympathy, have been parties to such illegal entries.

Often these admissions were arranged by syndicates or individuals who make a business of smuggling inadmissible persons into Canada from Hong Kong.

I am also satisfied that, contrary to popular belief, a large number of these illegal Chinese immigrants are not close relatives of Canadian residents. They were brought here solely for the profit of illegal immigration agents. This is a serious and disturbing situation. Not only does it tarnish the reputation of Chinese Canadians as good citizens, but it has added greatly to their problems when they seek to bring out their true relatives.

Speaking personally and for my department, I wish to emphasize that we have no desire to penalize Chinese Canadians seeking to bring their legitimate families to Canada.

During my visit to Hong Kong, and in subsequent discussions with departmental officials, every effort has been made to find ways to facilitate the admission of legal immigrants without destroying or weakening essential controls.

I found in Hong Kong that there are many changes which can be made in our system there that will facilitate the admission of close relatives to Canada. We have already reduced the waiting period for immigrants in Hong Kong from nine months to less than three, and I hope it can be reduced still further. The quickest way of improving the situation would be to provide more immigration staff in Hong Kong but for the time being extra staff cannot be accommodated in our Hong Kong office. We have already enlarged our staff as much as our office space will permit, and we are seeking larger office quarters. There is a severe shortage of office space in Hong Kong but we are trying to reserve space in a building now being erected. With larger and better quarters in Hong Kong and with certain other changes we should be able to deal with Chinese immigrants on a current basis without abnormal delays.

[Mr. Tremblay.]

It is worthy of note, however, that, notwithstanding the shortage of staff and shortage of office space in Hong Kong, last year immigration of Chinese to Canada increased substantially. In 1963, some 1,571 Chinese were admitted as compared with a total of 876 in 1962. In the first five months of this year 879 were admitted as against 481 during the same period in 1963. In other words, the number of Chinese immigrants in 1963 increased almost 100 per cent over the figure for 1962 and has again increased 84 per cent in the first five months of this year as compared with the same period in 1963.

It is obvious, therefore, that as a direct result of the policies of this government and the changes in procedures which have been effected since this government took office hundreds of Chinese families have emigrated to Canada and hundreds more have been re-united in this country.

A serious problem for immigrants in Hong Kong is the necessity to visit various offices for medical tests and examinations. This is tedious, causes long waits and is expensive for the migrants.

I am discussing with my colleague, the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss LaMarsh), the establishment of a completely integrated "one-stop" medical centre in our immigration office in Hong Kong. This would greatly benefit the immigrants.

There are in Hong Kong many well-qualified persons who have no relatives in Canada but who would make good immigrants. In the past, the department has been so preoccupied with servicing sponsored immigrants that little time was available for the unsponsored. This has been partially remedied and when we are in new quarters in Hong Kong, it should be possible to devote more of our resources to unsponsored immigrants without in any way interfering with the processing of the sponsored. Since sponsored immigrants are not usually skilled, it is desirable that this humanitarian flow be balanced by a movement of well-qualified unsponsored persons.

There are other changes which are being made in our office systems and routines, and our staffing and staff training policies, which should further improve our performance. These are matters of internal administration but I expect the results will soon speak for themselves.

The Chairman: Order. I regret to interrupt the minister but I must advise the house that his time is over.

Mr. Lambert: Carry on.

[*Text*]

Some hon. Members: Continue.

The Chairman: Is it agreed that the minister may proceed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

(*Translation*)

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Chairman, I am happy to say that my visit to Hong Kong satisfied me that our Canadian visa and medical officers, and our local Chinese staff are honest, extremely hard working public servants who have been doing a good job in the face of very difficult circumstances. I certainly do not want my comments on the needed improvements in the system to be considered as a reflection on their integrity or their devotion to duty. I have the greatest respect and regard for them all.

The foregoing has dealt with our administrative problems in connection with Chinese immigration. As a result of my trip I have also reached several general conclusions about the legal admissible classes and immigration policy as they apply to Chinese and I wish to speak of them at this time.

First, the admissible classes.

On the whole, the present admissible classes are adequate to permit a healthy Chinese immigration movement and the reunion of families. However, I am pleased to advise the house that the approval of the governor in council has just been given to one important addition to the admissible classes, and that is to make male fiancés admissible on the same legal basis as female fiancées. This amendment will benefit particularly the Canadian Chinese community but will have the happy corollary of satisfying the justifiable ambitions of other ethnic groups.

I am not recommending at present that sponsorship privileges for Chinese be extended to cover brothers, sisters and more distant relatives. I regret this but unfortunately there are serious practical difficulties involved. An expansion of the admissible classes to cover these non-dependents would seriously interfere with the good service we propose to give to the immediate dependents. In addition it would multiply the problem of control and detection of impostors to an extent far beyond our present experience and would render ineffective our efforts to exercise essential controls. This decision is dictated solely by the facts of the situation and not by any desire to discriminate against Chinese.

Second, the Chinese status adjustment program.

The Chinese have complained that this program is discriminatory. Actually the status adjustment system was intended to benefit the Chinese but its purpose has been misunderstood. Moreover, it has had limited success in spite of the fact that it has been in operation for four years, far longer than was anticipated. While we would not wish to discourage Chinese from voluntarily coming to our offices to set their personal immigration records straight we shall no longer exercise forbearance in respect of immigration violations merely because such voluntary statements are made. Everyone has had ample time to put his affairs in order and henceforth from September 1, 1964, R.C.M.P. and immigration officers are being instructed to apply the law to Chinese in exactly the same way as to other residents of Canada.

In concluding my remarks on Chinese immigration, I wish to say that, as Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, it is my aim to develop a positive immigration program to bring more well-qualified immigrants to this country and assist residents of Canada to reunite their dependent families here. Chinese immigration increased substantially last year and I firmly expect this increase to continue without loss of control over illegal immigration.

It is the sincere wish of this government, as I am sure it is of all Canadians of good will, to treat our Chinese compatriots as fairly as possible and make available to them the same facilities and opportunities provided to other citizens for the reunion of their families in this country and the prosperity of their community. If this desirable objective is to be attained it is essential that we have the wholehearted co-operation of the Chinese community, the vast majority of whose members are honest and reputable Canadians, in eliminating the abuses which have been of concern to all law-abiding citizens.

I should also say a word or two about my brief visit in Japan, during which I met the Japanese foreign minister and had informal talks with Japanese economic and emigration officials.

Emigration from Japan to Canada has been negligible in recent years, averaging less than 200 annually. Even with the change in immigration regulations in 1962, opening up immigration from all parts of the world, there was little interest shown by the Japanese, as indicated by the few applications received from that country.

There are several explanations for this. First, Japan's economy is booming and there

are actually labour shortages in many skilled occupations. Japanese workers have ample opportunities at home. Moreover, Japan's emigration has, in the past, been organized in group settlements and the Japanese are accustomed to applying for migration in schemes organized by their own government rather than for individual migration. On the other hand, Canada's society is today so complex and highly developed that it is not possible for us to introduce large group settlements of one ethnic origin, and our entire immigration system is based on individual and family selection and settlement in Canada.

In our discussions we did much to clarify our respective viewpoints. Also, I endeavoured to convince the Japanese that any of their people who do qualify and are admitted to Canada will be assisted by our immigration service to locate jobs and homes and, in general, will be aided as fully as they would be in one of their own government-organized group settlements.

In view of the present economic conditions in Japan, it is not realistic to expect that any large scale immigration movement will result. But I am confident that steps have been taken which will result in a growing movement to Canada of qualified Japanese professional and technical workers and their families.

I should refer to another point in immigration procedures concerning apparent inconsistencies in assessing the abilities of sponsors to receive and care for their relatives until the latter have become established in Canada. Let me say first of all that this has rarely been a problem in recent years where the spouse and dependent children of a sponsor in Canada have been involved. The department takes a lenient view in such cases and the financial and domestic arrangements required have been reasonably easy to meet.

The sponsoring of relatives other than dependents is, however, a different matter, as I think all members will agree. The responsibilities assumed by the sponsor in Canada are serious ones. They include the willingness and ability to provide care and maintenance as need be until the immigrant and his family establish themselves in Canada. It was in assessing the abilities of various sponsors to meet these responsibilities that there may have been some variance of opinion on the part of different immigration officers.

To overcome this problem my officers, after intensive study, have developed more objective standards of assessing settlement arrangements. These standards, which are essentially financial, were put into effect last February, upon my arrival in the department. Reports to date indicate that they are working out well, and in large measure have resolved the problem. Applicants who are unable to satisfy the criteria—which I believe to be reasonable—are informed of those deficiencies that must be overcome to have their applications approved. As I say, this system appears to be operating well; however, I shall keep it under review to ensure that it serves the purpose intended.

In the field of refugees, also, we intend to pursue those policies which have enabled Canada to show its concern with the unfortunate of the world's political upheavals. This concern has been demonstrated throughout the post-war years, notably in the displaced persons movement, in connection with the Hungarian uprising, the world refugee year and in other arrangements which have been made for individual refugees with particularly difficult handicaps.

The high commissioner for refugees, as an appointee of the United Nations, deserves our support within the terms of his present mandate. It is the intention of my department—where migration is an appropriate solution—to offer him all possible help within our capabilities. This in itself is not something new but is a reaffirmation of our government's position in the field of refugee problems.

I come now to certain matters of general interest in the immigration field. First, there is the question of legislation. As I mentioned in connection with my visit to the Far East, I am recommending to the governor in council that section 31(c) of the immigration regulations be amended to provide for the addition of male fiancés to those categories admissible on the sponsorship of a resident or citizen of Canada. This is all I propose for the moment in this direction. However, it is my firm intention to visit personally, all major areas of immigration operations and from the first hand knowledge which I shall gain, there may well come other recommendations for changes in the legislation.

At the same time, I am conscious of the representations made by members of parliament and others to the effect that there are provisions open to question in certain sections of the present Immigration Act. Some members have introduced private bills with the intention of revising specific sections of the act.

Let me say that I am in sympathy with many of the points raised. However, I think

most members will agree that there are many inter-relationships between various sections of the act, and isolated amendments while perhaps appropriate in respect of one or more particular problems, could have unfortunate effects in other areas.

All the points raised from outside the department as well as from within are being carefully noted and I shall shortly assign priorities for detailed studies of the changes suggested and required. Following this I would expect to introduce a revised act for the consideration of parliament as soon as possible.

Another question of importance in the general policy area is the problem of quality control in the immigration movement. From what I have said earlier I think it should be clear that this government intends to do everything possible to secure, through immigration, a substantial flow of desirable skilled people and their families and to expedite the reunion of families. In this process we intend to improve our administrative facilities and processes to the point where there can be no legitimate excuse for "queue jumping".

While we shall be fair it will be necessary, none the less, to be firm. Persons who seek to circumvent the law by entering Canada illegally, for example, ship deserters, can expect the full process of the law fairly and justly to be applied to them.

At the same time—and with even more emphasis if possible—I should like to stress the government's concern with these elements who seek to infiltrate the Canadian community to carry on criminal activities, especially of the organized variety. Let me assure the committee that persons of the kind under discussion will be denied admission, if known. Those who may have gained admission and are within the jurisdiction of immigration legislation will be subject to the provisions respecting deportation. Obviously all necessary control measures can be effective only with wholehearted public support. I hereby ask for such support from the Canadian people through you, their responsible representatives.

Finally, I am happy to inform the committee that just last night treasury board gave me authority to proceed at once with our plans for reorganization in immigration.

At this time the changes will involve immigration headquarters at Ottawa and our offices overseas. Proposals regarding our offices in Canada will follow in due course. The changes to be made in the organization at the present time will more effectively meet the government's policy to implement a more positive and productive immigration program. We shall then have a considerably greater capacity to seek out suitable immigrants, to provide all necessary information about Canada and its opportunities and to speed up the procedures by which immigrants coming either on their own or to join with relatives already in Canada will be dealt with.

Important portions of the work now centralized at Ottawa from our immigration offices in numerous countries will be decentralized in such a way as to eliminate much of the present transfer of paper and the consequent delays. It is important that not only better but that quicker services be given to all those persons who plan to come to this country as immigrants.

The changes in organization should improve the morale of our immigration employees markedly. This is a point the importance of which I have already stressed.

The new organization will reflect fully the functional aspects of the flow of immigration, beginning with its planning, proceeding to the recruitment and selection of immigrants in accord with such planning, and going on to the successful establishment of these immigrants in Canada. There will be five principal divisions at the headquarters in Ottawa: (1) policy and planning; (2) overseas services; (3) Canadian services; (4) special services; and (5) support services. Special services will have to do with those exceptional persons who give unusual difficulty, such as those who must be deported for one reason or another. Support services will have to do with all administrative requirements in respect to finances, personnel, provision of suitable quarters, both in Canada and overseas, furnishings and equipment, and all the numerous basic needs of any large body of employees.

The changes in the plans for the overseas services envisage the setting up of a new regional office in continental Europe, charged with the general supervision of the immigration programs in the 16 countries where we maintain offices. This is comparable in some degree to the regional office we already have in London which covers the United Kingdom and Ireland, but its territory is of course far more extensive and the problems it will meet will be more complex due to the numerous governments with which it will deal and the many languages with which it must have requisite familiarity. The provision of such a regional office at this time

will greatly reinforce the efforts of our present offices in the various countries of continental Europe. We will give them much greater support in their promotion and information programs and will be able to react much more quickly and effectively to their requirements than has ever been possible from Ottawa. This is a measure of decentralization that should be most effective. The result should be to stimulate and to expedite Canadian immigration efforts in all the countries now concerned, and in additional countries if such expansion becomes advisable.

In dealing with the reorganization of the overseas immigration services I should point out that these changes are by no means confined to Europe. Another aspect of the new plan will be to so organize as to give added support and attention to the matter of immigrants from sources in the western hemisphere as well as from sources in Asia and in the Pacific areas. For the first time there will be a unit of our immigration staff whose primary responsibility it will be to look after immigration from these important sources.

May I thank the committee for its patience in bearing with me through this fairly lengthy review of a number of important aspects of immigration. I trust it will be helpful to all of us.

Mr. Chairman, I have not said a word about the Indian affairs branch of the department. With the unanimous consent of the committee and since there is a great difference between the problems of immigration and those of Indian affairs, perhaps I could make later on some comments on item 15 concerning the Indians.

[*Text*]

Mr. Skoreyko: Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to the minister's long statement. I must say that during all the years I have been in the House of Commons I have listened to former ministers of citizenship and immigration make statements, but have not heard one that was as disappointing as this one. I do not say that to be deliberately critical but because of statements that have been made outside this house on many occasions by the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, particularly in regard to amendments that are indeed necessary to the Canadian Citizenship Act and the Immigration Act.

I thought today the minister would announce at least some of the important changes he has been talking about for so long. He did make one announcement to the effect that in so far as immigrants from Hong Kong are concerned, male fiancés would be able to get into Canada. I must say that is only a crumb when compared to the many promises he has made since he became minister of this department.

[Mr. Tremblay.]

Mr. Chairman, I should like to deal with some of the promises that have been made over a period of time as far back as the last election. A promise was made to the Chinese people in my area of Alberta that if they voted Liberal they would not be discriminated against. Promises were made by the former minister of citizenship and immigration that amendments would be brought before the house within a short period of time in respect of the Canadian Citizenship Act and the Immigration Act.

The last time I dealt with this subject was in December of 1963, at which time I referred to several of these promises. At that time the former minister said certain changes were being contemplated. These changes are being contemplated again today.

I should like to quote from the September 24 edition of the Montreal *Gazette*, as follows:

> Sweeping changes to regulations governing the admission to Canada of Chinese immigrants were forecast Monday night by immigration minister Favreau.

Who was the minister trying to impress when he said certain changes were to be made to allow Chinese immigrants into Canada? Perhaps he impressed some of the Chinese people in Canada who were not aware that the important changes had been made by the Conservative minister of citizenship and immigration, Mrs. Ellen Fairclough. I believe those changes were important; they were announced in this House of Commons on January 19, 1962, and I have a list of them here.

For the sake of informing those people who may not recall that it was Hon. Ellen Fairclough who made these sweeping changes, I should like to put on the record one paragraph of the statement she made in 1962:

> Subsection (c) of section 31 provides for the admission of a somewhat wider list of immediate dependants and close relatives. It applies not only to sponsors who are Canadian citizens but also to persons other than Canadian citizens who have been legally admitted to Canada for permanent residence and who wish to bring forward a mother, father, wife, grandparent, female fiancée or an unmarried minor child.

I am sure the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration recalls that the old regulations were indeed discriminatory as, indeed, the present act is with respect to certain countries

in Europe. I recall reading a newspaper report of a speech made by a responsible minister of the crown to a group of Chinese, in this instance Vancouver Chinese with whom he was having a nice Chinese dinner, and at that time he referred to sweeping changes in the regulations governing the admission to Canada of Chinese immigrants. Almost the same speech, word for word, was made a year later by the new minister on the occasion of his having a nice Chinese dinner in Toronto. With the newspaper report there is a picture of the new minister. He was not quite as broad in his promises, because the newspaper report in the *Globe and Mail* of June 25, 1964, contains this statement:

> He hinted also at a coming general overhaul of immigration policy and announced that he will go on a tour of Canadian immigration offices in other countries, including Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Portugal and Greece. "I shall go on the journey at the recess of parliament, if we have a recess," he told a reporter.

I was indeed happy to hear that the minister intended to visit these countries to find if there were any inadequacies in these offices that should be corrected immediately. I was glad indeed to hear this, but at the same time I am a little disappointed in that I have some 12 files before me of cases that have not been settled. I do not intend to deal with them all individually, but these 12 files have been on my desk now for a number of years. I an not being critical of the minister because these files have not been processed, but I am being critical of him because, in view of what the present regulations say, he is aware that there are people in Europe of other origins than those countries from which we readily accept immigrants and where we have office facilities, who are faced with problems. I refer to people of Ukrainian, Polish and Russian origin now living in Canada who have relatives in those countries where there are absolutely no facilities by which they can bring them to Canada.

I would make one suggestion in this regard. I suggest to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration that talks should be held with such countries as Russia, where we do not have facilities at present, to see if it is not possible to do something. I am sure the Russians would not give us permission to set up an immigration office in their country, but surely they would bend sufficiently to allow the immigration branch to have an agent in Russia who could operate out of our embassy in Moscow and whose prime function would be to encourage those people in Russia who have relatives here with whom they would like to be reunited, and give them the necessary assistance so they could be reunited.

As an example I have one case before me which is indeed a sad one. It involves a father and mother who came to Canada from Poland, but because of the existing regulations which prohibit the admission to Canada of a son or daughter over 25 years of age they had to leave their son and one daughter, I believe, in Poland. They did so on the understanding, though it was a misunderstanding on their part, that once they were established in Canada and could provide adequate accommodation for their son and daughter and their families these people would be able to come forward immediately. This man got settled in Canada and found a good job. He was a trained craftsman, a carpenter, I believe. One day he called me and said that this was what he had been told while he was in Poland, and he now wanted to make application for his son and daughter and their families.

I do not need to remind the minister that I could not offer him much encouragement. Since then I have been trying to bring this matter to a conclusion but to no avail. Something should be done, and I hope the minister will give the matter very serious consideration.

Certainly consultation with a country like Russia in order to see what they have to say could do no harm. I know there is a means by which some of these applications can be processed. We can approach the Russian embassy or the Polish embassy here in Ottawa, but this is the long way of going about the processing of such applications.

The minister also made some comment about refugees. I did not have the text of his speech before me and could not follow his remarks as closely as I might have wished. However, I want to point out that under the administration of the Leader of the Opposition 106 refugee families were admitted to Canada from Hong Kong. I believe five families settled in the Edmonton area, some four or five in Calgary and one or two in Red Deer. The others were distributed across Canada. I have before me a newspaper article which the minister may find very interesting. I certainly do. It is a report from the Ottawa bureau of the *Globe and Mail* and reads as follows:

> All but one of the 106 government sponsored Hong Kong refugee families brought to Canada in 1962 are self supporting. A spokesman for the Department of Citizenship and Immigration said heads

of 105 of the families were employed by January 1. The one unemployed man, the official said, was not able to work because of sickness.

I think the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration will agree with me that this was probably one of the sounder moves made by the department. I do not want to go into the history of similar matters now, but certainly these people have proved to be very stable indeed. I do not believe you can expect to get a better performance record from a group of refugees. One hundred and five out of the 106 families are self supporting. One man, because of sickness, is not able to support his family. If I know the Chinese community, and I think I do, I do not believe these Chinese families will ever become a burden on the government. The article goes on to say:

In addition, a number of the family heads have learned English well enough to obtain employment in the field in which they were trained in China.

All the men chosen for the move to Canada were skilled workers and many were professional men.

John Diefenbaker, when he was prime minister in 1962, decided to lift the quota on Hong Kong immigrants to allow into Canada about 100 refugee families who had fled China.

The move came in the middle of a Department of Justice investigation into illegal entry by Chinese into Canada.

May I ask the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration if he will now consider, on the basis of the performance of these families, doubling that figure the next time. Let us bring in 250 families. Let us see how that works. On many occasions the minister has talked about bringing in hundreds of thousands of immigrants. Is it not then reasonable to request the minister to bring in 200 or 250 refugee families? If that program works out, then in subsequent years let us bring in 500. You could never do better, Mr. Chairman, than to bring in families that have shown a performance record like this. If the minister has some views in respect of this matter, when he replies to some of the questions posed I would be glad indeed to hear from him.

I should like to deal now with another matter that comes under the Immigration Act and which has been the cause of considerable concern. I shall bring to the attention of the minister one case upon which I am working at the moment and which is similar to the cases which are causing concern. I have before me a letter from the former minister of citizenship and immigration which was sent in response to a request I made on behalf of a constituent who wished to bring a niece to Canada for adoption because the family in the old country was poor and unable to maintain the family adequately. The family in Alberta interested in this adoption were wealthy indeed and did not have children of their own. It was very discouraging, not only to myself but to these people, to receive a letter of refusal. I believe this situation is one which can be altered very quickly. The letter reads in part as follows:

[Mr. Skoreyko.]

Additionally, there is no provision in the immigration regulations for the admission to Canada of adopted children or children for adoption.

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, this is not an unreasonable request, and changes of this nature should be made and made quickly.

I want to bring to the minister's attention one case in the province of Alberta. I believe I dealt with this particular case on one previous occasion. An elderly gentleman and his wife, who owned quite a large estate, were never able to have a family of their own, and with my assistance applied to the immigration department for permission to bring in a niece for adoption. Of course the application was refused on the ground that there was no provision for this sort of thing in the Immigration Act. The estate owner died. Shortly after that his wife also passed away. I should like the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration to tell me, if he can, what happened to that $250,000 estate? It is true that it was administered by the crown, but is it not true also that a sizeable portion of that estate went to Russia?

I have a dual purpose in recommending this change to the minister. First of all, if a change such as this were made a similar incident would never again occur whereby the sum of $250,000 was sent out of Canada, because I believe it was turned over to the other members of the family in Russia. If that young lady had been admitted to Canada she would have been totally independent. She probably would have inherited the entire estate and a profitable business would have remained in the family.

There is another matter in connection with the citizenship act with which I should like to deal for a moment. The minister may recall, if he has read some of the briefs that have been sent to him—or his departmental officials can advise him to this effect if he has not—that the Canadian Ukrainian committee in Winnipeg asked the government to consider the repeal of section 18 of the citizenship act. In my view this section still discriminates against those people who are Canadian citizens but not Canadian by birth. This section deals with the loss of Canadian citizenship as

a result of residence outside of Canada. Certainly if this act is going to correspond with the true meaning of the bill of rights, this discriminatory section should be repealed.

The minister might consider another aspect of the Immigration Act which needs consideration. I should like the minister to inform me how security risks are assessed when our officials examine prospective immigrants. How do we do this? I shall give another example. For a number of years I have attempted to bring into Canada a family whose father at one time attended some communist meetings in Italy. The rest of the family have never been associated with the communist party. They swear they have no leanings in that direction, but our officials simply say that because the father attended meetings of the party in 1928-29 they are not the admissible class.

Do we have the Italian, French and German police determining the security risk involved in admitting certain immigrants? At this moment I am not prepared to offer any suggestions about a solution, but I think the minister might consider, in the case of an individual applicant, a letter of recommendation from the local priest, the local judge, or local police officer who has known the applicant for a number of years.

Dealing with the question on a local level, does the minister intend to reduce the qualification requirement for immigrants being questioned at the certificate presentation ceremonies in the respective courts to which he made reference? People who are very young, particularly those who are still in their school years, do not have much difficulty acquiring sufficient knowledge of the English language to qualify for such an examination, but I know of one case, that of a Chinese woman in the city of Edmonton well into her sixties, who probably never attended school a single day in her life. Because she was unable to name certain objects that were pointed out to her, her citizenship papers have been delayed. Is the local judge instructed to give such people special consideration, particularly on account of their age? A judge can find out from an applicant's relatives and friends how much educational background the applicant has. Certainly in this case an applicant who could not even write in Chinese would find it difficult within a short period of five years to name in English all objects that were pointed out to her.

Who operates the language courses to which the minister referred, and in what areas are they located? I think he suggested there was a citizenship course in Edmonton. Is there also one in Calgary?

Mr. Tremblay: There will be one there.

Mr. Skoreyko: I thank the minister. I notice my time is running out, and in conclusion I would draw to the minister's attention a speech which he himself made in this house on February 27, 1964. From what I know of the minister's attitude toward people of different national origins I think he is completely impartial and unbiased so far as ethnic groups are concerned, but I fail to understand why he spoke like he did on that occasion, as recorded at page 316 of *Hansard* for that date:

> There is a tradition of long standing in this parliament, that the Speaker's function in the House of Commons and in the other place is entrusted in turn to representatives of the two most important ethnic groups in this country.
>
> According to another tradition, the mover and seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the throne are chosen among the representatives of the two most important racial groups in Canada.

I wonder what the minister meant by that. If he meant what I think he meant, then of course the statement he made in this house today has very little meaning. I think it must have been a slip of the tongue, or probably an error in translation. I hope the minister did not mean to imply that any one group of people in Canada was more important than others. Mr. Chairman, I hope to rise later this afternoon as various items come up for discussion, and at the moment I thank the minister for his statement.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to have heard the minister's statement. This subject of an enlightened and sensible immigration policy is very important for a number of reasons, one being, as he indicated, that the economic welfare of Canada depends to a considerable extent on our having an enlightened immigration policy. Second, our relations with other peoples of the world depend on having an enlightened immigration policy. There are very many possibilities in the small world of today of resentment and misunderstanding arising if our immigration policies are, or appear to be, discriminatory and unfair. Finally, immigration is a matter of very great importance because of the immense number of individual human family problems, as the minister well knows, that are involved in the administration of immigration regulations. Therefore I am glad he has made this lengthy statement about the policies of his department.

There were many good things in the minister's statement, but I cannot help expressing my agreement with the hon. member for Edmonton East who said the statement, by and large, was a disappointing one. To me it was something like the old cliché of the curate's egg, good in parts and bad in parts. The total impression was not very satisfactory. The reason I say this to the minister is that despite some of the good points I will mention, and for which he and his department deserve credit, there remains a failure to tackle some of the basic problems, and we will not have a satisfactory immigration policy until they are tackled.

I will deal with that in greater detail later. The announcement as to the proposed changes in the regulations did not deal with the charges which have been made, and properly made, of discrimination written right into the regulations themselves. There is failure to appreciate that right at the root of the procedures laid down at the present time is a system which, as the hon. member for Edmonton East said, perpetuates a disregard for the basic principles of the bill of rights. This has not been dealt with, unfortunately, in the minister's statement.

But may I, first of all, call attention to things in this statement which we welcome. I warmly welcome the minister's announcement that steps are to be taken to bring about a positive approach to the subject of immigration. As long as we, or officials in the department, or some of them, think in terms of keeping people out; as long as that is the basic philosophy, no satisfactory result can ever be achieved. I was glad to hear the minister speak of a positive program, and I was glad to hear of the various steps he proposes to take in this direction; the setting up of an interdepartmental committee, for example.

This seems to be an excellent proposal. But why does the hon. gentleman not go a step further? Why do we not have a committee of this house charged with the responsibility of reviewing these matters? I think this parliament should be used. I think there are plenty of people in parliament with experience in these matters who could contribute, not only by making complaints about some of the things which are wrong but, and this is far more important, by helping toward the development of the positive approach of which the minister speaks.

There is one thing which is perfectly obvious. It is that in a sense immigration policy depends upon and is a function of our general over-all economic policy. If we have an expanding economy there is no problem about getting skilled immigrants to this country. If we have adequate social security measures we do not need to worry about promotional campaigns. Why has there been such a tremendous influx of immigrants into France, Germany and other countries in northern Europe from Italy, Greece and Turkey? No elaborate promotional campaigns were needed. What these countries had were expanding economies and opportunities, and this is a situation which is essential. We can talk as much as we like, but unless there are opportunities available to them, immigrants are not attracted.

The reverse is also true. As long as we have a substantial pool of unemployment in this country the pressure against a liberal immigration policy will be tremendous. It is bound to be so. We have seen it again and again. In times of economic stagnation the minister will be under constant pressure to turn off the tap, to use one of his own expressions; and he certainly has all the means of turning off the tap at his disposal if need be. I welcome this new positive approach and the changes in organization and staffing, both badly needed, which we understand are to be carried out. This approach is useful and worth while, and I wish the minister luck in carrying it out effectively because it is certainly a move in the right direction.

I have no wish to discuss for very long the lengthy passages in his speech in which the minister dealt with the immigration of Chinese from Hong Kong, because I do not regard this as simply a problem involving the Chinese. I regret very much that the only change which is proposed in the regulations should be a minuscule change, namely that females—to adopt the elegant word which was used—can sponsor male fiancés, or their entry into this country, whereas hitherto there was apparently discrimination based upon sex. We are all happy to know that this discrimination is to be removed. But if this makes any substantial difference to the situation I shall be surprised. I doubt whether there are enough Chinese females of marriageable age with the ability to attract these young men from Hong Kong to make this change in the regulations more than a tiny gesture.

The minister has, in this instance, frankly stated that he is not recommending that sponsorship privileges for Chinese be extended to cover the admission of brothers, sisters and more distant relatives. That statement, and the regulations which underline it, perpetuate a discrimination which is based, if you like,

on geographical grounds but in reality on racial grounds. It represents the survival in these regulations of racial discrimination.

I have heard the Prime Minister speak on this subject. I have heard the former minister of citizenship and immigration do the same. They together, I imagine, with the present minister, are enlightened men who say they do not have anything to do with discrimination. I remember the Prime Minister speaking heatedly about some United States legislation which continued discrimination on racial grounds. What are the circumstances here? I want the committee to appreciate this. Perhaps the committee does appreciate it already; it is written into the regulations. We do not need to wait for a new session of parliament or for legislation on other items to be completed before we can deal with it. It could be done by order in council with the stroke of a pen. But it is not being done. What is the situation today? Regulation 31(d) states, with application to persons permitted to land in Canada:

> a person who is a citizen of any country of Europe, including Turkey; or of any country of North, Central or South America or islands adjacent thereto; or of Egypt, Israel or Lebanon, if such person is:
>
> (i) the son, daughter, brother or sister, as well as the husband or wife and the unmarried son or daughter under twenty one years of age of any such son, daughter, brother or sister, as the case may be; or
>
> (ii) the unmarried orphan nephew or niece under twenty one years of age, or fiancé of a Canadian citizen or of a person legally admitted to Canada for permanent residence, who is residing in Canada and who has applied for such person—

And so on. And that excludes not just China and Hong Kong. It excludes all of Asia with the exception perhaps of Lebanon and Israel, and apparently all of Africa, too, which is the largest continent of the world, a continent whose people are now seeking a place in the sun. They are conscious of discrimination in all these countries.

Under regulation 31(c) the group of people who can be brought in from Asia and Africa is far more restricted. If I come from Poland, for example, I can bring my brother and sister into Canada, subject to the other qualifications, of course. If I come from Lebanon, or Israel, or Egypt or any part of Central or South America I can bring one group of my relatives to this country providing the other qualifications are met. But if I happen to come from Asia or from Africa—and I use those words generally—or from China or Japan—

An hon. Member: India.

Mr. Brewin: Or from India—this government takes a particular interest in Malaysia; we are very sympathetic toward Malaysia, apparently, but we say "You are in an inferior position as far as admission to Canada is concerned". I say this provision should be taken out of the regulations, and taken out now. The minister talks about allowing female financées to bring prospective husbands into the country. The labouring mountain has produced a little mouse. We are still keeping right in these regulations, bold and clear, a provision that if you come from one part of the world you are in one class, while if you come from another part of the world you are in another class and may not bring your relatives here to the same extent.

I say, Mr. Chairman, that this discrimination ought to be removed from the act, and no administrative problem about finding out what the Chinese relationships are should justify the maintenance of this trace of discrimination. Well, Mr. Chairman, "trace" is understating it; this is discrimination against the majority of the people in this world. I think if you add the Asians and the Africans together, it is precisely that. I do not know what the exact figures are because I have not counted them up, but I think you will find it is discrimination against the majority. There may well be administrative problems or difficulty in knowing who is the brother or sister of someone in Hong Kong when a person has lost his papers. There is no justification in this, though, for discrimination and the same treatment should be extended to all. If they want to narrow the classes—I would be very sorry to see them narrowed; I think that would be a great mistake—at least the same rule should apply to both groups of people. As I say, Mr. Chairman, I am very, very disappointed that this change has not been made.

I did notice that in his statement to the committee the minister made the following bow to the criticisms that have been made in this house. He said that some members of parliament have made representations with regard to certain sections of the present Immigration Act, and some have introduced private bills. Then he went on to say "Let me say I am in sympathy with many of the points raised".

I say to the minister that I appreciate his sympathy, but that sympathy must be translated into actions. It is no good saying one is sympathetic to these points. I think there is an old expression to the effect that sympathy does not butter parsnips, or something like

that. We have to have more than sympathy. Then the minister said he thought most members would agree that there are many interrelationships between various sections of the act and isolated amendments which, while perhaps appropriate in respect of one or more particular problem, could have unfortunate effects in other areas. Then he said that all the points raised from outside the department as well as from within were being carefully noted and he would shortly assign priorities for detailed studies of the changes suggested and required. The minister said that following this he would expect to introduce a revised act for the consideration of parliament as soon as possible.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, we do not need to worry about assigning priorities when the courts of this country as well as members of this house have again and again expressed, in the most clearcut terms as far as members of this house are concerned and in the solemn judgments of the highest courts of the land, that there are basic deficiencies in the present administration. I would like to ask the minister whether it is not a fact that the majority of people who are excluded or deported from this country are excluded or deported on the ground that they do not have immigrant visas or on the ground that they do not have medical certificates. I know there are many such cases; I do not know whether they constitute a majority. They are not prohibited from entering this country by any of the provisions in the act but because they have not a piece of paper, which is not given to them and is refused them, or they have not had a medical examination, which is refused them under the act.

The courts again and again, as long ago as 1931, have said that this procedure of not giving the grounds for deportation is wrong; they called it hugger-mugger, farcical. How many priorities do you have to assign; how many studies do you have to make, to determine that this procedure is wrong? This has been stated in this house a number of times. I regret that all the minister can say is that he is going to assign priorities shortly and expects to introduce a revised act. A revised act is urgently needed, not only to deal with these major points but to tidy up all sorts of other points.

I had a case just the other day of a Canadian citizen who wanted to bring his wife back from Ireland, where he had married her. Because she had a mild epilepsy she was excluded from coming to Canada. The family is kept apart. The minister cannot do anything about it—although he could issue a permit—because she is within a prohibited class. This man is well able to look after his wife. She is a mild case and is well able to be treated in this country. He happens to be a journalist. He cannot bring his wife into Canada except as a temporary visitor, and as a temporary visitor she cannot obtain hospital insurance and it is dubious whether the children would receive family allowance.

I am sure the minister and his staff would be the first to agree that this provision is a survival of an attitude that is no longer up to date, is neither humanitarian nor sensible. This sort of thing should be changed. Then we have exclusion because of "insanity." Persons are not permitted to enter this country if they have ever had enough sense to go to a mental institution for a check-up. That is practically the position. I forget the exact phraseology in the act, but one of the groups of people excluded are those who "have been insane at any time". All the medical men will tell you that it is a ridiculous definition; and sometimes it is assumed that you are insane. You are asked the question, "Have you ever been in a mental institution?" A lot of us, possibly, would be well advised to have a check-up in this respect from time to time. But you can be perfectly healthy and capable, a sane and reasonable person, and because of this provision in the act, which does not make sense any more today, you are excluded from entering this country.

The act should be carefully revised. I hope it will not be a question of the minister expecting to introduce a revised act. I hope he will make that firmer and say he will introduce a revised act, and that this is an A1 priority for his department. I also hope this matter will receive a lot more than sympathy. When the minister gets this draft act I hope he will submit it to a committee of parliament which can look into it carefully and make suggestions and revisions. Then we would have an immigration act that instead of being antiquated would be something we could be proud of.

There are one or two other matters I wanted to refer to in my remarks, Mr. Chairman. I believe I have a few more minutes. I wonder whether the minister would tell us what he means by the term "skilled". Perhaps he would give us a little more detail in this connection. He said in his statement that the term "skilled" includes those with a reasonably good level of education sufficient to permit a range of mobility and adaptability required in most occupations today. It would

be most helpful if we knew what is regarded as a reasonably good level of education.

While on that point, Mr. Chairman, the minister referred somewhere in his remarks to the difficulties that have arisen because of sponsorship. He said the qualifications for sponsorship were being dealt with inconsistently by different immigration officers. He referred to the fact that standards, which are essentially financial, were put into effect last February upon his arrival in the department.

I wonder whether the minister would table in this house, or make available to members, the standards which were put into effect last February. I know many would-be immigrants have received letters saying "Your sponsorship application is rejected because it does not meet requirements". In most of those letters I have not seen any attempt to tell them what changes are required. I think it would be extremely helpful not only to the members of this house but to all who deal with these matters if the minister were to set out for us the actual requirements.

The minister referred to another matter in rather harsh terms. He spoke of queue jumping. I understand the meaning of queue jumping involves the people coming into this country as visitors, and their desire to stay here and apply for citizenship rather than go back to their country of origin. I appeal to the minister to attempt to find some satisfactory solution to this problem, because section 7, subsection 3 of the Immigration Act itself specifically provides that when a person comes into Canada as a non-immigrant he has a right to report such fact, if he wants to stay, to the nearest immigration officer and present himself for examination at such place and time as may be directed, and that for the purposes under this act, he shall be deemed to be a person seeking admission to Canada.

I am absolutely convinced, Mr. Chairman, that parliament when it enacted that provision intended that if a visitor to Canada for some reason wanted to stay in Canada he should have the right to take his case and have it dealt with in Canada without having to return to his country of origin. I have in mind an individual who, while in Canada, becomes engaged, is offered a job, or who has been a student and, following graduation, desires to stay and work in Canada. I think it was the intention of parliament to give this right to these individuals, provided they are not in a prohibited class, and are qualified for entry.

I understand there is a great problem involved in respect of the machinery of the department, particularly in relation to the admissibility of immigrants. I realize that there are many problems when the department insist on a visitor going through all the requirements following an application for permanent admission. I know it is difficult to carry out the very careful inquiries which must be made, but I feel there must be some solution to these problems.

I would ask hon. members and the minister what would happen if they found themselves in the position of many of these visitors to Canada. I can imagine some of us being unmarried and having a desire to marry someone we met while visiting in another country. If we invited them to Canada as visitors and they decided to live here, how frustrating for the fiancée it would be to have to return to her country of origin and make application for admission to Canada. I can imagine how frustrating it must be for an individual in Canada who met and desired to marry someone from another country, having to send that individual back to the country of origin to make application for citizenship. This is clearly an unsatisfactory situation, and I feel it should be looked into very carefully.

I am wondering whether some method could be found to enable visitors to Canada, who desire to stay, to make application while in this country without having to return to the country of origin. Perhaps the examination carried out in respect of visitors to Canada could be more stringent, but having allowed the visitors in, they should be permitted to make application for citizenship while in Canada. I feel these individuals should have their cases examined as quickly as possible without the necessity of returning to their original homes and making application in the normal manner. After all, I feel it is a compliment to Canada when an individual seeks permission to remain here.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the minister will consider this situation in an attempt to find a solution to this problem, because at the present time the provisions of section 7, subsection 3 of the Immigration Act are being disregarded, and the right that can be conferred by the provisions of that section is not being followed at all.

Mr. Chairman, I have perhaps detained the committee long enough, and it would be repetitious for me to suggest to the minister that if he really wants to achieve the reputation, which I hope he will, of a minister who has cleaned up the immigration laws,

I think he should seriously consider the remarks that have been made in this house during this debate. I am sure the minister has consulted Mr. Sedgwick, an eminent lawyer from Toronto. I am sure Mr. Sedgwick would tell the minister that many of the procedures now followed are inconsistent with the bill of rights and fundamental principles of justice. I am sure the minister will listen to these remarks and not allow the difficulties and problems that exist to stand in the way of fair and just administration of our immigration laws.

I conclude, Mr. Chairman, by saying that while I commend the minister for his statement, he must go much further than he has to achieve the results required. I hope he has no delusions in this regard.

Mr. Patterson: Mr. Chairman, we appreciate the statement made by the minister in introducing his estimates. I am sure everyone followed with interest the rather lengthy presentation of the immigration picture in Canada today. I must agree with other speakers who have participated in this debate and who have suggested that there was not much indication in his statement of what he intends to do in the future. A great deal of emphasis was placed on plans the department is preparing, but there were no concrete proposals.

I believe this department has a very important role to play in the continued development of Canada. As a nation, Canada has tremendous prospective absorption possibilities. The population of Canada is very limited, being of the order of 19 million. Canada has vast geographic proportions and I feel can absorb a great number of immigrants and can do so very rapidly. I am sure everyone recognizes the necessity of increasing our population in order to develop markets adequate to absorb our production. There is a great deal of emphasis placed on overseas markets. We must dispose of our produce. I am sure we can do so by creating larger markets within our own borders. I think our domestic markets would grow following the adoption of the suggested new immigration policy, allowing people into Canada who will accept the responsibilities as well as the privileges of citizenship in this great country of ours.

The minister outlined the steps he proposed to take to improve immigration facilities. He referred to an interdepartmental committee as being a method of meeting the needs and demands in this respect. I think this is a very good suggestion and will help to alleviate the poor situation now in existence.

I think one of the most important things to do in respect of the promotional campaign he mentioned, is to develop this country, and by practical steps to show other people exactly what Canada is and what it can become. This cannot be done through the use of propaganda. We in this country do know of our vast resources and productive capacity. I am sure we can achieve a greater degree of development and progress than has been achieved to the present time. I am sure one of the ways of doing this is by bringing people into this country who will develop the nation as quickly as possible. I think when this development has taken place the example will be obvious to all countries of the world.

Not only must there be adequate policies in respect of immigration, the policies must be co-ordinated with those of every government department. I do not think it is possible for the minister and his department alone to do the job which must be done. As I pointed out before, there is a tremendous amount of development and progress needed to achieve the desired results. I feel there must be a correlation of policies of all departments in order to bring this about. Generally speaking I have found the officials of the immigration branch quite co-operative with regard to the matters I have discussed with them, but I believe that in many instances they are hampered by legislation and regulations that are in the main too restrictive in their nature. This has been referred to by the speakers who have preceded me. I am not going to labour the point but I believe there must be an opening up, a liberalization of the legislation and rules and regulations in order to make them more effective and to do the job that we believe the immigration department should do in this particular field.

The minister dealt mainly with immigration. I realize that this is a very important phase of his departmental responsibilities, but I believe that attention should be given to the requirements, privileges and responsibilities of Canadian citizenship. It is not sufficient just to bring people into Canada. It is not sufficient just to encourage them to come here and take up residence within our nation. I believe that the responsibilities of citizenship should be impressed upon them. In this regard I refer not only to new immigrants. I believe that all the people of Canada should realize that in accepting the privileges and benefits that are theirs within the borders of our country they must also be prepared to accept the responsibilities of citizenship. I have

raised this matter before and I believe it is a subject which should receive a great deal more consideration than it has up to the present time.

In making his statement the minister indicated he was not going to refer at this time to his responsibilities with respect to Indian affairs but would reserve his statement on that matter until we come to that branch. I believe that is desirable and makes for more effective debate.

Extensive debate has already taken place on interim supply motions with regard to immigration, and our participation in the debate at this time is going to be very limited. However there is one other point to which I should like to refer. The minister mentioned revision of the act. It would appear that this is highly desirable not only for the purpose of making the necessary changes that are required but also for the purpose of making the whole act more readable and more understandable and in that way making it more effective in accomplishing the particular task.

We would urge the minister to continue his diligent attention to these particular fields. I think it is absolutely essential to remember that especially in this department the human factor is of primary importance.

Mr. Hahn: Mr. Chairman, in speaking on the estimates of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration I do not want to take a lot of time. I was very glad to hear the minister state that the policy of the department is going to be a positive rather than a negative one and that we are actively going out to seek new immigrants for this country. Too often in the past I have felt that the department—when I say "department" I mean a combination of the legislation, the regulations and the department itself—has tended to act not as a pump drawing people into our country but more as a wall trying to keep them out. I hope and expect from the minister's statement that this will end.

There are three specific items that have been touched on about which I should like to make a few remarks. First of all, the hon. member for Greenwood raised the problem of geographic and racial discrimination in our immigration policy. I can only agree with him that I think this is wrong. I believe this is something that is not in keeping with the image of our country we want to present abroad and I do not think it is in keeping with the view of our attitudes that we ourselves have within our country. So I would ask the minister to regard this problem as a problem, and see if something cannot be done about it. I say again that the arguments presented by the hon. member for Greenwood made a lot of sense to me and I would hope that consideration might be given to them.

The second problem I should like to speak about briefly is that of immigrants from behind the iron curtain. As I understand the regulations, people within a certain age group are not admitted to this country because we are unable to find out anything about them. We do not know whether they are acceptable from a security point of view. It seems to me that because we are unable to prove the case for admission of these people we are in a position of having to assume the case against. We cannot prove they are fit immigrants for the country so we say that they must be unfit.

I am fully aware of the security problems involved. On the other hand, I do think there is something that might be done which has not been done in the past. Instead of looking only to the immigrant himself as a source of information about his character I think we might look to this end of the story. We might look to the sort of people who are sponsoring the immigrant. If we are going to bring somebody from behind the iron curtain to this country, and the people who are sponsoring him, the family with whom he is going to live, are people of good character and of industry who have established themselves as good citizens of this country, surely we should be able to give some consideration to the risk involved in bringing a person into that environment. If we have confidence, as I do, in our system of life in this country I think we should not be afraid of bringing somebody who might possibly be a communist into this type of environment, in the hope that our system would commend itself to the immigrant. So I would urge the department to look at the problem not only from the point of view of trying to find out information about the prospective immigrant in his country of origin but also from the point of view of the environment here to which the immigrant is coming, and see if we cannot establish some yardsticks on that basis that might allow some of these people into the country, that might allow some family reunions which, based on the experience of the cases I have had, I think should take place.

The third point I should like to raise deals with the problem of mental illness. This is the subject of a private member's bill which I have on the order paper, but the way the schedule is going I do not think there is a

chance that the bill will come up for debate this session. It was on the order paper last session but did not come up then either.

I think the easiest way for me to describe this problem is to cite the case history that first brought the problem to my attention. I refer to the case of a man who during the war lost his family and wandered throughout war torn Europe. After the war he was able to obtain certain skills as an electrician and became engaged to be married to a girl. His engagement was broken and he came to Canada in 1953. Shortly after he arrived in this country he had a nervous or mental breakdown and went into a mental hospital. There he stayed for a period of a couple of months, I believe. Since that time this man has established himself in this country. He has worked steadily since 1953, a period of 11 years now, and there has been absolutely no problem at all in terms of his mental health. He has had recent examinations by psychiatrists and they have indicated that his previous problem was the result of the upbringing he had during the war, the breaking up of his family, the loss of his parents, the breaking of his engagement and then suddenly being transplanted to this environment. The pressures were too great. But since that time he has re-established himself and from current psychiatric examinations the indications are that he is probably as good or a better risk than most people in this country today. This man is under an order of deportation.

Now, it is true this order of deportation will not be exercised. Indeed it cannot be exercised because there is no place we can send him. He is now a resident of Canada. It is fine to say to the man: You do not have to worry; you can stay here all the rest of your life. The order of deportation will not be exercised. This may seem like a reasonable thing to say. However in my opinion it is not. This man cannot become a Canadian citizen or become the citizen of any country. He cannot get a passport as you and I can to visit other countries. He is denied many of the rights that we, as Canadians, have. He is denied these rights under the Immigration Act, and not just for today or tomorrow; he is denied them all the rest of his life.

He wants to get married and raise a family. However he refuses to do so under these circumstances. He does not want to bring up children and have to try to explain to those children why he cannot go to Europe like other Canadians, or hold a passport from this country. I do not believe this is good enough. I believe that the legislation, as it is drafted now, fails to take into account the advancements that have been made in connection with the problem of mental illness. It fails to recognize what all other institutions in our society seem to recognize, that is that mental illness can be cured. We allow a prisoner who has been in our prisons, but who has rehabilitated himself, to become a Canadian citizen. I believe we should do the same thing for people who have been unfortunate enough to have had mental problems. I think we should recognize that these people can be cured, and after adequate proof of cure I think we should then return them to full status as Canadians. I believe that to do less is not in keeping with our attitudes in this country. I urge the minister, when he is making his revision of the Immigration Act, to bring this section up to date because in my opinion it is almost reminiscent of the middle ages. A change should be made so that a mental patient receives proper treatment in this country.

[Mr. Hahn.]

Mr. Mandziuk: I wish to associate myself, Mr. Chairman, with the remarks of the previous speaker, who made some very good suggestions. I hope the minister takes note of them. I wish to congratulate particularly the hon. member for Edmonton East for his remarks because when we are considering the extension of immigration quotas for people from other lands, I believe the department would be well advised to co-operate more fully with the Department of Industry so these people can make use of their skills when they arrive in Canada.

My remarks I hope will be brief because I intend to refer to that branch of the department which has responsibility for the Indian population in Canada. The minister's introductory remarks were quite extensive and he should be complimented. He covered a great deal of territory. We find champions for almost everything in Canada. We find people who champion the cause of law breakers, people who come into Canada illegally. We are so careful, and we want to give them free legal advice and see they are comfortably housed in our prisons. We want to see that they get the proper bail. We have champions for those who deliberately take the life of another. Just a short time ago an organization was established in Canada to lobby for the abolition of capital punishment. Canada sends a great deal of money to the underdeveloped nations through the Colombo plan.

Who does champion the cause of the Indians? We have almost a quarter of a million of these people in Canada. There was a time when we thought they were faced with extinction. However the Indian population is increasing and we have them in every province. I have some in my constituency, approximately 1,300 men, women and children scattered over five reserves. It is with these people I am familiar, but I think the same situation exists in every part of Canada in so far as our Indians are concerned.

I was particularly intrigued by a centennial project initiated by the Saskatchewan wheat pool, Mr. Chairman, and I wish to make a short reference to it. The Saskatchewan wheat pool has initiated what they call a conference and trade centre to be built in Saskatoon. The federal-provincial contribution will be $92,000 and public contributions will amount to around $150,000. This building is for the purpose of teaching the Indians in order to bridge the gap between the different cultures, thus enabling these Indians to lead a richer life. These short courses are going to be five or ten days, or perhaps of two weeks duration and will be given to Indians of all ages. The Saskatchewan wheat pool is to be commended for initiating such a project. I fail to see why this example could not be followed up by the government, instead of neglecting this section of our population as we do.

Now, Mr. Chairman, these are first Canadians. Away back almost 500 years ago when the first white man came to this country, the Indians had a culture. They had reached a certain level of civilization. They did not have a common language but they had an organized government and some ideas for practising democracy. One does not need to stretch his imagination too far to visualize what would have happened if the white man had not come and this Indian population, simply by a process of evolution, had been allowed to progress culturally. One wonders if these people would not have reached, by this time, a much higher level than some of the multitribal nations in Africa. I have great respect for the intelligence of these people. However, today they have no ambition. I think we have destroyed that.

What have we given the Indian? We have put him in a reserve, in a ghetto. We have destroyed his pride of race. We have destroyed his initiative. We have destroyed his ambition to do better because all we hand out to him is a relief voucher. He lives from day to day because he knows the little white father, the government, is going to take care of him. I admit that the schools on the various reserves are trying to do a good job. I commend the department for having started an experiment several years ago, namely encouraging the integration of the Indian boys and girls into our public school system.

I speak from experience because from one large Indian reserve in my riding a number of children were brought into our public schools, and from the conversations I have had with the board of trustees and the teachers, I learn they are making satisfactory progress. This experiment should be extended to the full. We should do away with the idea of the one room school on the Indian reserve where at times it is most difficult to secure a qualified teacher.

Some of the residential schools are also doing a wonderful job, and in my constituency the Birtle residential school is doing a magnificent job. We must achieve integration for the Indians. We must destroy any suspicions we have had. We must restore the Indian's confidence in himself so that when he gets education he may qualify for better positions. Educated Indians will become leaders in their communities, and I believe the project which the Saskatchewan wheat pool has initiated is a good one, which could be copied by many other parts of Canada.

Indian affairs are in no way related to citizenship and immigration. Citizenship and immigration are two subjects, related to each other, and I would suggest that the government give consideration to establishing an Indian affairs department. It might be created by providing for an associate minister of citizenship and immigration who would give his full time to Indian affairs.

Indian reserves are scattered all over the nation. Suggestions have been made that they be abolished, and the Indians have gone up in arms over those suggestions. Outside of striving to integrate some of the young we are not doing a thing to encourage Indians to establish themselves on the land that is presently cultivated by the whites. There are thousands of acres of good arable farmland rented by white farmers, on an acreage fee or on a share basis. Is it not about time we took steps to prepare the Indians to take over this land? It is their land, and if they worked it it would put an end to the spectacle of Indians waiting for relief vouchers.

An associate minister of Indian affairs would assist the minister greatly. At present the department is too big for one man to handle. It is a troika, as Khrushchev would

say, and in no way are Indians connected with citizenship and immigration. They do not have to be naturalized; they are the first citizens of this nation.

Several years ago, probably intended as an experiment and on the recommendation of the departmental heads, a change was made by taking the Indian agent off the reserve and putting him as far away as possible, presumably with the idea of encouraging the Indian to be self-supporting and to depend on himself and his band. In some instances in my riding the Indian agent is 40 or 50 miles away from the reserve to which he is assigned. In fact the nearest agent to a reserve is 50 miles away. The Indian has been in the habit of coming to the agent and regarding him as a father confessor, telling the agent all his problems, grievances and beefs. I know it is not pleasant for an Indian agent to live on a reserve ostracized from white society, but this is one of the hazards of his job, and I feel he should be as close as possible to the reserve, if not actually on it.

The Indian never goes anywhere without dragging his family along with him. You will see an Indian and his wife sitting on the roadside trying to hitchhike a ride to see the Indian agent. If they can afford the bus fare they travel that way, but the agent should be nearer to them.

I do not know what qualifications are expected of Indian agents. I am not offering any criticism of any agent I know personally, but I believe the agent has to be a teacher. He should also be an agricultural expert so that he may encourage Indians to make use of the land on which they reside. By competition he should instil in the Indian ambition to own, to possess something, rather than be content to carry on day by day without any hope for the future.

We have to have more houses on Indian reserves. If we have millions of dollars to spend for everything else then we must also have them for these people. We have put these people on reserves, and you should see the conditions under which many of them live. We worry about what is going on in Malaysia and Africa; I say let us start worrying about what is going on at our own back door or front door. Surely we can give better dwellings to the Indians, many of whom are living in hovels, log cabins with barely a covering on them, with broken window panes and bad floors. These are a blot on our civilization.

Let us try to integrate the Indians into our way of life. Let us get them into our public schools. Let us put dedicated Indian agents on our reserves. Let us bring the Indian to a level where he does not suffer from an inferiority complex. If that is done the department will be accomplishing something. I hope the minister will keep some of these suggestions in mind. They are important, and this is a segment of our population which we must attend to if we want to present a respectable face to the rest of the world.

[Mr. Mandziuk.]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a few brief comments on a subject which we are too often inclined to treat lightly, whereas it is the most essential subject to be found in this country, and I refer to immigration in so far as it relates to the demographic composition of Canada.

In accordance with our best traditions and by way of introduction, I should like to begin by congratulating the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, of whom we have reason to be proud.

Not too long ago, I had the opportunity to witness one of his performances on television, when he faced a panel of interviewers who stuck to their guns rather hard, and I was able to see how masterfully he handled their questions, which is altogether in keeping with his great ability and exceptional talent.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Choquette: I am pleased to hear the applause of my colleagues, because what I have to say later on might not meet with their approval.

The immigration problem is surely one of the most difficult for French Canada. It is obvious that our country can admit a very great number of immigrants, but it is also obvious, unfortunately, that immigration has never favoured the French speaking group. Figures are there to prove it.

I put on the order paper several questions regarding immigration, in order to learn how many immigrants have been admitted and have settled here since the beginning of the century. In those questions I was asking for the number of French speaking and English speaking Canadians; this would definitely show that the French speaking element has been reduced, through immigration, to a very alarming extent.

We believe in the dual language character of our country. Many people say that they want to accept the bilingual and bicultural fact. We probably find this good will every-

where, but even if those high-sounding principles were broadcast from coast to coast, from Newfoundland to British Columbia, if the French speaking element is constantly losing ground in Canada from a demographic point of view, the day will come when it will be absolutely useless to speak of bilingualism or biculturalism, for there will no longer be any French speaking element.

Then I shall appeal to any Canadian citizen to come to our assistance in the province of Quebec, in order to fight those who exploit prejudice and those who would like to drive our compatriots into breaking up our confederation. We are able to face up with the utmost energy and courage to those who resort to prejudice, but we want also to provide them with acceptable arguments in order to prove to them that confederation is to our advantage and not to our disadvantage, as they try to make us believe by foul and surreptitious means.

Mr. Chairman, the facts show that: Since 1946, Canada has welcomed 2,200,000 immigrants, of whom 650,000 were British, 270,000 German, 320,000 Italian, 160,000 Dutch, etc. and as far as the French speaking immigrants are concerned, they numbered fewer than 70,000.

It is clear that in the circumstances, a large proportion of immigrants is drawn to the majority group and inclined to identify itself with, and become part of that group, for which they can hardly be blamed.

But the point I would like to submit, Mr. Chairman, is that to the extent the French minorities in the nine other provinces are strengthened, become strong and actively dynamic, we shall be able, not only to fight, but to eliminate separatists, by telling them: If Quebec should separate there would still be a strong French speaking minority to denounce them as traitors and renegades. But, if the French speaking minorities in the remainder of this country are inexistent, the separatists will then gain the support of those who are weak enough to yield to their arguments.

My impression is that if we really want to establish a biethnic country, I think the area where this principle should be confirmed is the Immigration Act, where the demographic balance could be considered in one way or the other.

It is by laying down that biethnical principle, by recognizing it in the Immigration Act, that we will assert ourselves. And that, all the much more if it is recognized that bilingualism and biculturalism prevail in this country.

I would be remiss if I failed to deplore the lack of interest shown by the government of the province of Quebec in regard to immigration. That government was at fault, altogether. Certainly, such a lack of interest is consistent with the theories expressed not too long ago by the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Bagot (Mr. Ricard) who seemed to be afraid of the fact that Algerian immigrants were to settle in the province of Quebec. It is because of such obsolete and out of date prejudices that we have continually lost ground as far as immigration is concerned.

I have here a booklet written by Jean-Marc Léger, who is particularly interested in the problems of immigration and he wrote this:

> But there is a general complaint and also a general surprise: "French Canadians always speak to us in English. Even when we address them in French, if they detect a foreign accent or a certain slowness of speech, they immediately switch to English.

Here I speak on behalf of the immigrants who come to Canada and are surprised to see that as soon as French speaking Canadians realize that their name has a foreign sound they have a tendency to speak to them in English.

French Canadians show a lot of thoughtlessness which should be remedied if we want our grievances to be justified and accepted.

And Mr. Léger continues:

> In other circumstances, our people will consider new Canadians as English speaking people when it comes to the distribution of pamphlets or booklets published in French and in English. In a hotel or on a streetcar, in a restaurant or in a store, the name or the accent of a new Canadian will immediately encourage the French Canadian employee to carry the conversation in English.
>
> The situation is so ridiculous that some of our fellow citizens speak in English to French immigrants with Basque or Alsatian names.

And Mr. Léger said further that this xenophobia has always existed among a great number of us and, as a result, the immigrant did not feel at home when he came to live in Quebec.

It is on account of speeches such as those delivered by a former minister of the crown that immigrants are reluctant to come and live in Canada and more especially in the province of Quebec. It is on account of that backward attitude that immigration has always been unfavourable to French Canada.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a few remarks. If we really want Quebec to develop within confederation, the dual language principle should definitely be

included in the Immigration Act in one way or another.

Second, I think we would be justified in asking that the demographic balance, which was momentarily upset following massive immigration into Canada since the turn of the century, be corrected in some way so that the French minorities, as I was saying a moment ago, be strengthened numerically in the English speaking provinces. Then we would be in a position to say to the Quebec separatists: you have people in the other provinces who are speaking your language and have your culture and with whom we must make common cause in order to become true Canadians worthy of the name.

[*Text*]

Mr. Laniel: Mr. Chairman, could I ask a question of the hon. member for Lotbinière?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Choquette: If my hon. colleague will be kind enough to let me complete my remarks, then he may ask questions.

Mr. Laniel: I would like to ask the hon. member—

Mr. Choquette: I will answer your question at the end of my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, may I submit a third suggestion? I wonder if it would be so unpleasant to consider the following possibility: the law requires that when an immigrant becomes a naturalized Canadian, he must have a sufficient knowledge of one of the two official languages in Canada. Would it be so unreasonable to demand that a part from a sufficient knowledge of one of the two official languages in this country, the immigrant should also have a basic knowledge of the second official language in Canada, because after all when he has been living for five years in a biethnical and bicultural country, it seems to me that he should have an idea of the second culture and the second official language of that country.

And as a fourth suggestion—I do not know whether this would meet completely the ideas of the minister—I have the impression that the demographic make-up in a country is so primordial and vital that I feel we should have a parliamentary committee on immigration. This is a personal opinion that I am voicing—

Mr. Churchill: Why not one on the flag, too?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Chairman, I am happy that this intervention of my hon. colleague from Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) takes place now because I think he will cry out even more when he hears my fifth suggestion.

I belong to the younger generation, and we consider ourselves essentially Canadian everywhere; we respect the feelings and the principles of the older and more experienced generation who believes in ties and symbols which to our minds, are the badge of colonialism.

I believe that we of the younger generation must respect the feelings of the older generation but our generation must not be accused of being revolutionary because it wants to eliminate all colonialism symbols. We want our country to be essentially Canadian. There is a provision in the Immigration Act whereby every Canadian citizen is a British subject. I recognize that that may please a great number of Canadians, but you cannot blame the young people of my generation if they believe that the fact that we are subjects of another country constitutes a tie of bondage of one country to the other. In my opinion, we should be essentially Canadian, Canadian citizens, and if we want to pay respect to the crown presiding over the commonwealth, why could not all commonwealth nations grant mutual citizenship instead of giving recognition by legislation to a tie of servitude?

[*Text*]

The Deputy Chairman: The hon. member for Beauharnois-Salaberry.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, I would ask the minister why he—

(*Translation*)

Mr. Laniel: I should like to direct a question to the hon. member for Lotbinière.

(*Text*)

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, did you not give me the floor?

Mr. Laniel: I have a question for the hon. member for Lotbinière.

Mr. Churchill: I see. All right.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laniel: Is the hon. member for Lotbinière not of the opinion that there would be another way to increase the French Canadian population in this country, that is by a natural way? The hon. members are wondering if he is not himself giving the lie to the statements made by the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan).

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Chairman, I think French Canadians have resorted to this means more than they should. There is an old saying about the revenge of the cradle. Today, it is powerless to compete with the constant flow of immigrants.

[*Text*]

Mr. Churchill: I wanted to ask the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, what is the reason for the activity of his colleagues today who were so strangely silent on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday of this week? They are now conducting an apparently organized filibuster of his estimates, and he does not seem to have the confidence of his party.

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Webster: Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a few remarks regarding education among our Indian youth. A most outstanding development of school administration in recent years has been the enrolment of native children into non-Indian schools. Last year this trend affected 36 per cent of more than 50,000 young people from the reserves. This required 157 joint school agreements with provincial and local authorities—an excellent example of federal-provincial co-operation in providing an important community service. However, I would remind the minister that the Glassco commission recommended "the more rapid development of school integration as worthy of top priority". I hope the appropriate authorities will act on this advice and encourage an increasing number of families to send their children to non-Indian schools.

Last year a delegation from British Columbia presented a brief to the government in which they urged "a stepped up program of vocational training for native boys and girls with spot centres in Indian districts". Facilities of this kind would provide training that would prepare young people for job opportunities that are now closed to them. This would do much to lessen the possibility of discrimination in the field of employment. Such a development would take place more generally with the building of more and more technical and vocational institutions across the country.

School drop-outs among Indian youth at the secondary school level across Canada can be described only as a tragedy. In 1960 according to government reports only 82 students were doing work beyond grade 12. Last year only 98 of our native population were in attendance at a Canadian university. Every effort should be made to encourage more bright young Indian students to take advantage of the scholarships and other forms of assistance that are available at the present time. I hope Professor Hawthorne and his associates will conduct a searching inquiry to discover the reasons for the excessively large number of drop-outs among native children in the secondary schools across Canada. This country needs the services of more educated young Indian boys and girls in industry, in business and in the public service.

The department is to be commended for its program in the field of adult education. Last year 2,061 men and women were enrolled in a variety of courses, many of the instructors being provided by the extension departments of the universities. This is excellent work in citizenship and occupational training and should be encouraged in every way. However the adult education program is handicapped by lack of native Indian teachers. More of these young people should be persuaded to enrol in teacher training institutions. At present there are 1,500 teachers in Indian schools but only 200 are natives themselves.

Finally may I urge greater attention to setting up more Indian friendship or social centres in thickly populated areas across Canada. Eleven cities have such meeting places now, as a result of the interest and initiative of local groups. Vancouver recently commenced a service of this kind through the action of enterprising citizens and local native people themselves. But they are having financial difficulties.

To an annual budget of $18,000, the department of indian affairs contributes only $5,000. I understand that this is the maximum amount paid to any of the centres in Canada. Surely they are deserving of more generous assistance through some public agency. I urge the minister to consider sympathetically future requests. The department should assume a greater share of the cost of supporting these important institutions.

Mr. Rapp: Mr. Chairman, I should like to take this opportunity to make a few remarks about the Department of Citizenship and Immigration. I represent a constituency in which a great number of citizens who have come from European countries live. Quite a number of them came from countries behind the iron curtain. I receive a great many letters from these people.

I must say that I have received a great deal of co-operation from the officials of this

department, and only a short time ago one of my constituents required a Canadian citizenship certificate and passport in order to make a trip to his land of birth in Europe. As a result of the very quick work of the officials of the department this individual was able to obtain the documents.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to bring one further matter to the attention of the minister. Many of these people came to Canada about the turn of the century. Their passports and other documents were not satisfactory as far as the immigration officials were concerned. I think perhaps the officials should pay a little more attention to these people applying for certificates. Quite often they do not have the necessary information to obtain a passport or certificate of registration. In many instances the officials of the provincial and federal governments have co-operated in supplying the information needed. I have heard many complaints made by these people in respect of applications for citizenship papers. In many of these cases the people concerned have lived in Canada for quite some time and have not lost contact with their relatives and friends living in the country from which they came. Sometimes they make remarks, or express themselves in terms that could be misunderstood. They speak of the fine qualities of the countries in which they were born, indicating that even though some of these countries are behind the iron curtain conditions were quite favourable. They are in no way desirous of returning to those countries. I think immigration officials should keep in mind the difficulties some of these individuals face, when processing applications for citizenship. These people have close ties with relatives in Europe and find it very difficult to dissociate themselves from their origin.

I am aware of a man and wife who came to Canada many years ago and raised their children here. These children were all born in Canada. For some reason or other the father cannot obtain citizenship although his wife has become a citizen. I think cases of this kind should be considered, and some effort made to help these people obtain citizenship.

One other difficulty that has come to my attention involves recent arrivals to this country who have put money in travel bureaus, following which the travel bureaus have become bankrupt and they have lost their savings. One of these is the Atlas travel bureau of Toronto. I reported this situation to the department of immigration and received the reply that the companies were private companies and the department had no jurisdiction. The department of immigration does look after the issuing of these registration certificates, and I think they should make some investigation of this type of thing.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to state that there are several Indian reservations in my constituency. Many of the Indians have asked to have the reservations enlarged. Some of these reservations are situated adjacent to crown owned land. These Indians find that they can no longer make a satisfactory living by trapping and fishing, and wish to commence farming. They need a little more land. I think the department should give some consideration to this request.

I should also like to direct the minister's attention to a matter in respect of passports. I travelled in Europe not so long ago as a member of the NATO delegation and I had no trouble whatever in those countries. The officials just looked at my passport and it was all right. But if you try to cross the border to the United States the first thing they ask you is not what country you are a citizen of but where you were born, and if you happen to say you were born in Russia their eyes pop out and you think that the next thing they will do is to put handcuffs on you. I think this could be very well avoided and that the first question should be as to your national status. Instead of inquiring about the place and date of your birth they should inquire about your citizenship and should not be concerned with where you were born and how you were born. I know the same thing has happened to many other people who have crossed from Canada to the United States. People are asked these questions and have to undergo the embarrassment of the officials looking a little more closely at your baggage and what-not. I think this should be corrected. That is all I have to say.

Mr. Rynard: Mr. Chairman, I should like to touch briefly on a matter which I feel is of great concern to the people of Canada and has to do with immigration. I refer to the case of Mr. Harold Banks. I do not intend to rehash previous arguments about this man nor do I intend to express my opinion of the illegal action of the Liberal government which gave this man the status of a landed immigrant in Canada. But I should like to suggest a way that may free us of this man entirely.

I believe many people are unaware that when the previous government was in office the former minister of citizenship and immigration, Hon. Ellen Fairclough, refused to grant Mr. Banks citizenship. She did everything in her power to rectify the action of the previous government which had granted him landed status.

I believe that under the Immigration Act a landed immigrant who leaves Canada with the intention of living permanently outside of Canada loses the domicile he has attained, whether he has been in Canada one or ten years. I am not a lawyer and therefore cannot give a legal opinion, but I would think that if Mr. Banks is a fugitive from justice, if he has fled from Canada to the United States to avoid serving the 30 day sentence imposed upon him for contempt of court, this might easily be construed as leaving Canada with the intention of remaining permanently outside this country.

I suggest that the present Minister of Citizenship and Immigration should look into this matter most carefully. If Mr. Banks has indeed left the country and lost his domicile by so doing, then every effort should be made to ensure that if and when he applies for reentry into Canada he be required to meet every test applied to all immigrants coming here for the first time. If these tests are properly applied, I am sure he can be refused entry as a person convicted of crimes involving moral turpitude under section 5(d) of the Immigration Act.

Then there is also the Hooper case, the man who was detained in Don jail for 100 days because he refused to answer questions that were asked by an immigration officer. It is true that under a certain section of the Immigration Act an officer has the power to detain and that it is an offence to refuse to answer questions. However the act was passed long before the passage of the bill of rights, which guarantees certain freedoms. Is it in the spirit of the bill of rights to hold a club of possible imprisonment over the head of a man who refuses to testify against himself? Should a person suspected of being in this country illegally be forced to provide evidence on which his deportation can be ordered? Should not the same principle apply as applies in any other prosecution? The civil police must build up their own case against an accused. There is no provision in the Criminal Code as far as I know whereby a person can be jailed for failing to make a confession.

Some people have suggested to me that so far as immigration is concerned they do not feel that the government is pursuing a sufficiently aggressive policy to bring immigrants into this country who are prepared to do manual work. I refer particularly to the field of agriculture, including gardeners, caretakers and manual workers. A great many fail on the tests of skills imposed by the department which are perhaps too severe under present conditions. Perhaps a plan along the lines suggested by some of the experts along those lines to bring in people from some countries who will do the manual jobs should be initiated by the minister of immigration.

I want to refer to the immigrants who have built up this country and to say first of all that actually the only citizens of this country are the North American or red Indians. All the rest of us are immigrants. The first immigrants, of course, were the French. They were followed by people from the United Kingdom. Then the United Empire Loyalists came to this country and they were composed of Germans as well as those of English stock. Then followed immigrants from the British Isles and then European immigrants in the main, until today in this country we have a million people of German descent, half a million Ukrainians, half a million Netherlanders, half a million Italians and many others totalling in all three million. The result is that today we have a country of minorities.

But I want to say that we cannot just thank federal governments for the policies of immigration and methods of bringing people into the country that have been initiated. I remember that in 1945 no move at all was being made to bring immigrants into the country and Hon. George Drew, who was premier of Ontario at that time, started an airlift. Within the space of a few months he brought in approximately 25,000 people. This demonstrated to the federal government that they would have to get off their seats and start moving.

Over the years since 1945 over 2¼ million immigrants have come to our shores and the province of Ontario from which I come has taken over half of them. Many of these immigrants who have come to Canada over the years have made substantial contributions to our economy. Names come to my mind such as Stephen Roman of Denison Consolidated, Romandale Farms and other enterprises. I think of the great contribution made by Mr. Koerner of British Columbia who established

sawmills throughout that province and finally created the Koerner foundation which has done so much to help the University of British Columbia and education generally in that province. Then there is the Bata firm from Czechoslovakia which founded a town in Ontario and established one of the great shoe factories in Canada. I think too of the Bick family who came from Holland. Mr. Bick came here as a market gardener in a modest way and gradually expanded his enterprises until he went into pickle manufacturing and is now one of the big pickle manufacturers on this continent.

Then, in so far as the farm sector is concerned, since 1945 immigrants have purchased lands worth over $100 million. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that some of these farms would be abandoned today if it were not for these immigrants. Agriculture needs workers because of the older age group—in this industry.

It is in the professional field that I am particularly concerned. There were over 100,000 professional people who entered Canada since the war. Of these, 20,000 were engineers. I sometimes wonder if we stop to think of the great contribution these immigrants make in dollars and cents, to say nothing of their brain power. The cost of educating these 20,000 engineers at about $6,000 each would be over $120 million, to say nothing of the cost of raising them until they were ready to enter university. These people come over here ready to go to work and their earning capacity represents well over a quarter of a million dollars each. This is a great economic thrust to our economy.

I should like to speak for a moment about my own profession. There were 6,000 doctors entering Canada since 1945, most of whom came from the British Isles. The cost of training these 6,000 doctors would be approximately $84 million in Canada. This is a gift. I am not including the cost of raising these doctors from infancy until the time they were ready to go to medical school. The earning power of this group would be approximately $3 billion, quite a proportion of which would go to the government in the form of income taxes. It is a fact that since the last war 37 per cent of all the doctors in this country, including our own medical school graduates, came from outside of this country. About 18,000 of the nurses who are today working in the hospitals across Canada were trained in hospitals outside of this country. Think of what it would have cost us to have raised these young people from birth and then trained them to take their place in the world.

Then, I come to the other professional fields. We find that over 16,000 teachers and professors have come to this country since 1945. We are very short, as I have said, of doctors and nurses at the moment. The Hall commission report stressed the need for doctors and nurses over the next 10 years and the need for five new medical schools, as I pointed out before. The shortage will become more acute because the sources of supply overseas are drying up. It takes something like seven years to train a doctor from the time he starts medical school until he is ready to go to work. No drive has been needed up to this moment in order to attract doctors to this country. As a matter of fact, the government of the day deserves no credit, in many ways, for the people who have come here. We have to change our tactics. Doctors are harder to get. I would suggest to the government that they consider offering some incentives to the medical profession. Certainly, positions should be located. There will be difficulty in getting the doctors. However, the government should hold consultations with the Canadian medical association to ascertain the best way of attracting these doctors when they reach our shores. I am thinking of the first six months or the first year they are here when they have to pass examinations. Perhaps some degree of latitude could be given in these particular fields. These doctors are well trained, most of them in United Kingdom universities. I draw to the attention of the minister the fact that this matter is urgent. We will be unable to turn out sufficient doctors from our own medical schools for the next 10 years.

When I say the need is urgent, Mr. Chairman, all I have to do is to point out to you that there are hospitals across Canada today that are operating without interns. I can go to the metropolitan city of Toronto and indicate hospitals which are running without interns. I can take you to hospitals where there are floors closed because we have not the nursing personnel to run them. This is not good enough. I say to the minister therefore that he should get in touch with the Canadian medical association to see what can be done to bring to this country physicians, nurses and trained personnel.

Mr. Olson: I do not intend to spend a great deal of time on these estimates today because the two questions I want to raise have been discussed during this session and the last session of parliament. First of all, I was in-

terested in the remarks made by the minister concerning the attitude of the Canadian government toward immigrants from Hong Kong. The minister made one or two statements which I believe appeared to indicate a changed attitude toward the immigration problem in Hong Kong.

My conclusion was that the minister pointed out we should look at immigration from Hong Kong in terms of ordinary immigration rather than in terms of a refugee problem. In order to substantiate this position he went on to say that if there were a relaxation of immigration regulations to permit additional people to come from Hong Kong to Canada or any other place in North America, this would initiate another flood of illegal immigrants from the mainland of China into Hong Kong. I think there is some sense to this reasoning. However, Mr. Chairman, we know also that there are still a great number of families in Canada who have relatives, brothers, sons, daughters and so on, in Hong Kong. In some cases the reasons given for the refusal to admit these relatives to Canada are not sufficient to provide the families here with additional information. In other words, there are cases that I have in Medicine Hat, and I am sure every other member in the house has too, in connection with which the immigration department does not provide sufficient information to the people here to satisfy them as to the reasons the immigration department refuses to allow them to enter Canada.

There may be an improvement in the policy, but nevertheless there seems to be an overriding suspicion, because of certain things that have happened during the last two or three years, that some of the people applied for are not members of the family. The department can never get conclusive evidence of birth and all the other vital statistics required for persons who come from mainland China. I do not say the minister should brush aside all these regulations but he should take this factor into account, and give sympathetic consideration to such applications.

The minister claims the government is working very diligently to find ways and means of overcoming these difficulties and reuniting these Chinese families in Canada. We sincerely wish him success.

I now wish to refer to a particular case in my constituency, but I shall not name the individual concerned. I shall send the name to the minister. This man has resided in Canada for 35 years, and although on four occasions a judge has passed his application for citizenship it was turned down by ministerial authority. This man has now made his fifth application and he sincerely and honestly does not know what caused the rejection of his previous ones.

I realize regulations are required for security purposes, but I believe this man should be given at least a suggestion of the reason why he is being rejected so that he could answer it. From talking to his neighbours I am satisfied there must be something in his file that has no foundation. This matter has been going on for 12 years, and neighbours who know him have nothing but praise for the man's conduct.

This man reapplied two or three months ago, and if the present minister rejects his application I hope he will at least provide some inkling of the reason. I would be pleased to discuss this man's application with the minister or his officials. It is not satisfactory to say he has been living here for 35 years and in that time no one has interfered or bothered with him, and therefore his certificate of citizenship is not important. Without it he is prohibited from crossing the border into the United States or travelling to any other country for fear that without citizenship papers he will not get back into Canada, which he has come to regard as his homeland. I hope the minister will give sympathetic consideration to this application or else provide some inkling of why this man has been rejected.

Mr. Wahn: I hope the estimates of the department will pass quickly, Mr. Chairman, but I do feel I should say a few words with regard to immigration because of the importance of the subject to my riding and Canada as a whole. In St. Paul's riding about one third of the residents are people who have made their homes there after coming from other countries. The great majority of them have become good Canadian citizens, and have made a great contribution to the life of Toronto and to the riding itself. Therefore I have a particular interest in immigration because of the nature of my riding, and also I have a particular interest in it because I have served as a member of the United Church committee on immigration, which is concerned with questions relating to this department.

I was delighted to hear the minister say he proposed to adopt a positive program to welcome immigrants to Canada. This is about the most important decision that any minister of immigration could make. I welcome that statement. I believe immigrants should not

be treated as people who are looking for favours when they ask for admission to Canada. They should not be treated as suppliants. They should be welcomed to this country and treated with respect, and that attitude should prevail no matter what the colour of their skin, no matter what their country of origin, no matter what their level of education. I am delighted to know that is the approach which the minister proposes to adopt.

There was one point, however, in the minister's remarks which caused me some concern and which I would ask him to review very carefully with his departmental officials. I refer to the statement on page 13 of the speech notes in which the minister indicated that the Chinese amnesty program might be changed in some way—

An hon. Member: He said "suspended", "terminated".

Mr. Wahn: —and that there might be a different attitude with regard to the adjustment of status program. The minister intimated that some Chinese had complained that the adjustment program was discriminatory even though it was intended to benefit the Chinese. I would respectfully ask the minister to review this whole question with his officials and others interested in the subject.

I should like to draw his attention to question No. 1,383 which I placed on the order paper some time ago. It reads as follows:

> How many persons of Chinese origin have filed adjustment statements, (that is, statements to adjust their irregular or illegal status) at the Toronto immigration office during the 1960 calendar year and each subsequent calendar year to date?

The answer to that question was:

> The numbers of persons of Chinese origin who filed adjustment statements at the Toronto immigration office in the calendar years of 1960 and 1961 was 62. Separate figures for 1960 and 1961 are not available. The figures for the number of such persons who filed these statements at the Toronto immigration office since 1961 are: 1962, 233; 1963, 434; 1964, 312 (first 5 months).

So there was a steady increase in the number of adjustment statements filed at the Toronto office. As a result of my personal experience in a riding where a great many citizens of Chinese origin live, may I say that the general feeling is that the adjustment and amnesty programs are vital from a social point of view, and vital for the re-establishment of Chinese families on a regular basis. Not only should they be continued, but the existing procedures should be improved. I would draw to the minister's attention the brief presented to his predecessor by the Chinese communities of Hamilton, Montreal, Ottawa and Toronto. Far from suggesting that the amnesty and adjustment programs are discriminatory, members of the Chinese delegation emphasized that they should be continued and improved. I respectfully suggest therefore that this whole question requires careful re-examination. The figures indicate that the programs have been extremely successful, and this contention will be borne out I believe by the experience of social workers who are acquainted with the needs in cities such as Toronto, where the problem has been a serious one.

In welcoming this statement that Canada's immigration program is to be a positive one, I should like to take a few minutes to explain why I think this is so important to an urban riding such as my own. The royal commission on Canada's economic prospects reported the following:

> Immigrants have made a decided contribution to the scale of economic development in Canada... It is in Canada's interest to continue to encourage people from other countries to emigrate here in order both to assist and participate in the development of our country, and also to contribute further variety to our social organizations and institutions. Between 1946 and 1962, immigrants brought to Canada over $1 billion in capital, and almost half a billion dollars worth of settlers effects...Between 1950 and 1962 immigrants bought 7,147 farms and rented more than 1,300 others...From 1950 to 1962, 9,850 new Canadians established businesses of their own for which they paid over $116 million.
>
> In 1961 the research staff of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration made a survey of 7,000 immigrants who had obtained their Canadian citizenship papers. Of this group about 350 had established their own businesses and created jobs for over 3,400 other Canadians.

There are many striking facts of this sort which should be cited in support of the decision to make Canada's immigration policy a positive one. It has sometimes been said, erroneously, that immigrants increase the problem of unemployment. This has been carefully investigated, and of course it is not true. An examination of the unemployment and immigration statistics since 1940 shows clearly that there is no correlation between immigration and unemployment. It is entirely to our benefit to encourage immigration and to welcome immigrants here when they arrive. For this reason it is important that the minister should proceed to increase the staff of the department along the lines he has suggested. I welcome his statement that every effort will be made to improve the status of the department, because this is a vital department in our lives. I think the

staff of the overseas offices, in particular, should be increased in order to eliminate the long line-ups which often occur at immigration offices abroad. If these line-ups could be eliminated the root cause of illegal and irregular entries into Canada would be eliminated. The department should concentrate on doing this because it is the true solution to the problem of illegal and irregular entries.

As I said earlier, in my riding I have a large number of residents of Chinese origin and for this reason I am very familiar with certain of their problems. I should like the minister to review very carefully suggestions which have been made from time to time with regard to the special problems of people of Chinese origin particularly in relation to the adjustment and amnesty program. Several practical difficulties have arisen which have limited the value of these programs although, as I have stated, they have been extremely valuable.

In the first place, when a man goes to the immigration office to adjust his status and get back his real name he is required to turn in his citizenship papers or landing papers and is left completely without papers of any sort until such time as the adjustment procedure has been completed. This often takes months —five months, or six months or even longer. During all this time the man is without papers. I suggest that the minister should consider making photostatic copies of these documents and returning the originals so that the man may be able to move about pending the completion of the adjustment process.

Another point is this. It has been emphasized that if the people concerned will come forward, tell the truth and adjust their status they will not be prejudiced in any way and will not lose their citizenship. This has been the case, generally, but there have been exceptions. For example, the case has been brought to my attention of a Chinese who had been over here for a long time holding false papers which described him as a natural born citizen. He went to the immigration office in good faith to adjust his status. His certificate was taken from him and he was told that in due course his status would be adjusted but that he must put in the usual period of five years before he could get his citizenship. Mr. Chairman, a man may have been here for 15, 20 or even 25 years and yet he must still wait five years before citizenship papers are issued. This is a situation which should be cleared up, and it could be cleared up rapidly.

Another point I should like to bring to the minister's attention is this: When a man goes to adjust his status—and I am assuming that this adjustment procedure and amnesty program will continue—he often wishes to apply for the admission of relatives at the same time. The practice has been not to accept such an application until the adjustment process has been completed. The adjustment takes a long time; the application for the relative takes a long time, so it will be several years before he actually gets his relative here. This tends to discourage the use of the adjustment program, and here again a simple change could considerably improve the results.

There has also been a suggestion that sometimes the immigration offices in Canada, after taking an adjustment statement have possibly furnished information to the Hong Kong authorities which has been used by the Hong Kong authorities as the grounds for bringing a prosecution in Hong Kong against relatives there. I would respectfully ask the minister to review all such cases and assure the house in due course that this practice is not being followed. I ask for this assurance because I think all members of the house would agree that such a practice is not one which any Canadian government would want to see adopted.

I think most members have had the experience of cases where immigration applications have been rejected and no reasons have been given for the rejection. I think reference has been made to this question this afternoon. It seems quite clear that in most cases it should be possible to tell an applicant why the application has been rejected. This would save a great deal of departmental time; it would prevent frustration on the part of applicants, and I think it would be in accordance with elementary justice. If an applicant knows why his application has been rejected, he is in a position either to remove any misunderstanding which may exist or, alternatively, he just accepts the rejection. But if he is not told the reason, it leaves him in a complete state of frustration; it also leaves people who are trying to help him in a complete state of frustration.

Mr. Chairman, one further point which I should like to make at this stage is that it would appear to many of us that there should be some sort of an appeal board set up which would hear appeals from the exercise of discretion by departmental officials, particularly in cases where applications have been made for sponsored relatives. All of us have had experience of constituents who have been very dissatisfied with the treat-

ment they have received and who have felt they had no legal recourse. I would respectfully suggest to the minister that this whole situation should be reviewed again, and at the earliest possible date an appeal board should be established which would be independent of the departmental officials and would hear appeals, particularly in sponsorship cases.

I have one final remark, Mr. Chairman, and it is with regard to the suggestion made by the minister that in the case of immigrants from Hong Kong male fiancés would be admitted on the same basis as female. This is a small step in the right direction. I think in this country we have accepted the principle of equality without discrimination on the basis of colour or country of origin. The simple fact is—and I think no one can deny it—that at the present time in Canada we do have discrimination based upon country of origin; in other words, based upon racial origin. I would respectfully urge the minister to review the sections of the regulations which are discriminatory at the present time. These are the sections which make a distinction between relatives who can be sponsored from European countries and those from the countries of Asia and Africa. My suggestion would be, with all respect, that the landing requirements should be the same for all people, irrespective of racial origin, so that in actual fact we can take the position in Canada that our immigration practices are not discriminatory and are based upon the principle of equality.

Mr. More: Mr. Chairman, I just wish to make a few remarks at this time which will hasten the passage of the estimates item by item, because I am not holding up any item. First of all, this is my first opportunity to congratulate the minister on his appointment. Coupled with that I would like to congratulate his parliamentary secretary, because he is a man for whom during the time I have been in the house I have had great personal respect. I have had fine cooperation from the minister personally, and his parliamentary secretary, in the cases I have brought to their attention, although I have not always had satisfactory conclusions. However, I think I can go this far and say that the minister personally exhibits those traits of character and non-prejudice which I think are very important in holding the office that he does.

I think that is about as far as I can go in congratulating him on his effort today. After reading his speech—which I was very happy to receive, incidentally, and give attention to —which is to be reproduced outside the house, and considering the promises of the Liberal party to the electorate, I agree with the hon. member for Greenwood who said we had only a mouse in the literature in front of us. Why it was felt that this speech contained so much and was important enough to warrant prior release to the press gallery, for the life of me I cannot understand, in view of the election promises that were made and the Liberal planks in this regard which brought them support—for I believe these planks and promises did bring them support.

There is no evidence here of any priority and I do not know why this government places priorities on certain things which seem to have very little importance when one considers the major problems of Canada, and at the same time probably frustrate the minister in his desires to carry out his own personal wishes in amending this legislation. I think the Canadian people deserve an explanation of these things.

I agree generally with the remarks that have been made throughout this debate. I fully agree with the remarks of the hon. member who has just resumed his seat. I am concerned with one announcement in this presentation of the minister to the committee, namely that the amnesty and adjustment program will be terminated on September 1. First of all I would like to suggest to the minister that it is unfair to a large segment of the people, because the immigration offices have not been able to handle the work that has come to them through this program. It is the experience at my local office that the people who seek to make statements have sometimes had to wait two or three weeks before anything is done. Perhaps this has been because an interpreter was needed, but sometimes it has been because the business of the office was so heavy that the officials could not attend to the particular case. That is one reason why I think the announcement that this program will terminate two weeks from now is a terrible one, and I urge the minister to reconsider this matter. I am going to make some suggestions to him in this regard before I conclude my remarks.

The other matter I want to emphasize today—and I know from speaking personally to the minister that he is aware of this situation—is that although they say the program is four years old and this has been ample time for everyone to take advantage of it, this is not in truth the fact. First of all, it

was a year to a year and a half, or maybe two years, before there was any co-operation from the Chinese community in regard to this program. There is a very basic and a very good reason for this. These people are a law unto themselves. Although they render services to the communities in which they live and to all people who can bring them business, in their own personal relationships they are very, very close and there is a very definite authority in the head of a Chinese family.

In many cases the head of the Chinese family is 70 or 75 years old. He is a small fellow who has probably been afraid all his life. He knows what the circumstances are in respect of his status and is afraid of the result of any disclosure on his part. Very often this man has worked all his life, made a success of a small business and has supported a family. What does happen as a result of the police disclosure and action? I am sure we all know the answer to that question.

Very often the head of the family has been frightened by stories told him by the individuals who make money out of these situations. The Chinese fellow is afraid he will lose his position and be sent out of the country. He has often told his own family what to say about their regularization status. False information is given by all the members of his family.

Young Chinese people refer to their fathers as "daddy". Some of these young children have told me that their parents told them to give the false information they have been giving. Many times these people will not give explanations at all. I have one particular situation in mind. A Chinese family has been running a grocery and has found a good living in this occupation from the point of view of their requirements. There is one son in this family who in fact is an illegal entrant. This husband and wife did not have any children of their own. The father before bringing his wife to Canada made three trips to China. When his wife came to Canada they followed an old Chinese custom and brought this boy as their son. He was not in fact a blood son.

I spent a good deal of time with these people over a period of three years. I have known the family for some 20 years. On each occasion I visited them they would say: "You help our son; you help our son". I said: "Pop, I want to help you". On each occasion they would tell me a slightly different story. After the three year period I had decided in my own mind what the discrepancies and untruths were. I finally paid a visit to this family and told the son there was nothing I would rather do than help him obtain a regularized status. I said to him, "You are not telling me the truth. I have come to four or five conclusions about what you have told me. Many things you have said are not true." I then told him what I felt was the truth. The young lad then said, "You are almost right, Mr. More, but what I have told you is what my daddy told me to say". I said to the young lad, "Go downstairs and tell your daddy I want to see him". The little old man came up and started his story in the usual manner. I said: "Look, pop, this has been going on for three years. I have run out of reasons for visiting you. Either you must trust me or say that you do not, in which case we will go no further". I said that I could not accept the story he had told me and knew that it was not the truth. I outlined to the old man what I felt was the true story. He said, "You are pretty near right, Mr. More. I will tell you this." When he had finished his story I felt that I finally had some idea of the truth. I gave him advice about further action. That was a Saturday and on the following Monday he went to the immigration office. Within two months he was regularized. Today he has made an application for his family to come to Canada. I hope his family will be able to come within a short period of time.

Mr. Chairman, the facts I have just related apply to a family of which I have some knowledge. I wonder whether anyone with any influence in other communities has been friendly with people in similar circumstances, helping them to understand and accept the assurances that have been given. These people should be given the understanding that their status can be regularized if they will tell the truth. I have only referred to one case with which I am familiar, and wonder how many more there are in existence. Each year these people are learning to trust their friends and believe in the assurances because of satisfactory treatment other individuals have received. They are beginning to believe that they will not receive discriminatory treatment. There are many hundreds of people who I believe will come forward soon and tell the true facts. I believe they will do so as a result of this program.

The program in question has really only been operating effectively for two years rather than four. Someone has worked very hard over a period of two years in an attempt to break down the fear these unfortunate people have. I refer again to what the hon.

member for St. Paul's said and assure the members of this committee that I cannot sit here silently in approval of these estimates. I cannot do so because of what the minister said in respect of cutting off this program in two weeks. What will happen to the people who cannot be serviced in your offices within that short period of time? They are being denied an opportunity to come forward and establish a regularized status. This opportunity is being arbitrarily removed without warning. The minister today announced that this program would be concluded in two weeks. People who have not taken advantage of the situation will be discriminated against after the conclusion of the program. I cannot understand how the minister has arrived at this decision. I agree there must be a cut-off date. I think the program and educational work have now reached a stage when the people will open their hearts and trust those who wish to help them. I suggest to the minister that he end the program on September 1, 1965. I do not think two weeks warning is enough, or fair. Many of these people will within a short period of time accept this program and take advantage of it, but I am sure all of the people who should take advantage of it will not do so within the next two weeks.

We must remember that these people are very different from the people who come from Europe and other countries. Their family ties and authorities are completely different. They have not been accepted in this country with open arms. Generally they have been able to support themselves and are accepted as individuals who work long and hard hours. People are very pleased to find these little Chinese stores open late at night. These people have been accepted to that extent.

I should like to ask the minister to consider extending this program. I assure him we want to get on with the business of the house and deal with his estimates. This program is tremendously helpful to these people. I hope the minister has listened carefully to all the suggestions that have been made, and the arguments I have put forward in support of an extension of the program. I hope he listened with attention to what the hon. member for St. Paul's said. He may be assured the program is not four years old but in fact only two years old. I think an improvement is coming in respect of these people, as evidenced by the fact they have more confidence in people of their community who assure them of fair treatment. I do not think the gates should be closed at the end of this month. The program should continue for at least 12 months. That much warning would be much better than the two weeks warning now being considered and I think the least I can ask the minister to do at this time is extend the program. The least I ask of the minister at this time is that he give notice here and now that the doors are open and that the program is available. Give it publicly and make it widely known. I will certainly make it known to the people of my community that the program will be finished by the first of September or the end of September, 1965. Having undertaken a humane program which was brought about as a result of discrimination throughout the history of the Chinese in Canada, please do not eliminate completely the benefit of that program by only two weeks warning that the program is finished.

There is discrimination in the act and nothing can cover it up. I concur fully in the remarks of the hon. member for Greenwood in this regard. It is something of which no Canadian can be proud. As I say, we know that the older Chinese have not assimilated but have carried on their old Chinese ways. On the other hand, their sons and daughters are the equal of any in school and the equal of any of us as citizens of Canada. I ask the minister to consider these points well. I thank him for his co-operation and personal consideration whenever it has been necessary to approach him.

Mr. Fairweather: Mr. Chairman, I hope that the one or two comments I wish to make today will not be taken out of their context and find their way into a framed picture on the minister's wall. With that caveat I will proceed to make a few comments. First of all I agree with the two members who have taken the strongest possible exception to what I say, with all fairness, is an arbitrary cut-off date for the amnesty program. My hopes and expectations were realized in their remarks.

It is an interesting coincidence to me that within the last day or two I have been discussing this problem with the department and yesterday I arranged by long distance telephone to have a Chinese make disclosure when I am available to go with him some day next week. I agree with the hon. member for Regina City that the program is only started. We have had a few hundred come forward so far, and for the life of me I cannot see what the point is in this short-sighted cut-off date. I hope that before the

afternoon is out the minister will show his usual fair sense of proportion and announce as some of us have asked that the period of amnesty will not be arbitrarily cut off in two weeks time. This would spoil a program that is only getting under way.

I suppose we all relate to personal examples, and in the case of the person I have in mind it has taken him a couple of years to get to the stage that he feels able to brave the questioning of the department. These people have been unfortunate and the rest of us can take no pride in the situation. They have lived in a somewhat isolated way but now they are coming out of their shells, so to speak, and are willing to make statements. I hope they will be given every opportunity. Everything else in Canada seems to be postponed until 1967 and maybe the minister would find it convenient to postpone this date to the centennial year.

There are two specific questions I want to ask. One or two speakers have referred to the question of male fiancés and seemed to think that they were restricted to Hong Kong. I did not take this from the minister's statement and I see he nods his head. I am sure this is to be taken in the widest sense of the word. It is somewhere in the minister's statement but I cannot find it at the moment. I hope I can be reassured on this matter and I trust that those within iron curtain countries will be included. I have a particular example in mind. In many instances the British authorities have facilities in these countries and if we in Canada are not yet ready to establish immigration offices and consular officials there, surely we can usefully avail ourselves to the facilities of our British friends because so many Canadians have been cut off from their family sources since the late 1940's.

I was disappointed that the minister did not make a statement on a matter that has been very close to me as chairman of the immigration committee of the Anglican church. For 14 months I have waited at the minister's door at various times and the doors of other officials with regard to a program that seemed to me to have wide acceptance within the department. I refer to the program under which church people would sponsor 50 boys from Hong Kong to come into this country for training and then to find their places as citizens.

I have been patient about this matter for 14 months. On many occasions during the question period and at other times when I have wished to press the minister about it he has assured me that he would make a statement on this aspect of immigration. I think it is a rather humanitarian project although I admit that the numbers involved are just a drop in the bucket. However, he assured me that if I would wait until his estimates were presented I would have my answer. I followed his remarks about Hong Kong today with close attention and I should like to have the assurance that the department will accept the proposal of the Anglican Church of Canada and allow these boys to come to Canada under sponsorship to attend technical or other schools within the country. The minister having put me off, if I may use that term, for 14 months, I would be gravely disappointed if, after I and others who are interested in this project have waited so patiently, we were told that this program, which as I say has met with wide acceptance on the part of those officials of the department with whom I have spoken, was not going to be part of the over-all program. I would hope that within the next few minutes the minister would give me a favourable answer in this regard.

I want to say how much I appreciated the remarks of the hon. member for St. Paul's and the hon. member for Greenwood. I think that immigration is not a partisan matter, in the sense that problems concerning immigration and the provisions of the Immigration Act are brought forward by members in all parts of the house. But I must say I agree with the hon. member for Greenwood in his reference to the really splendid statement about amending the act. If I ever heard something written in an office to be uttered through the mouth of the minister, it was this statement. I want to repeat it because I suppose the same thing has been said by every minister whenever he has not wanted to make a move, and I have to admit that people have tried to put such things into my mouth at times. These are his words:

> There are many inter-relationships between various sections of the act and isolated amendments, while perhaps appropriate in respect of one or more particular problems, could have unfortunate effects in other areas.

This has been said a thousand times before in the house and it is not good enough. For the life of me I cannot understand this worship at the altar of the sanctity of a statute. If we did our job properly in this place we would have two or three amendments to the act a year, provided they were sensible ones and commended themselves to the majority of members. But, no, the act is some sacred

thing on an altar; we all come to bow down and genuflect before the act. I believe that answer is not good enough. If there are amendments suggested by the courts or by members, then for heaven's sake they should be made. Then, in the years to come we could have a consolidation of the act. Then, we could have it revised and revised again to look after all the small problems. This sanctity of the statute is nothing more than nonsense in my opinion.

Having said that, I hope there will be a committee of the house on immigration soon. There is a wide interest amongst the members in such a committee. We would like to hear about the plans the minister has. We commend him for them. The hon. member for Regina City complimented the minister and his parliamentary secretary. I should like to add my compliments. I should like also to compliment the new deputy minister. I see that *Maclean's* magazine classifies him as a submandarin, whatever that is. He has been a wonderful addition to the department and I thank him for the courtesy he has shown to me. I hope he did not have anything to do with the writing of this nonsensical sentence about the sanctity of the statute, because it is nothing more than nonsense.

Mr. Klein: Mr. Chairman, the members of my constituency were very pleased with the speech made by the minister in this house on August 4. What they found to be very encouraging was the statement made which appears on page 6394 of *Hansard*, to this effect:

> As far as immigration is concerned, I have already stated in the house that we have now reached a point where a positive and aggressive policy in immigration matters should be established in our country.

Then on the next page I find this statement:

> Later, when the business of the house will permit, I hope to make a revision of the Immigration Act, so that it may be more in keeping with the requirements of the twentieth century and the situation in which find themselves modern states which need more and more to welcome new citizens who are willing to go there.

Perhaps with respect to the question of the twentieth century we might be at the stage in our history at which the United States was in the nineteenth century. Perhaps we ought to borrow some of the aspects of the immigration policy of the United States in the nineteenth century when we are speaking about immigration into Canada in the twentieth century. This speech received unanimous editorial support in the country. I should like to refer to an editorial which appeared in the Ottawa *Citizen* yesterday which stated, amongst other things, the following:

> That must be quite an immigration policy that immigration minister Tremblay and his colleagues are hammering out. Mr. Tremblay has been promising a new approach to the whole question of immigration, particularly with respect to regulations governing the entry of newcomers from Asian and Middle East countries, ever since he assumed his present portfolio in January.

Then, it says further:

> Just over 93,000 immigrants came to Canada in 1963—a pitiable low figure for a country of Canada's size and natural resources.

Now, I should like to point out to the minister that if you take the train from Montreal and you travel east to the maritime provinces you can travel hundreds of miles without seeing a house. If you take a train from the city of Toronto and you travel west to Winnipeg you also travel hundreds of miles without seeing a house. We must ask ourselves if we are being moral in this country when we have over 3.5 million square miles of territory with only 19 million people in it. I am serious when I say that we must question ourselves also when we condemn the policy of apartheid in South Africa as to whether or not perhaps we are practising a passive form of apartheid in Canada by refusing to admit people to this country. What is the use of condemning South Africa if we will do nothing about the British West Indies?

In the Montreal *Gazette* of this morning the editorial states:

> Immigration has fallen so low that probably almost as many Canadians are leaving the country as are coming in. The curtailment of immigration from its high point of 282,164 in 1957 was at first deliberate Canadian policy, the outcome of the slowdown in the economy. But there has been no slowdown the past few years. And yet the flow of immigration has not recovered.
>
> The hard truth is that people no longer want to come to Canada in the numbers they once did.

In this respect, I should like to say the following: At the end of world war II Canada was the fourth largest manufacturing country in the world. We were sending our products to the different markets in Europe. Now the markets to which we have been sending our products are manufacturing the products we used to send. I say that if we can no longer export the products, let us import the customers. When we speak of landed immigrants in this country, we should change the phraseology. When we speak of the 90,000 immigrants who came to this country as landed immigrants, we should speak of them as landed consumers.

The editorial in the *Gazette* goes on to say:

> It has become clear now that the methods of the Canadian immigration department will have to be revolutionized. This does not mean that the standards set for immigrants will have to be lowered. But it does mean that Canada can no longer wait for prospective immigrants to put in their applications. Canada will have to go out after suitable immigrants.

In this respect there are, as the minister will confirm, thousands of applications waiting to be processed in Greece; thousands of applications waiting to be processed in Italy. We need more staff in these different countries in order to process these applications. May I say that in my constituency there are thousands upon thousands of Greek people who are ready to suffer all kinds of personal deprivation in order to bring their fathers, mothers, sisters and brothers from Greece or from Italy and the different countries in Europe.

Now, Mr. Chairman, recently there have been speeches made in the house with regard to the C.B.C. I am only mentioning this because the cost of the C.B.C. has been criticized. It is criticized because we are televising and broadcasting to too few people in this country. If we had double or treble the population we have we would still only require the kind of broadcasting and televising facilities that we have now.

We have two transcontinental railways in this country, one of which is costing the country millions of dollars every year simply because there are not enough people to make use of these railroads. We are also faced with the situation where we want to implement the recommendations of the Hall royal commission. A headline in yesterday's *Gazette* said this: "Plan for health package could raise taxes 50 per cent." If we had more people in this country such plans could operate economically.

The trouble is that we have not enough people in this country and with too few people we will never be a great nation. If we want to make this a great nation what we need is people to make it great. If there are people in this country who are concerned —and I am not—about the great colossus to the south, I ask how can we ever be in a position to do anything about that situation unless we are ready to admit people to this country? You cannot live beside a nation of 200 million people, with only 19 million here, and be expected to be able to compete with it in any way, shape or form.

We have every natural resource in this country except one, people. That is the one natural resource we lack. So, Mr. Chairman, I hope that the policies yet to be enunciated by the minister will take into account some of the things that have been said here today. Canada should stop thinking in terms of what Canada can do for immigrants but should think in terms of what the immigrants can do for Canada.

Mr. Orlikow: I suppose I should join with other hon. members who have congratulated the minister on the excellence of his speech, but if I do not, Mr. Chairman, it is not because I have anything specifically against the minister or his speech. It is simply because I have heard other ministers make the same kind of speech. The former minister made a wonderful speech last year. Ministers in earlier governments, both Liberal and Conservative, all made the same kind of speeches. I suppose they came out of the same file, because if one does not do anything to implement the speech that was made the previous year, there is not much point in writing a new speech.

Not for a moment do I believe that the method which the minister announced today, to increase the number of immigrants coming to Canada, will be any more successful than were the methods announced by the former minister. Let us face cold hard facts. The people who have come to Canada ever since those of us who are not Indians started coming here and the type of people we have wanted to encourage, were those who came from northern and western Europe. In recent years those people have virtually stopped coming.

The minister is making a big mistake if he believes that by opening more immigration offices he will attract more people from Great Britain, Norway, Sweden, Holland, Belgium or Germany. The peoples of those countries are pretty intelligent and well informed. That is why we want them here, but that is also why they will not come here. Why should they come from those countries when they have full employment at home, and have had it for the last half dozen or more years, and when they know we have had large scale unemployment for the last 10 years? Even though the unemployment figures are down somewhat, there is no prospect that this coming winter we will not again have somewhere in the neighbourhood of 500,000 unemployed.

Similarly, persons who have families in those countries will look at the kind of medicare plans presently operating in those countries, financed to a large extent if not en-

tirely by their governments. If they do this they will not come to Canada because the pension plans they enjoy at present fall far short of the pension schemes we have in Canada, indeed far short of the projected Canada pension plan which is to begin in a year or so but which will take at least 10 years to become fully operative. If we are going to have large scale immigration from Europe it will have to be from the countries of southern Europe.

I do not intend to speak for long about the kind of treatment meted out to people who have come to this country somewhat illegally. On another occasion the hon. member for Royal said this was the kind of person we wanted, the kind of person who has the gumption to jump ship and break the laws. These people have been put in jail for 30, 60 or a hundred days before their trials, at which they have been sentenced to two, three or five months in prison and then deported. Certainly they will not spread any encouragement to people in their home countries to come to Canada.

It is time for the department to take a hard look at the situation behind the iron curtain. Many people who entered Canada since world war II originally came from countries which are now behind the iron curtain. They were displaced during the war. They were in concentration camps or slave labour camps. They were working in factories in France, where they had been transported by the occupying armies of nazi Germany, and after the war they found their way to Canada. I join with members who have already spoken in saying this was a good thing for Canada and that we are happy to have them here.

Many of these people were separated from their families, some from wives, some from children, some from cousins, nephews or nieces. Like many other hon. members I too represent a constituency populated by a large number of people who came to Canada from Europe following world war II, and who have relatives living in countries behind the iron curtain. I know of cases, as I am sure do other hon. members, of people who are already citizens here and who have cousins, nephews, sons-in-law and other relatives in countries such as Hungary, Rumania, Yugoslavia and Poland. It seems to me we all should practise some of the compassion we are so glad to prate about. I understand the need for security regulations and I am not too critical of them, but it seems to me if we are to encourage the relatives of those people who are already here to come to Canada we must be more elastic in our interpretation of them than we have been in the past. I hope the minister will take a sympathetic look at this matter. I know he can say with justification that he has been co-operative, as was his predecessor, with regard to individual cases. I have been successful in some of these cases. I know the hon. member for Toronto Greenwood has been successful. My hon. friend from Winnipeg North Centre says he has been successful. I, personally, do not take any credit when I am successful in one of these cases because I think that if a person has to go to his member of parliament in a case of this sort, then, rather than being proud that I have succeeded I feel I ought to be ashamed that the regulations are such as to make it necessary for anyone to take that course. I think the regulations should be such that a person could get permission to enter Canada simply by going to the local office of the department of immigration and making an application. I am not saying we should open the doors wide. I am not saying that if some member of a central committee of the communist party or some minister in the communist government of one of the countries behind the iron curtain wanted to come to Canada we should say: Come on in, we are making it easy. All I am asking is that the tens of thousands of people who are living here and who have relatives who wish to come to Canada should be given a great deal of encouragement.

I should like to say something, now, about what I consider to be the total inadequacy of the change in the regulations which the minister intends to make with respect to this act. I will not repeat the exact words he used. A previous speaker has already done that. When they are read aloud it becomes apparent how ludicrous the concession is. Nor am I satisfied with the minister's promise that he is looking into this question and that we shall soon be getting a complete revision of the act. This is what the former minister of citizenship and immigration said last year. Ministers have been saying it for a long time.

I have before me a memorandum presented to the government of Canada by the Canadian Labour Congress dated March 14, 1962. So it was presented to the former government. This memorandum says, with regard to some changes which were proposed by the minister of citizenship and immigration at that time:

> While gratified with what appear to be changes for the better, we are bound to express dis-

appointment that the Immigration Act itself has remained unchanged. There has been widespread agreement, including expressions from your government, that the act should be overhauled, and the congress among others had anticipated an amended act rather than only a change in the regulations. We urge immediate consideration of amendments to an act which has proved obviously unsatisfactory in many respects.

I wonder for how many more sessions and how many more years members on all sides of the house will have to get up and make statements of that kind. I do not believe that this minister or any other minister ever came into the house and told a deliberate lie. What is the sacred cow which prohibits every minister, despite the fact that he sets out with the best of intentions, from bringing about this revision? Every minister has made the same kind of statement: We are getting to it; it won't be long. I do not wish to heap coals of fire, but I hope it will not be as long as it has taken the Liberal party to bring in a pension plan, that is, 35 or 40 years. Surely it is time, now, that the Immigration Act was completely revised along lines which have been indicated so often and so eloquently by spokesmen from all parties in years gone by.

I should like to say something about the discriminatory features which still exist in the act and the regulations. I am constantly amazed at the way in which ministers can make speeches expressing sentiments of equality and justice which are so obviously false. I do not know whether the minister just blinds himself—

Miss LaMarsh: Shame.

Mr. Orlikow: The minister of health says "shame". Let me give a couple of examples. There is not a minister with whom I have had a better or more successful relationship than the present Minister of Justice. On September 23, 1963, that hon. gentleman made a speech to the Chinese community in Vancouver during which he said:

I have been distressed by the accusations of discrimination which have reached me. If prejudice exists in immigration matters it must be eliminated. True Canadianism permits no discrimination. All citizens are equal in rights and responsibilities, regardless of ethnic origin or creed. It is with this view in mind that I am most sincere in my efforts to weed out discrimination and prejudice.

That is a wonderful statement. But today his colleague announces that in two weeks time the amnesty program for the benefit of Chinese who are here illegally will be discontinued. I would point out that this is a program which has only just started to produce results. I would remind the minister of health that the only group which will be affected, the group for whom this program was adopted consists of the Chinese, and I suggest that when the former minister of citizenship and immigration made that speech to the Chinese community he must have been speaking with his tongue in his cheek.

During the last session, the hon. member for Greenwood raised the question of a Canadian-born citizen of Chinese origin, Wayson Choy who had applied to be allowed to enter the United States and who was turned down because of his Chinese origin despite the fact that, like most of us in this house, he had been born in Canada. The Prime Minister made the following statement on October 28:

At the outset I should like to make it very clear that as for Canadian law and policy the present government, like its predecessor, is firmly opposed in principle and in practice to racial discrimination.

That sounds very good. But anyone who looks at the Immigration Act and its regulations will readily see how ludicrous statements of this kind are.

I am sorry I do not have my files with me this afternoon—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles: He does not need them.

Mr. Orlikow: I have to smile at the cheers from those on the benches to my right. Having sat here day in and day out, listening for many hours to the drivel which comes from some of those members I admit I have to smile at their hope that we will co-operate to get on with our business. Suddenly they become great believers in speed and efficiency in this parliament.

The regulations which we have today are designed to a large extent to keep out of Canada those people whose colour is not white. If hon. members opposite do not believe me, if the minister does not believe this is true, I would point out that the people he has to convince are not, those of us who sit on this side of the chamber; he has to convince not only the Chinese of Hong Kong but he has to convince and educate the vast majority of British subjects, citizens of the commonwealth, who live in the West Indies.

As I was going to say before I was so rudely interrupted, in the last year we have had visits to Canada from the prime ministers of some of the West Indian countries. I am speaking from memory, Mr. Chairman, but it seems to me the prime minister of Barbados was here, the prime minister of Trinidad, the

prime minister of Tobago, and I think the prime minister of the Windward Islands. All of them mentioned the same fact, that their people find it virtually impossible to come to Canada. The proof is very simple to find, if one wants to look for it, if one wants to be realistic instead of having one's head in the clouds like the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

Just consider the tens of thousands, the hundreds of thousands of people who have gone from Jamaica, from Trinidad and from Barbados to the British Isles; so much so that they have had their difficulties there. But why have they gone to Great Britain rather than Canada? They have done this because the British, very reasonably, have done nothing to keep them out; while we, on the contrary, have done a great deal to keep them out. I and other hon. members who handle immigration cases have had the same experience. There have been many cases of West Indians, people from Jamaica, Trinidad and the other countries of the West Indies who have come to Canada to study, who have spent a year, or two or three years getting the kind of training which every minister has said develops the kind of person we want in this country, they have become skilled in some craft, and yet when they decide to stay in Canada, on the basis of their experience here, having had the kind of training they have had, they have found it virtually impossible to get the minister or the department to permit them to stay. So I say that if the minister wants to make his speeches mean something, if he wants to be honest, he ought to consider what happens to those people from the West Indies and he ought to clean up the mess that still exists.

Mr. Chairman, I now wish to deal briefly with some of the provisions of the Immigration Act. I hoped these provisions would have disappeared by now, as they would have if the minister had followed the speeches made by the former minister and had brought in a revised act, as he should have done. I would like to show just what these provisions do and how ridiculous was the statement made by the Prime Minister during the last session, in the light of the actual practices in Canada. Section 61 of the Immigration Act, in dealing with the regulations provides, by paragraph (g), that the governor in council may make regulations for the prohibiting or limiting of the admission of persons by reason of:

(i) nationality, citizenship, ethnic group, occupation, class or geographical area of origin,

(ii) peculiar customs, habits, modes of life or methods of holding property.

[Mr. Orlikow.]

It might be interesting to find out some day just what the department considers to be "peculiar customs", because what is one person's peculiar customs may be somebody else's normal customs. Then paragraph (iii) says:

(iii) unsuitability having regard to the climatic, economic, social, industrial, educational, labour, health or other conditions or requirements existing, temporarily or otherwise, in Canada or in the area or country from or through which such persons come to Canada, or

(iv) probable inability to become readily assimilated or to assume the duties and responsibilities of Canadian citizenship within a reasonable time after their admission.

The regulations, which are the main means of controlling immigration to Canada, still contain provisions which in effect, if not in language, discriminate on geographic, and hence racial grounds, in precisely the same way as the immigration laws of the United States, which were objected to by the Prime Minister so eloquently during the last session. The main section relating to admission to this country is regulation 31 of the immigration regulations passed on June 18, 1962. The former minister of citizenship and immigration was wont to repeat that these regulations would eliminate discrimination to some extent. We have succeeded in persuading the public of this, but in fact this discrimination still exists. The hon. member for Greenwood pointed out how regulation 36 classifies people. I quote from regulation 31 (d), which says that a person who is a citizen of any country of Europe, including Turkey, or of any country of North, Central or South America or islands adjacent thereto, or of Egypt, Israel or Lebanon is admitted if applied for by relatives in Canada on a fairly wide group of relationships, if such person is able and willing to provide care and maintenance.

I would point out that two very large and important members of the commonwealth, namely India and Pakistan, are among those countries which do not qualify under this regulation; so that citizens of India and Pakistan, as far as this country is concerned, as expressed in this regulation, are in fact second class citizens as compared with the citizens of other commonwealth countries. I am glad I am not one of those who go to commonwealth conferences representing this country, because I for one certainly could not justify this kind of discrimination, whatever the original reasons may have been.

I suggest to the minister that the time has long since passed when the house should be

put off with tinkering with the act and tinkering with the regulations. I know the minister is a new minister, but these matters must be known to the top officials of the department. I have a good deal of confidence in them, despite what some other hon. members, or one member, may think; I have confidence that they must have done a great deal of work along the lines which have already been discussed so often in this house. I suggest that the minister should get busy and correct these matters by a very early date. I suppose it is too late to hope that during this session or during 1964 we will have an amended Immigration Act. I should like to say to the minister that this session will last some time yet. We have a lot of business that must be done, and I am not convinced that he believes an amendment to the Immigration Act is high on the priority list and will be brought forward this year. I do state, however, that if we consider his estimates in 1965 and there has not been a new act brought forward he will have a long, rough, hard, bumpy time before they pass.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to deal with one or two other matters, and will do so briefly at this time. I do not intend to go into detail in referring to the debates that have already taken place during this session in respect of the kind of treatment meted out to people who have come into Canada illegally. The minister made an excellent statement about this matter. The minister has appointed eminent counsel to investigate the situation. I know Mr. Sedgwick is now working on this task and I do not raise this subject as a result of any prejudgment to the effect that Mr. Sedgwick will not present a good report. Surely the department will have to wait until it receives Mr. Sedgwick's report before eliminating some of the horrible practices which in my mind have existed and still exist. The minister can give a detailed explanation to the best of his ability in respect of each case, but in my opinion he cannot in any way justify the fact that a number of people have been kept in prisons for 30, 60, 90 or 100 days before their cases have been settled. The minister cannot in any way justify the fact that a large percentage of those people were brought before magistrates, tried, convicted, sentenced and jailed, although not represented by counsel.

I have said before that I do not believe any person should be tried for an offence for which he can be jailed upon conviction without the benefit of counsel. Certainly no individual in Canada illegally, without friends, contacts and probably no money, should be subjected to that kind of treatment. The department should make arrangements to provide counsel for these individuals. These arrangements would necessitate the spending of a good deal of money, but I feel it would be money well spent. This country would have the kind of reputation for fairness and decency we think we are entitled to as a result of following that suggested practice.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to make one further remark in respect of individuals being kept in jail while their cases are being investigated. I am not at all satisfied with the arrangements made by the department. In Toronto and Montreal these people are being held in Don and Bordeaux jails while their cases are being investigated. I placed a question about this situation on the order paper several weeks ago, and that question has not been answered. My understanding is that these people who are still being held in those jails because they are here illegally, are subject to the same rules and regulations as apply to other inmates.

The Chairman: Order. I must interrupt the hon. gentleman. His time has expired.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether I may be allowed to speak for one minute to complete my remarks in respect of this subject?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Orlikow: I feel that the department is responsible for these people being kept in these jails. The department made the arrangements to do this. I am told that visitors of the people being held in the Bordeaux jail can only visit once or twice each week, that mail privileges are very restricted and that visitors are being fingerprinted. Surely Mr. Chairman, if a large number of people are to be held, pending investigation of their cases, the department should make arrangements to keep these people at some place other than the local jail.

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to limit the debate on immigration. It is the duty of each member who desires to comment on immigration estimates following my statement, to do so. However, before commenting on the remarks made by hon. gentlemen I should like to make a statement about Indian affairs.

The Chairman: Is it the wish of the committee at this stage to hear the minister's statement on Indian affairs? There may be

other members who wish to speak on immigration matters. Is it agreed that the minister make a statement at this time?

Mr. Tremblay: I do not wish to limit the debate.

Mr. Dinsdale: Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak very briefly about immigration matters. Perhaps if I am allowed three minutes I can assist in facilitating the conclusion of the discussion on immigration. Certainly we have no intention of extending the discussion this afternoon, and we felt that there was ample time to discuss the estimates of this department when we were considering interim supply. Because of that fact, it is our hope we will be able to conclude our consideration of the estimates of this department this afternoon.

Several individuals, including the minister, have referred to a new age and spirit about to emerge in regard to Canada's attitude towards immigration. That was the theme of the minister's statement. He referred to the developments that are to take place in the future. The hon. member who just spoke referred to the necessity for a new approach to immigration, and I should like to point out to him and other hon. members that a change in regulations was made in 1962 which provided a new approach to immigration matters. All that is needed to achieve a broader perspective is the application of a more enlightened spirit and policy in the administrative approach.

The main problem that did exist under the old discriminatory approach to immigration was the limiting of unsponsored categories to rather exclusive groups. When the new regulations are applied, in the spirit in which they should be applied, there will be absolutely no limitation to unsponsored immigrants. Immigrants may come to Canada from any place in the world, provided they have the educational background and skills to make it possible for them to fit into Canada's economy.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Are you referring to the changes made in 1962?

Mr. Dinsdale: I was referring to the changes brought forward by the former government in 1962 and approved by this parliament.

The refugee category was also broadened at that time. This category was restricted to refugees from Europe until 1962, at which time it was changed, making it possible to meet special emergency circumstances. The refugee provisions now apply to any group anywhere in the world. I think we have demonstrated a means of meeting some of the problems that have been referred to by various members during this discussion this afternoon. These problems can be solved by broadening our approach to the problem. The minister has indicated that new administrative techniques are going to be applied. Certainly the regulations that were passed in 1962 depend upon the broadening of the administrative facilities and there are two questions I should like to ask in regard to office facilities. I refer first to the West Indies. Up until a few years ago there was no permanent headquarters in the West Indies and immigration was taken care of by a mobile immigration team. I think this gave rise to the problems that were outlined by the hon. member for Winnipeg North. Certainly here is a country where many people are interested in coming to Canada. The regulations now make it possible for them to come to Canada if the administrative means are provided in order to make it possible.

I should also like to ask the minister about the administrative facilities available in Greece where there seems to have been some sort of bottleneck in the past. I feel that the regulations of 1962 are adequate to meet most, if not all, of the problems that have been raised in the discussion this afternoon.

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, I propose to take only a few minutes of the time of the committee to make some comments about the operations of the department with respect to immigration. I might say in passing that I was interested to note the words of one of the members of the opposition with regard to the deputy minister being referred to in a Canadian magazine as a member of the mandarin class. This may be an omen of hope to those in the house who are interested in increasing Chinese immigration. I do not really know, but I know that we wish him well in his attempt to carry out some positive changes in the department.

In any event, Mr. Chairman, I was pleased to note the positive steps that were mentioned in the minister's statement, particularly those dealing with increasing the staffs in overseas offices, putting them in proper quarters, and general changes and improvements in administrative practices. However, I say, I hope in a constructive spirit and with the utmost respect, that statements and speeches favouring a positive approach to immigration and even the broadening of the regulations themselves will not mean too much unless there are at the same time the staff and the administrative

machinery needed to handle the admission of sizeable numbers of immigrants in a prompt and courteous manner, and even more important is the need for an attitude in the department from top to bottom that this department is a department of immigration and that immigrants are needed and useful to this country.

The lack of effect of changes in the regulations unless backed up by proper administrative machinery and proper attitudes is shown by the record of the previous Conservative government. I was interested to hear the comments of the hon. member for Brandon-Souris on this point. In the years between 1945 and 1957 I must say that under the regulations which then existed and which have been criticized by the hon. member for Brandon-Souris and other members, over 1,600,000 immigrants came to Canada, all of them under a Liberal administration, and the overwhelming majority of them became good, useful and productive citizens. In 1956 the last full year of Liberal government 164,857 people came to this country and in 1957 the number rose to 282,164. In 1958, the first full year of Conservative government, the number dropped to 124,851 and it dropped each year thereafter until in 1961 it fell to a shameful low of 71,684. I might say that if the excuse is given that economic conditions had deteriorated at that time I think members of the opposition are caught in a difficult dilemma because I had understood their comments in this house to be that in those years there were no economic difficulties, and in fact in 1961 improvement had begun.

Mr. Dinsdale: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Gray: I will accept questions at the end of my remarks, which will not be too prolonged if the hon. member does not mind. In January, 1962 the new regulations referred to by the hon. member for Brandon-Souris were proclaimed. What happened then? Was there a dramatic increase in immigration? No. The number increased by less than 3,000 to 74,586. Therefore the changed regulations apparently meant very little under the previous administration since there appeared to be a failure to fill staff vacancies and perhaps there was even an actual decrease in staff. I think it can be said that the attitude of the previous government was exemplified by the minister of that time, Mrs. Fairclough, who on behalf of the government was responsible for a very unfortunate order in council limiting Italian immigration. In any event, since the present administration took office there at least has been a start toward improvement, with immigration rising in 1963 to some 93,000.

But, Mr. Chairman, this is only a start toward improvement. There is a lot more that can and must be done, and much of it need not wait for changes in legislation because the vast powers given to the minister and the government under the present act to deal with these matters through order in council, thereby changing the regulations, are such that changes can have a far reaching effect if put into effect in this way. These changes in departmental organization and administrative practice can have a far reaching and useful effect.

I might say to those who are particularly interested, as I am, in having changes made in the legislation, which can only be done through being introduced in the house, that if members of the official opposition would be kind enough to permit the resolution and amendments now pending before the house to come to a vote it would be a lot easier to have other needed legislation, including changes in the Immigration Act, brought before us for implementation, and it could be done a lot quicker.

I noted the minister's reference in his statement to the link between the number of immigrants to be admitted and the administrative apparatus of the department. But, Mr. Chairman, our aim should not be to hold back the number of immigrants to fit the administrative apparatus of the department. Instead our aim should be to expand the administrative apparatus of the department to meet the needs of this country for an expanded population through immigration.

It is important to look for people abroad with high degrees of skill and training, but there is still room in this country for people who bring with them not much more than basic intelligence, good health and the desire to make a contribution to our country's life. If we expect suddenly to get very large numbers of immigrants from Europe, for example, with very high degrees of skill, education and training, I think that to a certain extent we are fooling ourselves. It is true, however, that through better promotion and more staff abroad we can get more immigrants of this type. With the dramatically improved economic conditions in western Europe and the opportunities there the high proportion of skilled people who might have wanted to

come here 10 years ago is no longer available.

I hope that this emphasis on skill and training will not be used by the department officials as a subtle way to keep people out. It is true that we must try to match the flow and type of immigration to the type of skills needed, the type of jobs available and the economic conditions of the country, but we are not going to have tens of thousands of Ph.D.'s in atomic physics, or computer technicians battering at our doors to get into Canada. If we want to expand the population of the country more quickly than natural increase will permit and in some way to balance the outflow to other countries, we are going to have to make it possible for substantial numbers of people to come here who have relatively low degrees of formal skills and training when they arrive.

There is no question but that an expanded population increases jobs for all and helps the economy to grow. One basic answer to our economic problems is a larger population. This is shown by the fact that the United States, with the same type of geographic divisions and difficulties, has a population of some 190 million providing a huge internal market so that that country is not exposed in the same way as our own to external economic changes.

Just by way of conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me suggest that my own community of Windsor is a wonderful example of how people coming from almost every part of the world, the British Isles, western Europe, central and eastern Europe, the Mediterranean countries and the Orient, can work and live together in harmony and make a great and positive contribution to this country.

There is still a lot more to be done toward making the law more just and equitable, toward making more effective and generally improving both the act and the regulations as well as the operations of the department itself. I say by way of conclusion that the record of the previous Liberal government between 1945 and 1957 in bringing almost two million immigrants to this country, while at the same time giving us an expanding economy with expanding employment opportunities for all, is an indication of the achievement that can come, and I am confident will come, in the very near future.

Mr. Dinsdale: May I be allowed just a brief question of the hon. member? I wonder if he is aware that one of the major reasons for changing the regulations in 1962 was that the traditional source of immigrants was drying up in Europe as a result of the economic boom, and instead of sending people abroad, countries such as Germany and France were inviting immigrants to meet their employment needs? This was the reason for broadening on such an extensive basis the categories of immigrants. Is he aware also, as the minister outlined today, that as the result of the regulation changes there was a dramatic upsurge in immigrants coming in from Hong Kong, for example, in 1962 and 1963?

Then, there is the joint provincial responsibility in immigration matters. I am sure he is aware of the dynamic immigration program that was sponsored by the Ontario government in the immediate post-war years, which was one of the most successful immigration schemes.

Mr. Gray: If I may reply briefly to my hon. friend's very interesting question, I should like to direct his attention to an interesting editorial in the *Globe and Mail* for June 10, 1964, entitled "A Tale of Two Countries". This editorial points out that at a time when our immigration was decreasing in a drastic manner, some one million immigrants from Italy, Greece, Portugal and Spain went to West Germany and 100,000 more are expected to go there this year. As the editorial points out so well:

> In these figures and facts there are two morals for Canada. One is that a lively, competitive economy can absorb almost any amount of immigration.

Then, I quote from the editorial again:

> The other moral Canada may draw from the West German story is that there is still a substantial pool of ambitious manpower and womanpower in southern Europe. If West Germany can get large numbers of these people to settle there temporarily, cannot we get large numbers of them to settle here permanently?

I have, in my reply, only to echo these statements and point out that if last year we only got 14,427 people from Italy and 4,759 from Greece it shows that even under the regulations to which my hon. friend refers, there is still a lot more that Canada could and should do in this regard.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay: As regards Indian affairs, I would like to reiterate that my aim with regard to Indians is to help them participate fully in the social and economic life of this country. We are pursuing this aim through a wide range of programs aimed at the development of the individual and the development of the community. Throughout the em-

phasis is on the progressive involvement of the Indians in both planning and execution. Again, we are seeking to bring about the further extension to Indians of services normally available to other citizens. This will involve continuing consultation not only with the provinces and with other federal departments but with the Indians themselves for we know the importance of obtaining their views on matters which are of direct concern to them.

I want to review in some detail the current Indian affairs programs. However, before doing so, I would like to speak of three or four matters which also deserve attention and which are occupying much of my thought and energy at this time.

Hon. members will recall that the administration of Indian affairs was considered at the federal-provincial conference held in November, 1963. It was agreed by the delegates that the matter was so complex as to warrant a federal-provincial ministerial conference and plans are proceeding toward this end.

In the months that have intervened since November we have been developing various proposals aimed at encouraging greater provincial interest and co-operation in Indian affairs always with the basic objective of providing Indians with the same opportunities for social and economic advancement as are enjoyed by other citizens. We know that the provinces have also used the intervening period to good advantage in considering what part they might play in furthering the basic objectives agreed upon at the November conference.

We intend to keep the Indians fully informed with regard to the further extension of provincial services to them. I have already written to the council of each band explaining the exploratory purpose of the November conference and will keep them up to date as developments occur.

In keeping with our wish to consult the Indians on all matters of direct concern to them, the Indian claims Bill No. C-130, as introduced in the house on December 14 last, was sent in January to Indian bands, Indian organizations and others throughout the country. I am glad to say we have been having a generally good response to this with nearly 250 bands already heard from. Some 31 replies have been received from other sources. Close study will be given to the various suggestions made before proceeding with the legislation.

It would also be my hope that we can begin to move ahead over the next year with appropriate amendments to the Indian Act. Much of the ground work has been done already. On the other hand, it is not something we want to rush through without a great deal of careful thought. What is more, our legislative thinking must be reshaped to some extent by current and possibly quite new developments in the Indian affairs field, not the least of which are the promotion of closer co-operation with the provinces, and the community development approach of which I will be speaking later.

I have mentioned Indian consultation in connection with the possible further extension of normal federal and provincial services to Indians and in regard to the Indian claims bill. I would also confirm here what has been said before about the Indian Act, namely that this government would consult with the Indians on any proposed changes. Consultation is not, of course, an easy task when there are over 550 bands and a dozen or more Indian organizations. Much thought is being given to ways and means of providing for more ready access to Indian opinion at all levels—band, regional and national. I am confident we shall be able to work something out in this respect that will be satisfactory to the Indians and the government alike.

As well as through direct consultation with the Indians we hope to learn much from the Indian research project which was announced in the house on December 2 last and which is now in the field study stage. The research director, Dr. H. B. Hawthorn, has informed me that he and Dr. Adelard Tremblay, associate director, have been successful in gathering a very capable group to work on the project. As stated in December the purpose of the project is to provide a body of knowledge that will assist in establishing guidelines for future policy and the over-all planning required to promote the welfare and progress of Canadian Indians. I am sure that much valuable information will soon begin to flow from the study which is unique in Canadian experience.

Before going on to review the Indian affairs programs, I would like to mention that although I am greatly interested in the well-being of the Indians, matters relating directly to Indian health come within the jurisdiction of the Department of National Health and Welfare. I am of course, willing to take up with my colleague questions which may arise concerning Indian health. However, I would point out that hon. members will be given

an opportunity to raise whatever questions they may have in this field when the estimates of that department are being discussed.

Basic to the work of the Indian affairs branch is the education program. The estimates for 1964-65 reflect the continued emphasis on the program with 57.55 per cent of the amount requested designated for Indian education, including $27,200,000 for the administration, operation and maintenance of the school program, and $7,416,000 for capital expenditures. This represents an anticipated increased cost for education of $3,528,190 or 11.3 per cent over the previous year. Of this amount about 3 per cent is attributable to a higher enrolment in schools of all kinds, 2.8 per cent to rising costs including higher payments to provincial school boards, 1.7 per cent to an accelerated program of building repairs to maintain minimum standards of school accommodation, and 3.8 per cent for new construction.

School enrolment continues to increase at a steady pace with the school population for the 1963-64 academic year standing at 55,475 or an increase of approximately 5,000 over the previous year. The largest part of this increase was due to the admission of approximately 4,200 more pupils in provincial schools.

To facilitate the further enrolment of Indian pupils in the provincial school systems, provision has been made in the proposed capital expenditures for contributions towards provincial school facilities of approximately $2,345,000 as compared to expenditures for this purpose during 1963-64 of approximately $1,913,000. Payments to provincial schools for tuition fees for Indian pupils have also continued to increase proportionately, and expenditures of approximately $4,255,000 are anticipated, an increase of $465,000 over last year.

Our government has continued to provide financial assistance to worthy Indian students to enable them to follow academic, professional or vocational courses so long as the students display reasonable promise and industry. During the year 22 special scholarships were awarded to outstanding students for studies in engineering, nursing, medicine, teacher training, metallurgy, auto mechanics, diesel mechanics, carpentry, music and commercial art. In addition financial assistance according to need was given to over 4,000 pupils to enable them to attend high school or university, or to obtain professional training.

[Mr. Tremblay.]

I am endeavouring to develop a basis for the establishment of school boards on reserves which would assume responsibility for the operation of reserve schools in accordance with provincial legislation and under the direction of provincial education administration. It is hoped that in the near future pilot projects of this nature will be conducted in selected areas.

The number of Indian students attending schools providing trades and professional training more than doubled during the past year. To accelerate the increase even more, it is intended to give added emphasis to this field of education in the coming year. In addition to the regular trade schools, the Indian affairs branch conducts special courses to provide vocational training in such activities as guiding and boat building.

The growing importance of economic development programs to many Indians in all walks of life is reflected in the estimates. These are essentially self-help programs and wherever possible financial assistance from appropriation is furnished on a repayable basis. Last year a total of $163,000 was repaid, most of which was for materials and supplies used in wildlife and fishery projects and for advances for agricultural, handicraft and employment placement purposes.

Expenditures from appropriation are augmented by loans from a revolving loan fund and by expenditures, grants, or loans from band trust funds. The revolving loan fund of $1,000,000, established as a source of credit for Indians who do not have access to ordinary lending institutions, is operating with about $750,000 out on loan at any time, leaving about one fourth of the fund available for new loans.

The use of band trust funds for economic development purposes is also increasing. Last year some $300,000 in band funds was diverted from direct relief to more constructive purposes including the improvement of reserve facilities. Seventy three projects were accepted by the Department of Labour for the winter works incentive program with an estimated 1,297 Indians employed for a total of over 20,000 man days. Payroll costs were $228,000 half of which is of course recoverable under the program.

Bands lacking sufficient funds to participate in the winter works incentive program are assisted under a special community employment program undertaken each year by the department. In the past year $1,200,000 was approved for this purpose. An additional sum of $414,000 was made available under the

federal supplementary government winter construction program to carry out works projects on reserves in 16 designated development areas.

Indians are encouraged to exploit and develop the natural assets of their reserves and the provision is made in the estimates for materials, supplies and equipment to help them in this. Programs of assistance to farmers and ranchers are being continued with the emphasis on livestock raising for which a promising rotating herd program has been established. The forest resources of Indian reserves are another important factor in their economy and harvesting by the Indians themselves has increased to 90 per cent as compared to 25 per cent 15 years ago. Oil and gas are providing Indian bands, mostly in Alberta, with an annual revenue of over $2 million.

There is a potential for industrial enterprise on many reserves that has been scarcely tapped. However, while development of this kind has so far been limited, this is an area where we hope that more can be done. To this end we have established a close working relationship with the Department of Industry and hope to take full advantage of their services. We will also need to considerably strengthen branch staff in this field.

The estimates reflect an expanded scale of activities to meet the demand for Indian handicrafts. More raw materials are being provided on a repayable basis while the need for broader distribution is being met through expansion of the department's central marketing facilities. My department recognizes that still greater attention needs to be given to this field and with this aim has recently taken on an arts and crafts development officer. This man will be examining the development of Indian handicraft to see in what way it can be further stimulated.

Development projects have been undertaken for the benefit of the very large group of Indians who still pursue their traditional vocations of hunting, fishing, trapping and wild crop harvesting. Since these projects are based on provincially-owned resources their success is dependent largely on continuation of the excellent co-operation now in effect either by formal cost-sharing agreements or informal work-sharing arrangements with the provinces concerned.

Assistance in commercial fishing is provided by supplying gear and in some cases freezing and storage facilities. Trappers are assisted by provision of grub stakes, essential supplies and equipment. In relation to both fishing and trapping, marketing assistance is provided where necessary.

Indians seeking wage employment are assisted through the department's employment placement program. Growing numbers of selected candidates are being placed in permanent employment in urban centres with the co-operation of the special services division of the national employment service. The total of such permanent placements in five years of operation has reached 2,124 of which 507 were placed in 1963-64. The majority of these were qualified for their jobs through academic and vocational training provided by the department.

Rural and seasonal placements, again with assistance from the national employment service, have on the basis of known figures reached a total of 26,854, including nearly 9,109 placed during the past year. These figures do not include the many Indians who have obtained employment on their own initiative.

Provision is again being made for a road construction program aimed at developing road systems on the more populated reserves and providing access to Indian groups who are living in isolation. Although progress has been made over the past several years in this field much remains to be done. This is particularly the case in providing access to reserves whose residents, as yet, have no adequate means of reaching centres of population where they can take advantage of employment opportunities, school facilities and so on. In some instances provincial governments have participated in the construction and maintenance of roads on reserves. It is hoped that further discussions with the provinces will result in better road facilities being made available to the Indians.

Sanitation continues to be an urgent problem in many areas and a substantial increase in the allotment for this type of work will be noted. The provision of wells, and water and sewage systems where feasible, is being given priority by the department's technical staff. Efforts are also being made to encourage band leaders to take the lead in the development of better sanitation facilities.

In view of the pressing need for more adequate housing, an increase of some $600,000 has been requested in the housing appropriation for this year. This, together with contributions from the Indians themselves should help to meet some of the more urgent requirements. However, it is foreseen that much more will have to be done in future to keep pace with the steady increase in

population and to reduce the existing backlog.

Concern has been expressed about the apparent disparities between the amount of public assistance provided to Indians as compared to that received by other residents of the various provinces. On the surface there appear to be such disparities. However, they are more apparent than real. Indian assistance rates cover food only. Fuel, shelter, clothing and other forms of assistance are provided to Indians as extra items on the basis of need. On the other hand, provincial scales, though varying greatly from province to province, generally include a lump sum payment for food, shelter, clothing, fuel and other needs.

The problem in public assistance is not, therefore, one of amounts of assistance but rather that Indians receive assistance within one framework of administration while other citizens receive it within another. This tends to set Indians apart in a way which I think we all recognize as undesirable. So far the one exception is in Ontario where a number of bands participate under the provincial general welfare assistance act in the same way as other communities. It is the hope of the federal government that similar arrangements can eventually be made throughout the country.

Again, while arrangements have been made in some of the provinces for the extension of provincial and other child welfare services to Indians on reserves, I recognize the need for extending such services to all reserves as quickly as possible.

Despite the progress that is being made under existing programs it is recognized that additional positive measures of a preventive and remedial nature are needed to accelerate the process of bridging the social and economic gaps which are still all too common between Indians and non-Indians in this country. For some time this government has been giving close study to this problem and, as I announced in the house on July 7, has now developed a community development program to complement existing services in the fields of welfare, education, health and economic development and to assist in raising living standards and improving the economic, social and cultural life of the Indians.

This community development program will emphasize Indian participation and initiative in advancing the well-being of Indian communities and will result in the application of a community development approach in many of the existing projects and services being provided by the Indian affairs branch.

[Mr. Tremblay.]

As you were informed, it is expected that over the next three years this will involve an investment of over $3,500,000. The cost of this program is not included in these estimates but will be presented in supplementaries, at which time I will be prepared to answer any questions which hon. members may have.

This government is prepared to take the initiative in introducing a community development program on any Indian reserve which would benefit from this approach. Federal community development work would be phased into provincial operations whenever the Indians concerned are ready for this change and the province is able to extend its own services. There will be no duplication of provincial services.

Although the community development program will affect in some ways the whole Indian affairs organization, a new social programs division is being created to reflect a new federal emphasis on the need to promote actively the development of Indian communities.

This new division will pull together and focus more effectively a number of services which have been provided in the past in a fragmentary way. This includes the current work being done in Indian leadership training and recreational services on Indian reserves.

The new social programs division will also include a "cultural affairs section" which will be staffed with Indians. This section will recognize the cultural needs of Indian communities and will facilitate the development of various forms of Indian cultural expression in the arts, including painting, sculpture, music, dancing and so on. Similar work will be done in the field of sports. Equal emphasis of course is being placed on the economic and social needs of Indian communities.

It will be necessary to appoint a number of community development officers to co-ordinate new and existing programs in the complex and demanding task of facilitating the development of Indian communities and giving them access to a wide range of technical and other resources which are available at the local, provincial and federal levels. Skilled practitioners in community development are extremely scarce in Canada, however. The federal government plans therefore to arrange additional training for appointees to equip them better for this work.

Training for community development officers constitutes only one aspect of the training that will be carried out. To accommodate the community development approach properly, Indian affairs branch will also be retraining its existing field staff.

Training courses are also being organized for Indians to fill jobs in the community development program. The aim is to create a group of trained and competent Indian employees as soon as possible to assist in the work of community development and eventually to fill positions of responsibility in Indian communities. In effect, Indian communities will be assisted to develop their own municipal type of civil service to manage welfare, recreational services, economic projects and many other local services.

Grants to Indian councils, particularly in communities in which such councils have achieved a measure of effectiveness will be an important instrument of development. Such assistance will supplement band revenues and is intended to make it possible for Indian councils to employ Indians full time in various community services.

The present adult education measures will be stepped up in the context of the community development program. Depending on the needs of various Indian communities, courses will be provided in such matters as budgeting, homemaking, food handling, sanitation and so on.

Within the framework of this program, there will be continuous consultation with Indian groups and individuals. Much of this consultation will take place informally and consideration is being given as well to a more formal structure of Indian advisory committees. These committees will be chosen by the Indian people and will be as broadly representative as possible.

In education, the influx of Indian pupils into provincial schools and training institutes has created a wide-spread need for adequate guidance services particularly for those students who are boarding in cities. Many students need much guidance and encouragement to make the necessary social adjustments to city life and city school study habits. The teacher-counsellor service provided by the branch must be strengthened each year to handle this problem. Indian age grade levels have been brought closer to provincial norms in recent years, but by reason of absenteeism and late starting there is still a relatively large number of children two or more years behind in their grades and who will leave school before completing at least grade VIII. More remedial and accelerated classes are being organized to overcome this difficulty. Pupils leaving school before completing high school or a vocational training course constitutes a real problem. Drop-outs on the reserve are such as to seriously affect economic and social development. More upgrading classes are required to assist this group in raising their academic standing, thereby permitting them to find employment or to take further training if they wish.

It will be apparent from what I have said that there is a real need to move forward in all program areas. To be truly effective this will demand additional effort and attention. The present staff can only do so much. There is a need to strengthen—

[*Text*]

Mr. Woolliams: I wonder whether the minister would permit a question? He is dealing with education. Is it the intention of the department to close the schools on the Indian reserves and have the Indian children attend public schools in the provinces, along with the other children who are attending?

Mr. Tremblay: The hon. member means the integration of Indian students. Yes, that has been the policy in the past and it is the present policy of the government. But, as hon. members know, we must reach agreement with each province, and each province must accept that these students shall go to the public schools.

Mr. Woolliams: I have one other question, Mr. Chairman. What has been the reaction of the Indian councils in this regard? I am thinking particularly of the Blackfoot reservation in Gleichen, and the Morley reservation, both of which are Indian reservations in the province of Alberta.

Mr. Tremblay: I met the chief and a few members of this band a few months ago. They are very much in favour of this system if these schools can give to their students exactly the same services that they are anxious to get from any other type of school.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chairman, I have only one paragraph to add before I am through.

It will be apparent from what I have said that there is a real need to move forward in all program areas. To be truly effective this will demand additional effort and attention. 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.

Every Canadian has a responsibility if only to extend the hand of friendship when the moment comes. There are in this country many groups of public-spirited citizens who are conducting their own programs of aid to Indians in city, town and country. Their contribution is invaluable. I appreciate as well all the suggestions we have received from hon. members and other interested persons, groups or agencies during the past year. We will always be receptive to any suggestions which might be of benefit to the Indian people.

[*Text*]

Mr. Woolliams: I wonder whether the minister would answer one more question, Mr. Chairman—just one. This question has reference to Indian affairs. I certainly do not want to delay the passage of the estimates, but this question is causing some concern among the Indian residents, particularly in the province of Alberta. Is it the intention of the department to close the hospitals situated on the reservations, or hospitals that have been set up particularly in reference to medicare for the Indians? What is the reaction of the department to this matter at the present time?

Mr. Tremblay: The department has no responsibility with regard to hospital services; these are the responsibility of the Department of National Health and Welfare. It is that department's responsibility to decide which services shall be given to the Indians, as is the case with any other group of people.

Mr. Woolliams: I wonder whether the minister would go one step further. Is it not a fact that the hospitals situated on Indian reservations were under the jurisdiction of his department and financed from the estimates of his department? I may be wrong in this respect.

Mr. Tremblay: As I said, Mr. Chairman, this is the responsibility of the Department of National Health and Welfare.

Mr. Woolliams: Are they financed by the Department of National Health and Welfare, or the department of Indian affairs?

Mr. Tremblay: We pay the services of those hospitals.

Mr. Woolliams: That is the point. Then, have you not some responsibility in reference to these hospitals?

[Mr. Tremblay.]

Mr. Tremblay: No. We pay for the services of these hospitals, like any other hospitals provincial or municipal. There is a system whereby we decide how much to pay to any such institution.

Mr. More: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether before five o'clock the minister has any statement to make in regard to the amnesty program. The story is in the newspapers, on the front page, and I am sure it is going to create consternation. I wonder whether, if the minister has any statement to make in this regard, it could be publicized over the week end, if there has been any change in thought in this connection.

Mr. Tremblay: I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that we decided to choose this date, September 1, knowing that all the Chinese people who will want to benefit from this program will have sufficient time to make their statements. But we will be quite ready, if we are wrong in this assumption, to extend this period. If there are applicants who want to make a statement after September 1, we will be quite happy to extend the period.

Mr. Pugh: Mr. Chairman, I have one short question on schooling. Has the Indian population the equivalent of a night school? Most schools in British Columbia run night classes for parents and those who have left school but wish to further their studies. Does the department provide similar facilities for Indian parents who may wish to attend these classes? Also, if there are schools on the reserves, may Indian parents attend them?

Mr. Tremblay: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we have facilities for adult education in many places in Canada. I cannot give the hon. member the exact list of the reserves, but we have facilities for those parents who wish to take courses. I will provide the hon. member with this list as soon as possible.

Mr. Pugh: Are these facilities acceptable to them? Do many Indians attend?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Drouin: Could the hon. gentleman tell us whether the medical and hospital costs he referred to a moment ago also include doctor's fees? Does the department pay the doctor in addition to the hospital costs?

Mr. Tremblay: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we pay both hospital and medical costs within the hospital.

[*Text*]

Item agreed to.

Citizenship—

5. Administration, operation and maintenance including grants and contributions for language instruction and citizenship promotion, $1,715,000.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Chairman, I have one question I would like to ask on vote No. 5, which is the citizenship section of the estimates. We had some discussion earlier on the question of Indian friendship centres. I am trying to identify the particular item in the estimates which covers this matter. I am wondering whether I am correct in assuming that this comes under the item of grants for citizenship promotion. I notice there is some increase in this item in the current estimates, over last year. It does seem to me that this is not a very large amount to be assigned under the rather imposing title of grants for citizenship promotion in this country. I realize that the item above that, which has to do with the provision of language instruction for immigrants, is considerably larger.

I am wondering, with the idea of the Indian friendship centres apparently catching on in various places across the country, just what proportion of this $75,000 it is expected will be devoted in the current fiscal year to that end, and what proportion of the $75,000 is to be used in other forms of citizenship promotion. I think the department is doing something about citizenship promotion with regard to people who are getting their citizenship papers, and I am wondering whether that field of endeavour is also to be covered by this $75,000 vote. It seems to me that if this is the case it is not going to allow very much for any possible development, expansion or assistance in a real way for the friendship centres. Could the minister give us some details as to just what is covered by this $75,000 item?

Mr. Tremblay: I do not have a breakdown of the amount for friendship centres, Mr. Chairman. It is part of the total amount of this item. I will provide the hon. member with this information as soon as possible.

The Chairman: Shall the resolution carry?

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Chairman, the minister has indicated that he will provide information on this matter when we resume our consideration of these estimates. I think we should leave this until the time we resume our consideration.

Mr. MacNaught: Mr. Chairman, I believe it is the feeling of all hon. members that if you do not look at the clock for a few moments we will be able to dispose of this item.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Chairman, may I suggest with all deference to the acting house leader that while we have listened to some rather interesting speeches from the various members of the committee, we have not really started our consideration of the estimates. For example, we have not touched upon the question of the operation of the Indian affairs branch, which I think will require a great deal of consideration. I do not see how we could possibly approach the completion of our consideration.

Mr. More: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the hon. member who has just taken his seat feels that if by unanimous consent we suspend private members' hour we could complete our consideration of this item.

The Chairman: I suggest the resolution be reported and that any suggestion of that kind can be considered later.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Resolution adopted in committee of supply this day reported and concurred in.

Mr. More: Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that by unanimous consent we suspend the private members' hour?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Apparently it is not unanimously agreed by the house to forgo the private members' hour.

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.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North) moved the second reading of Bill No. C-47, to amend the Weights and Measures Act (truth in packaging).

He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to ensure that retail purchasers of goods packaged in a wrapper or container be fully informed of the weight or measure of the contents. I take no personal pride in this bill and admit that it has been explained in great detail by people who are much more competent to do so than I am.

The national president of the consumers' association of Canada, Mrs. Plumptre, was described by the Minister of National Health

and Welfare (Miss LaMarsh) in answer to a question in the following words:

> Mrs. A. F. W. Plumptre, national president, consumers' association of Canada, Ottawa, has devoted a great deal of time to consumer education and consumer wants. She is the outstanding person in this country in consumer activities. Her knowledge will be invaluable to this council.

Mrs. Plumptre wrote me a letter on March 12, 1964 in which she quoted the text of a resolution passed at the annual meeting of the consumers' association of Canada in June, 1962, which reads as follows:

> Whereas there appears to be an increasing number of packages on the market whose contents are stated in fractions of ounces; and
>
> Whereas consumers are experiencing difficulty in determining readily, while shopping, the comparative values of many products, due to the varying weights of packaged goods;
>
> Be it resolved that the consumers' association of Canada requests the Department of Trade and Commerce and the food and drug directorate to standardize the weights of packages of food and other items weighing four ounces and over, in units of quarter pounds, half pounds and pounds.

Mr. Speaker, if this bill was passed today, and I am sure it would if the Minister of National Health and Welfare supported it, it would provide invaluable aid to the consumers advisory council which the minister has appointed.

There is some protection at the present time in that manufacturers have to list all the ingredients contained in the product, and their name and address in the event an individual wishes to write them about their product. Many containers have an indication on the label of the weight in terms of 14 ounces, 35⅜ ounces, or some other weight, as the case may be, and anyone would have to stand at the counter and do a little mental arithmetic, or use a sliderule, to compare quantities and prices of different products.

The "ten cents off" gimmick is being used very extensively. One can go into any supermarket in Ottawa and find bottles of instant coffee with labels reading "ten cents off", even though manufacturers have no authority at all to suggest to retailers the prices to be charged for products. They cannot do that as a result of the legislation we have passed to control combines. The statement "ten cents off" means nothing at all. One can find products contained in packages, such as toothpaste, the smallest being referred to as the giant size, the next largest as the economy size and the largest as king size. Soap flakes containers have an inch of air at the top so that one cannot tell what size the container is. This practice is standard in respect of a great number of packaged goods people are invited to purchase.

Mr. Speaker, two or three months ago I did some comparative shopping at one of the large supermarkets in Ottawa. I found that I could buy York homogenized peanut butter in the 12 ounce size for 39 cents and in the one pound size for 49 cents. I challenge any housewife to figure out easily which is the cheaper. I found that I could buy French's mustard in a six ounce size, two for 29 cents and in a 16 ounce size for 25 cents, and Heinz ketchup in the 11 fluid ounce size for 27 cents, the 15 fluid ounce size for 35 cents and the 20 fluid ounce size for 41 cents. Again it is virtually impossible to determine the price. Salmon is a really interesting example. We have Clover Leaf pink salmon, 3¾ ounces, the small size, selling for 25 cents, the next size, 7¾ ounces, selling for 35 cents and the large size 15½ ounces, selling for 69 cents. I can see no justifiable reason for that kind of packaging on the part of manufacturers except as a means of confusing potential customers.

You have canned corn in 10 and 15 ounce sizes. You have different brands of soups sitting next to each other. One product is 10 ounces, another is 10½ ounces and another is 10¾ ounces. Obviously it is impossible for the customer to be able to calculate the price. You have two types of baby food sitting next to each other, one packaged in a 3½ ounce size and the other 4¾ ounces. Obviously it is almost impossible to calculate relative prices to decide which is cheaper.

Amongst the worst offenders are the soap products. Spic and Span comes in three sizes, 1 pound 3½ ounces, 2 pounds 8 ounces and 4 pounds 6½ ounces. The small size of Joy is 12 ounces and the larger size is 32 ounces. Dash comes in two sizes, 1 pound 9 ounces and 4 pounds 11 ounces. Surf comes in two sizes, 2 pounds 10 ounces for 73 cents, with the statement that you are getting 20 cents off, and 5 pounds for $1.19, and you are supposed to be getting 40 cents off.

I could go on indefinitely, Mr. Speaker, but I think the illustrations I have given show very conclusively the difficulties with which the customer has to deal if he is trying to buy on the basis of price. So far as packaging and labelling are concerned, it is true that we have passed through a packaging revolution and that the phenomenal growth in supermarkets is related to the package which sells, and not the quantity or the price. In effect the package has replaced the neighbourhood grocer whose job once was to sell

the products in his store. Part and parcel of the selling job that the neighbourhood grocer once performed was to give his customers information about the products he was selling. Today the supermarket does that job but all it does is to put the packages on the shelves and it is up to the customer to take his choice. The sole way in which they really sell the product is by the package.

It seems to me it is important that this new salesman gives the same kind of essential and meaningful information to the customer as was once given to him by the grocer. This information is essential if the consumer is going to make a rational and intelligent choice between competing products. We have been told continually that the consumer is king. Everything is directed toward satisfying the consumer. If the consumer is to make a wise choice, surely we have to guarantee to the consumer that he can make an honest choice and choose the best product on the basis of quality and quantity.

I think that businessmen have a vital stake in giving the consumer all the information he or she needs to make a rational choice. Yet this does not happen any more. In the United States lengthy hearings have been held on this subject and it has been established that very often the consumer is unable to obtain the basic information necessary to make a rational shopping decision. He is prevented from doing so by the kind of packaging and the method of sizing which I have already illustrated. The price per unit as between two brands and sizes has become difficult if not impossible to calculate. In some instances the buyer is deceived by a package that does not fairly reflect the quantity inside. These practices make rational shopping almost an impossibility. Among these practices I would list the following:

1. Inconspicuous or non-existent quantity designations.

2. Deceptive illustrations.

3. Imprinting on the package by the manufacturer of price information implying a retail bargain where the manufacturer has no control over retail price, such as "cents off" and "economy size" designations.

4. Use of adjectives to describe the net quantity that attempt to give the impression of a greater amount than the same quantity of a competitor, such as "giant half quart" in place of "16 ounces" or "pint".

5. A proliferation of weights and measures expressed in odd amounts making price comparisons almost a mathematical impossibility. In the United States it was found that there were 73 quantities of potato chips under three pounds. Which is the better buy, 20 ounces at 35 cents or 22½ ounces for 40 cents?

6. Use of containers of sizes, shapes and dimensional proportions that give a distorted impression of the actual quantity within. This includes non-functional slack fill where the consumer may be paying for the air instead of for the product.

7. The use of size designations that have no actual relation to the quantity in order to gain a competitive advantage. One manufacturer's "king size" is another manufacturer's "large" for an equivalent amount. In toothpaste the smallest size may be marked "large". If we are not lucky, it will be marked "giant".

8. Meaningless serving designations involving the same quantity, but one package says "serves two" and the other package says "serves four".

9. Lack of any useful method of price comparison where weight or count are meaningless.

10. Lack of ingredient or composition information when this may be important, or presenting such information in an inconspicuous manner. Size is often difficult to find on Canadian products although the law requires that the weight be shown.

11. Reduction in content while masking the weight loss from the consumer by manipulation of package size and content markings.

These are just some of the practices which would be controlled by the bill if the house would agree to its passage. The bill seeks to bring our practices up to date by recognizing the emergence of this relatively new form of non-price competition. A packaging and labelling bill does this by facing up to the realities of present day marketing conditions, naming as restraints of trade those practices brought about by unfair and deceptive methods of packaging and labelling certain consumer commodities.

In proposing the bill, Mr. Speaker, there is no intention on my part to make it difficult for legitimate and honest businessmen. As a matter of fact, I think that the passage of the bill would make it easier for honest businessmen because it would control the small number of unscrupulous businessmen who want to get an unfair share of the market by using some of these cute tricks and, to say the least, immoral practices in competition with the businessman who wants to be fair.

There was an editorial on February 21, 1964 entitled "Slide Rule Shopping", in which

they commented on this bill which I am proposing. I just want to read a couple of paragraphs:

> Two cartons of honey look just the same, but one holds 16 ounces and the other 12. Bottles of vinegar come at 8, 12, 16½, 24 and 33 ounces. Soap flakes of varying brands are in packages of 14 ounces, 16½ ounces, 20 ounces, 20½ ounces and 34 ounces. A small box of detergent could weigh (depending on the name) 15 ounces, 20 ounces or 21 ounces.
>
> In these circumstances, the only way to figure out the best buy is with a sliderule, or maybe a computer. What is wrong with plain old pints and quarts, pounds and half-pounds? Could not the shopper's lot be made a bit easier? Or are the manufacturers deliberately trying to confuse her?

The purpose of my bill, Mr. Speaker, is to make it easier for the consumer. I hope that the government and the members of this house will facilitate the passage of the measure and give the government departments, both trade and commerce and health and welfare, as well as the new consumers advisory council, an opportunity to do their work as they should, without having their arms tied behind their backs.

Mr. Macdonald: Before the hon. member takes his seat, I wonder if I could ask him a question about his bill? Do I understand correctly that he is suggesting the administration should decide, in connection with cans of soup, for instance, that only cans of a certain size may be used by a manufacturer, and none other? Is that a correct interpretation?

Mr. Orlikow: That is correct. If the hon. member or the minister wish to have the details of what is involved in this bill they can get the evidence in the hearings that were held in the United States on the bill proposed by Senator Philip A. Hart of Michigan. Extensive and detailed hearings were held in which government and industry spokesmen gave full testimony. I believe all the information could be secured from this source.

Mr. Marvin Gelber (York South): We live today in a society which is very largely dominated by advertising techniques and advertising philosophies. There is a story told of a man who said to his wife, "My dear, I have been made a vice president." She looked very sceptical and he said, "Are you not surprised?" She said, "Well, down at the groceteria there is a vice president in charge of prunes". He was incredulous, so he phoned the groceteria and said, "I want to speak to the vice president in charge of prunes". The girl said, "Yes, bulk or packaged?"

The advertisers, associated with the psychologists, in studying the mores of our society can almost predict our wants and can almost instruct us upon what we should buy. There is a story told by Vance Packard in his "The Hidden Persuaders" about a conversation between two psychologists. One of them said, "Now, take the man who drives a Studebaker, smokes Old Golds, uses cream-based hair oil, an electric shaver, carries a Parker 51 fountain pen. Obviously he's a salesman, an active man, aggressive in face to face situations and wants to make a good impression. Probably he was quite a romantic type in his youth". And the other psychologist added: "Also, you'll find that he is wearing loud shorts."

The psychologists, Mr. Speaker, allied with the merchandisers have developed a study of the techniques of impulse buying. As a matter of fact one psychologist who was studying merchandising techniques, realizing he could not give a lie detector test to the women who were shopping as to their reasons for choosing one product rather than another, decided to place a motion picture camera in a store to photograph the ladies as they went through the store. He counted the number of times her eyes blinked as an indication of how tense she was in making her merchandising decisions. The results were surprising to him. Instead of becoming more and more tense as she went through the store she became more and more relaxed. As a matter of fact, the blinking of her eyes decreased as she was going up and down the aisles to the extent that it became half of the normally expected rate.

A person can go into a store today and instead of facing the possibility of buying 600 items, he can choose between 6,000 and 8,000 items. The point made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) is a very salient comment about the merchandising habits of our society. I think that the individual salesman selling his wares can compare with the improved merchandising of, let us say, groceries. It has been discovered as the result of studies, that people going into a self-serve groceteria will buy a considerably larger number of items than people going into a grocery store in which they are served by a salesman. Impulse buying is that important. The person being sold by a salesman has time to weigh the pros and cons of a decision and may decide not to buy, whereas a person subject to impulse buying goes into a store in which the position of the item in the store, the colour of the package, the size of the package, the name of the item, are all decided on a scientific basis in order to induce the purchaser

to make his decision. When a person leaves the store he will have more items, it has been discovered, than he would have had if he had been served by a salesman. It has been discovered also that if there is any person more susceptible to impulse buying than the housewife, it is her husband. Men are even more subject to impulse buying than women.

As a result of these studies it has been decided that the size of the package, the colour of the package, the format, all these things are very important in terms of merchandising a product. The hon. member has introduced a bill concerning packaging. He mentioned the question of toothpaste in support of the point he made. I should like to read from the *Consumers' Report* of May, 1963 concerning one of the best known brands of toothpaste sold on this market. The report says that your correspondent's difficulty may be stated briefly as follows: One large tube, $1\frac{1}{16}$ ounces plus one family tube, $5\frac{11}{16}$ ounces equals $6\frac{3}{4}$ ounces for 98 cents, as against two giant tubes, $2\frac{7}{8}$ ounces each equalling $5\frac{3}{4}$ ounces for 99 cents. The result is, Mr. Speaker, that the person buying the giant size tube of toothpaste is paying 22.61 cents per ounce while the person buying the family size tube pays 17.23 cents per ounce, a difference of more than 5 cents per ounce for the same brand of toothpaste, depending upon the size of the package.

Here is a form of what someone might call disguised taxation. Certainly there is a very wide differential between the merchandising packages. A very substantial levy is made on the people of Canada and the United States as well as other countries subject to this type of merchandising because of the packaging methods which are being used. Recently, in the field of cosmetics, the question of hollow wall packaging was examined by the attorney general of California. He accused 23 leading cosmetic companies of using deceptive packaging. It was found that by varying the package the customer was completely misled as to the amount of the product he was buying.

A very interesting study was made of aspirin in Baltimore city hospitals. Five different brands were examined and there was a report of the findings in the journal of the American medical association, December 29, 1962. I would like to quote from the report in *Consumers' Report,* where it says this:

> Within days after the report appeared, the manufacturer of Bayer aspirin and the distributor of St. Joseph's aspirin began to capitalize on the fact that their products came out rather well in the study. Most upsetting to the federal trade commission and the American medical association was the advertising for Bayer aspirin which boasted that a "government-supported medical team," whose findings "were reported in the highly authoritative journal of the American medical association," had found the Bayer product equal to the higher-priced pain reliever. The ad further claimed that "Bayer aspirin brings relief that is as fast, as strong, and as gentle to the stomach as you can get. . . .Bayer aspirin had a somewhat higher pain relief score than any of the other products."

In point of fact the study proved there was no difference in the pain relieving capabilities of the different brands, but that two brands, which contained phenacetin, tended to give more stomach upset.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a few extracts from a conference on consumer problems, sponsored by the Consumers' Association of Canada, to which the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) referred, in co-operation with the consumers union of the United States, held at Queen's University in 1962. I would like to read a comment made by Dr. C. A. Morrell, of the Department of National Health and Welfare, who said this:

> Of the 2,263 people who said they wanted a change—

This is in packaging—

> —1,061 wanted to change them because they thought packages were deceptive. This is nearly one in five people questioned and I think it is enough to give the packaging industry a reason for a critical review of what they are doing...
>
> Although the possibility of deception is the main reason for Food and Drug to be interested in packaging, there are other reasons too. Packages should be of such construction and material that they cause no health hazards to the consumer. It is my feeling that some study should be made of vacuum sealed plastic packages to determine whether they should be used at all for packing certain kinds of meat and fish. Deaths from botulism derived from smoked fish sold in vacuum packed plastic containers occurred recently. Experimentally, at least, it has been possible to show the development of staphylococcus toxin in bacon, similarly packaged. The point to note is that under this kind of packaging the usual spoilage organisms did not develop and so the warning signs of bad odour and appearance were not there. Our own laboratory people said that had they not known the facts they would have had no objections to eating either the fish or bacon—they looked and smelled like good fish and bacon. New forms of packaging should not be introduced without careful forethought and study of possible hazards.

Mr. Woolliams: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Gelber: Certainly.

Mr. Woolliams: Does he think he could cure this evil by legislation or by competition? Which would he accept?

Mr. Gelber: I would say in reply that it says in the Bible that when the Babylonian king was having a feast a hand appeared and wrote on the wall "Mene, mene, Tekel, Upharsin,"—"Counted, counted, weighed and found wanting"—or in today's terms that the Toledo scales showed there was a short weight measure. I think, Mr. Speaker, if we have people to inspect scales to make sure they are giving accurate measure we should also inspect all packages to see that their prepackaged measure is accurate.

I would like to refer again to the committee set up by the Minister of National Health and Welfare. On August 10 the minister announced the appointment of a committee, the consumers advisory committee, and she said, as recorded at page 6581 of *Hansard,* that it is to do the following:

> (a) To consider and advise the minister on such questions relating to the operation of the Food and Drugs Act and the Proprietary or Patent Medicine Act as she may refer to the committee; and (b) to give consideration and advice to the minister on such matters relating to the operation of the Food and Drugs Act and the Proprietary or Patent Medicine Act from the point of view of consumer interest as the committee shall see fit.

I do believe the very important matter raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North in this bill will be of great concern to that committee, and will certainly give guidance to them in their meetings.

The hon. member referred to Senator Hart of the United States senate and said his bill was inspired by the Hart bill. I would like to read a comment made by Senator Hart before the 47th national conference on weights and measures in 1962, the report of which was published by the United States department of commerce. He said this:

> It seems to me that what is required are definite standards against which packages and labels can be measured. Enforcement then requires only measurement against the standard; not a determination of whose definition of "conspicuousness" or "misleading" is correct.
>
> Standards, whether in the law or in regulation, give to the manufacturer greater freedom to compete on the basis of price and quality. He can plan his merchandizing campaign knowing that his competitor will be held to the same packaging and labeling standards as himself. And he can spend the large sums necessary for packaging and labeling equipment, materials and printing, secure in the knowledge that his packages and labels conform to the law and regulations because the law is certain and precise.

The hon. gentleman who has introduced this bill, No. C-47, merits the thanks of the house for having brought the matter up for public discussion. The name of Senator Hart's bill, to which reference has been made, is the truth in packaging bill. In this country the problems raised in the hon. member's bill are of concern to the Department of Trade and Commerce, and also to the Department of National Health and Welfare, the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Fisheries, and some of the matters raised in this bill are not related to the Weights and Measures Act which it is seeking to amend. In fact I do not know if some of the matters raised in this bill are within the competence of this parliament because some lawyers think they are trespassing on provincial jurisdiction. Certainly many of the items in it have a great deal of merit. Clause 1(p) speaks of weight, measure, quantity or count, and this adds nothing to our existing law except "count." It is doubtful if that type of regulation, that kind of item or that type of consideration will come under the Weights and Measures Act. Certainly under the Criminal Code of Canada miscount is an offence.

With reference to clause 1(q)(i) it speaks of "standard size designation," and I am doubtful about this. I am not a lawyer, but I believe legal opinion would not support this because "standard size designation" could come within provincial government jurisdiction.

Clause 1(q)(ii) reads:

> —the net quantity of the contents of any prepackaged goods, in terms of weight, measure or count, that shall constitute a serving and shall be used where the goods are in a wrapper or container—

It is doubtful if "serving" would come within the competence of the Weights and Measures Act.

Clause 1 (q)(iii) reads:

> ...the standard quantative designation of the contents of any prepackaged goods that shall be used when the net quantity of the contents cannot meaningly be designated in terms of weight, measure or count,...

This refers to quality and it seems to me that the acts of this parliament cannot ensure quality of performance to satisfy the anticipations of the customer. It seems to me that is a rather broad conception.

Subclause (q)(iv) certainly has merit, as do (r)(i) and (r)(ii). Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a quotation from the Cohen report on English company law, where it said this:

No system can wholly protect fools from their own folly or from the knavery of others, and the advantages of trying to do so as fully as possible have to be weighed against the disadvantages of imposing fetters on business conducted honestly and efficiently.

Merchandising is changing so rapidly and the power of advertising in our society is so persuasive that the questions raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) have a special meaning. We could well look at our federal legislation, and the provinces could well look at their legislation, to see whether the problems to which the hon. member has drawn attention are being adequately dealt with.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Lotbinière.

Mr. Woolliams: Hear, hear.

Mr. Auguste Choquette (Lotbinière): I wish to thank my personal friend, Red Skelton, for his encouraging support.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, the bill now before us is very interesting, and I am sure that its sponsor was prompted by a very generous intention.

The purpose is to avoid as much as possible all misrepresentations, all attempts at trickery in which businessmen and dealers are often tempted to indulge.

But first, Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a remark to the house. The purpose of this bill is to amend subsection 1 of section 35 of the Weights and Measures Act.

Let us read, for instance, some provisions of that act.

(p) the weight, measure, quantity or count, or the fraction or multiple thereof of the contents of the wrapper or container of any pre-packaged goods;

The next paragraph reads as follows:

(q) the establishment and definition of—

That only goes to show that the language of administrative legislation is a real jargon. In any act concerning administrative legislation, whether it be the Bankruptcy Act or the act concerning which an amendment is now before us, the Criminal Code or any branch of the administrative legislation, we always find that inevitable complexity, that real inextricable maze, as I said a while ago, which constitutes more or less a kind of despotism imposed upon the people.

There is an old principle that says: No one is supposed to be ignorant of the law.

Take the tax act, the Bankruptcy Act or any act of that kind in which merely a subsection of one section, among many others, is to be amended. How can it be maintained in such circumstances that nobody is supposed to ignore the law?

I wish to make the following comment. I urge all those who are responsible for the drafting of legislation to try to clear up their wording, so that it may be understood by every citizen, if the principle that no one is supposed to ignore the law is to be applied.

The contrary is preposterous and stupid.

Imagine paragraph (b) of subsection (1) of section 35 of a piece of legislation among thousands of others. And the citizens are supposed to comply with the law and understand that legal jargon.

This is absurd and contrary to reason.

Mr. Speaker, I feel it is time that the members of parliament, representatives of the people, do something to make legislative texts truly accessible to any citizen subject to common law.

I appeal to all hon. members so that our legislative texts can be rid of all that mumbo jumbo ordinary citizens cannot understand.

If that is not done, let no one say that everyone must know the law. With texts such as this one, I say that no one should know the law, even members of parliament, maybe the latter least of all.

Mr. Speaker, after those preliminary remarks—

[*Text*]

Mr. Barnett: Would the hon. member care to explain to the house what we are going to do for all the unemployed lawyers if his suggestions are carried out?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Choquette: I highly appreciate my hon. colleague's sense of humour.

Indeed, if there is a party that has fought unemployment, as we have done here, on this side of the house, if there is a political formation which has really wanted to deal with unemployment, it is the party to which my hon. friend belongs. I am convinced that the suggestion he just made is most appropriate. As a matter of fact, there is no doubt that there are many lawyers who are unemployed because they cannot get elected as members of parliament. Therefore, it would be a good thing to avail ourselves of their talent and services so they could try and clarify the true wording of our administrative law.

A little earlier, while studying that bill, another thought occurred to me. There again,

I think I have the support of my hon. friends of the New Democratic party.

There is talk about parliamentary reform. The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre Mr. Churchill)—

Mr. Prud'homme: Winnipeg North Centre.

Mr. Choquette: The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) because the other, the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre, often loses his bearings. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre made very appropriate suggestions to reform our parliamentary system.

Personally, I humbly submitted a few suggestions to the committee of the house on procedure and organization—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member will understand that he has to speak to the principle of the bill under consideration. I feel that he is now drifting quite far from the matter under discussion.

[*Text*]

Mr. Knowles: I think truth in packaging in the House of Commons would be a good idea, too.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Choquette: It would be a good idea, but what I want to make clear to my hon. friends opposite is that a bill of this type has, first of all, a technical aspect and requires the advice of experts in the commercial publicity field. As everybody can see, the bill is rather difficult to read and even to understand on account of what I would term the jumble of our legal terms. Is it not contrary to the parliamentary reforms advocated by our hon. friends opposite to consider matters requiring technical knowledge, the hearing of witnesses and which, more or less, call for some kind of survey in order to ascertain to what extent the public is being misled and to what extent also the people are satisfied?

I fail to see how a parliament could lose one hour of its time to consider amending a paragraph or a section, among several, in an act lost in a jumble of other legislation connected with administrative law. As this seems to be nothing but an administrative matter, parliament should not be bothered with it for a whole hour, when there are other very urgent problems to settle. We should not be bothered or importuned with such technical details.

I feel that at certain times, legislators should confine themselves to matters of great scope dealing with major and important principles. They should not be asked to devote one hour of their time uselessly, since it seems that the bill is not going to be passed.

[*Text*]

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question? Does he not realize that this bill is so drafted that it would give to the administration the opportunity to make all the regulations? Does he not realize that the bill actually meets the very point he is making; that we should not deal with it here but that we give the power to make regulations to the government?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, what the hon. member says is partly true, but should parliament devote its efforts to those little regulations, or rather put all its energy into working out an over-all type of legislation? I think this belongs in the administrative field; each department employs legal advisers who are able to see and find out how the consumers are to be protected. They are aware of any restrictions which should be imposed on dealers and merchants who might take advantage of the consumers in general. This is strictly our administrative matter. The government provides in each department, for legal advisers who are paid with the people's money and who are responsible for advising the government with regard to the form of each piece of legislation, so as to make it more adaptable and useful in its practical application.

That is precisely why I cannot understand that the hon. member who introduced the bill, who calls himself a member of a reform party, should ask the house to waste its time in considering technicalities. Therefore, I think that rather we should ask the legal advisers of the department concerned for their opinion. Indeed, we see that by asking for expert advice—and I am not thinking of legal advisers, because I have had no contact with them—but after consulting knowledgeable people in this field, we have been informed that this bill will alter precisely nothing from a practical point of view. Even if it were passed as it now stands, consumers would have the same protection and dealers would be limited by the same restrictions. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, parliament has been down-graded by a useless logomachy whereas it should have been maintained on a proper plane.

That is why I am disgusted with the hour spent in discussion of insignificant details which merely concern the opinion or legal advice of the department concerned.

If we tried to explain in this manner how the government works instead of in the way my hon. friends wish, I am convinced the public would only have admiration for the efforts we are putting forth.

Mr. Speaker, those are the views of a junior member of the house.

[*Text*]

Mr. D. S. Macdonald (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, it is with some reluctance that I rise to follow one of the main dramatic events in order to make a few pedestrian remarks about the bill in question. I would like to cite three particular considerations which I would submit to the house are reasons why the bill should not be adopted. The first relates to the philosophy of law itself; the second relates to the division of jurisdiction between the federal and provincial governments; and the third relates to Canada's international obligations, more particularly those under the general agreement on tariffs and trade.

I was very much surprised that none of the members of the official opposition rose, when they had the opportunity to do so, to speak on this subject, in view of the fact that the bill proposes—and to this extent I disagree with my colleague the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette)—a very substantial administration for the purpose of setting down the standards which will have to be followed in every case.

The house will recall that at the conclusion of the remarks of the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) I asked him whether he really proposed that the government was to decree the size of containers to be used in respect of any particular product. He agreed with me that this was his contention. While I referred to one particular product, it will be obvious to hon. members that there will have to be a great multiplicity of administrative decisions, rules and orders to decide the size of cans, containers, boxes, bags and other packages in which merchandise is retailed, and it will require a vast addition to the bureaucracy for the purpose of determining these questions. In this respect I would point out that it is very much different from the fundamental purpose of the Weights and Measures Act, which in essence can be enforced by a—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I apologize for interrupting the parliamentary secretary, but I should point out that the time for the consideration of private members' business has now expired.

Mr. Knowles: He should apologize, not you.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

[The following item was passed in committee of supply this day]:

DEPARTMENT OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

1. Departmental administration, $1,130,500.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, August 17, 1964

The house met at 2 p.m.

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN SECOND REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. L. T. Pennell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance) moved that the second report of the standing committee on privileges and elections presented on June 15, 1964 be now concurred in.

He said: Mr. Speaker, parliamentary fortune of the second report of the standing committee on privileges and elections has long been delayed. It is my earnest hope that the healing power of time has composed whatever differences there may have been over its acceptance. This inquest into the past has deeply exercised the minds of many members, and its evolution from its origin has been in a sea of controversy.

If it is not inconvenient or disagreeable to the house, may I be allowed to offer a few observations. It is scarcely necessary for me to make plain that I speak only for myself. It would be convenient, I think, if I began by reintroducing the history of the matter for the house in a very summary fashion, and by this means we may retrace our steps.

It will be remembered that on April 27 last the hon. member for Labelle rose on a point of privilege and made a statement to the house which included the gist of an alleged conversation between the national organizer of the Liberal party and himself in the presence of four other hon. members. Perhaps due to provocation, the statement was couched in language that readily lent itself to misconstruction.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

I should like for what it is worth to refer to standing order 30 which reads as follows:

> If anything shall come in question touching the conduct of any member, or his election, or his right to hold his seat, he may make a statement and shall withdraw during the time the matter is in debate.

The debate, at the present time, started with the remarks of the hon. member for Brant-Haldimand (Mr. Pennell).

Under standing order 30, would it not be more appropriate to ask the member concerned to make his statement and then to ask him to withdraw while the matter is in discussion?

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: It seems to me there must be some misunderstanding, because the hon. member for Brant-Haldimand, if I understand it correctly, is speaking to this motion under standing order 32(1)(b) and not standing order 30. So far as I know there is no question of any member withdrawing at the moment. Am I correct?

Mr. Pennell: That is correct, Mr. Speaker. Before I was interrupted I had indicated that on April 27 last the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Girouard) had made a statement to the house on a point of privilege, which included the gist of an alleged conversation between himself and the national organizer of the Liberal party in the presence of four other hon. members.

The day following, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) rose on a point of privilege also, and moved that the matters raised in the statement be remitted to the committee for study and report. It was unfortunate, perhaps, that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre misinterpreted the meaning of the statement, although I am bound to say in fairness to him that his misinterpretation was not unreasonable having regard to the language in which the statement was framed.

Mr. Knowles: It was shared by the whole house.

Mr. Churchill: No.

Mr. Pennell: In any event, Mr. Speaker, I shall not trust to my memory. I would like to refer textually to *Hansard* at page 2645, where the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is reported as saying:

> I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Labelle has alleged in this house that he was offered a bribe...It is a breach of the privileges of this House of Commons...

That constituted the first allegation that accompanied the motion made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. If I may, I should like to go on now to page 2646 of *Hansard* where the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre continued as follows:

> The hon. member for Labelle has been insulted by the alleged offer of a bribe. The Prime Minister has been insulted by what the hon. member for Labelle said about him...But my concern is that an insult to any member of the House of Commons is an insult to the house as a whole.

Once these allegations were turned loose, Mr. Speaker, a burden of suspicion fell upon all parties concerned, and it is a melancholy thing to see good names and honourable reputations trampled into the ground. It would be appropriate, I suggest, that the house remind itself of what is contained within the report. I do not propose to read all the report but only two material sentences:

> Your committee reports that it found no evidence of bribery or attempted bribery. There was no question of privilege involved in the present reference.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we ought to do everything within our power to undo the injustice that has been done, and in the course of my submission I shall respectfully invite the house to accept the report of one of its own committees as the considered judgment of the entire house. Before I turn to deal very briefly with the evidence on which the report rests I desire to dispel the innuendoes arising from alleged reports of the happenings at the chance and casual meeting which took place at Hull on the evening of February 17.

I am pleased to emphasize that the conduct of every member present was not unworthy of the standard expected of members in this chamber. As I approach the evidence it will be my earnest endeavour as well as my earnest desire to approach it in a detached and impartial manner. In fairness to the hon. member for Labelle I must say he made it abundantly clear, at the earliest opportunity before the committee, that he did not rise with the intention of accusing anyone or anything. I would ask the house to turn to page 50 in the first volume of the proceedings before the committee where the hon. member is reported as follows:

> —when I rose on a question of privilege I did not rise with the intention of accusing anyone or anything.

The cross-examination of this witness, as of all witnesses, was taken up with great industry and relentless zeal. As recorded at page 59 of the first volume the hon. member for Port Arthur cross-examined the hon. member for Labelle:

> Mr. Fisher: Well, you are very clear on this, that you were not offered any bribe by Mr. Davey?
>
> Mr. Girouard: Yes, I am clear.

The cross-examination continued as recorded at page 119 in the second volume.

> Mr. Fisher: Did Mr. Davey get into any of the advantages that might lie with the Liberal party for you personally in terms of your advancement to, say, senior positions in the party?
>
> Mr. Girouard: No.
>
> Mr. Fisher: Did Mr. Davey get into questions concerning such things as judicial appointments or advantages that might come to you as a practising lawyer?
>
> Mr. Girouard: No.
>
> Mr. Fisher: Did he suggest to you that there was a patronage list which would be available to you?
>
> Mr. Girouard: No.

The witness was further examined by the hon. member for Renfrew North. In this connection I wish to turn to volume 3, page 187:

> Mr. Greene: You have told us in the witness box on two occasions that there was no bribery—
>
> Mr. Girouard: No, I said there had not been any bribery. I want to state that here, before the members of the press. I said that no attempt had been made to bribe me.
>
> Mr. Greene: I think you said in your previous evidence, if I recollect it correctly, that in your opinion there was no bribery. Is that correct?
>
> Mr. Girouard: That is correct.

It is my respectful submission that no matter how you look at the evidence of the hon. member for Labelle you are driven back to the conclusion reached by the committee.

It is only fit and proper that I should make reference to the evidence of the hon. member for York-Scarborough and of the national organizer of the Liberal party. Both confirm the evidence of the hon. member for Labelle that there had been no attempt to bribe him. The force of the evidence when viewed dispassionately and with a single desire to see that justice is done dissipates and destroys every particle of the allegation of bribery.

I now pass to the second allegation, which might best be described as nothing more than the ghost of a rumour wrapped up in hearsay four times removed. It was a paradox, however, that the committee had to accept that, while they were called upon to investigate a question of privilege they found there was no question of privilege to investigate.

Let me go back to the report which I have already read to the house: "There is no question of bribery involved in the present

reference". The committee looked at all the circumstances and considered the evidence with care and precision, but came to the honest conclusion that the point involved was outside the definition of a question of privilege as we understand it in this house. May I say we were not unmindful of the attractive and persuasive argument put forward by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, but the committee also had the advice of the learned parliamentary counsel who was in attendance throughout.

I might reasonably anticipate that this part of the report may become a target for criticism because the committee did not return a formal verdict as to the truth or falsity of the allegation. The answer to such criticism is simplicity itself. Once the committee, after careful and conscientious consideration, had reached the conclusion that there was no question of privilege involved, then it would have been in violation of its principles to have taken the matter further. But I am bold enough to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is in this part of the report that may be found the real and lasting fruits of the committee's efforts. If out of the experience of the committee we serve to stiffen the resolution of this house not to spend its energies in pursuing synthetic points of privilege, then the committee will have been proved a useful instrument.

In the peculiar and special circumstances of this case I would be doing a great injustice to hon. members on both sides of the house if I were to let the matter rest there. It is within the knowledge of the house that on April 28 the right hon. Prime Minister rose in this house and categorically denied that there was any truth in this allegation. I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that all reasonable and fair minded members on both sides of the house will agree that the Prime Minister's denial was an unanswerable reply to a contrary suggestion. It would be contrary, however, to the canons of decency and fair play if I did not also bring to your attention the fact that the hon. member for Labelle, while he denied that he was the original author of the allegation, at least was frank enough to concede that he did not suggest there was any truth in the allegation. The hon. member for York-Scarborough, while he also entered a personal disclaimer as to the authorship of this allegation, also stated—and was joined by the national organizer of the Liberal party—that there was no truth in this suggestion.

Whatever may be the fate of this motion, Mr. Speaker, at least I am entitled to claim that before the committee not one word was subtracted from the statement the Prime Minister made in this house on April 28.

I come for a brief moment to another matter that excited some difference of opinion within the committee, when the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire), as was his right, in a somewhat aggressive and hostile fashion took exception to the suggestion that the committee should terminate its hearings upon the evidence of only three witnesses. However, the contrary point of view put forth by the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Fisher) carried conviction to the mind of the committee and eventually commanded its assent. I can do no better than to borrow his words, which may be found on page 278 of the fourth volume of the minutes of proceedings and evidence of that committee:

> It is now obvious that we are almost certain to have the word of five persons against the word of one which, to a general attitude towards fair play, looks unsatisfactory to everyone; that is, five to one in terms of this question of whether or not there were enticements...I think we would be stupid to go much further in trying to nail this particular thing down. It seems to me that it is going to be a question of one man's word against five other men's word.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that I do not dissociate myself from those remarks. On the contrary, I fully and wholeheartedly approve.

I come now to my final observation, and I move on to more debatable grounds. The house is acutely aware that there was a violent collision between the evidence given under oath by the hon. member for Labelle on the one hand and that given under oath by the hon. member for York-Scarborough and the national organizer of the Liberal party on the other. I would be failing in my duty, Mr. Speaker, if I attempted to pass over in silence this conflict in the evidence. I candidly confess that if you viewed this antagonism through the spectacles of suspicion, in a spirit of hostility and mistrust, then it is open to the harshest construction and must lead to the most prejudicial conclusion. But the first principle of justice demands that we view this matter in the most favourable light. It is my humble submission that if we approach this problem in a reasonable manner, making reasonable conclusions and reasonable assumptions, then the knot of entangled evidence may be untied with honour and with freedom of conscience.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to disfigure my few remarks with egotism, but perhaps the house will allow me to say that I have spent

a large measure of my life within a court-room, and I do not find the circumstances now engaging the attention of the house particularly unusual. More than 100 years ago a great judge of the common law dealt with this problem in this language:

> It is a matter of frequent observation that persons dwelling for a long time on facts which they believe must have occurred come at last to persuade themselves that they do actually recollect the occurrences of circumstances which at first they only begin by believing must have happened. Without imputing anything like wilful and corrupt perjury to witnesses they often in truth bona fide believe that they have heard and remembered conversations which in truth never existed.

This was the language of Sir John Romilly, attorney general and solicitor general in Great Britain and a judge of the high court. It is no exaggeration to say that his judgment has been confirmed from that day until this moment. I am confident that the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Woolliams) out of his own experiences will confirm the authority which I have just cited. If he will allow me, I would adopt his words which he used before the committee and which are to be found at page 279 of the fourth volume of the committee report. They are as follows:

> Of course it is not unusual in any tribunal, whether it is a committee such as this where you call a witness, or a board or even a court, to find that witnesses differ. For example, it happens often in a court of law that one witness in a vehicle accident says he was on the right side of the road going in the one direction and another witness says he was on the other side going in another direction and all this happened on a 66 foot highway, and both of them have a head on collision almost at a standstill.

It should be borne in mind, Mr. Speaker, that these witnesses were asked to cast their minds back over a period of some two and a half months to recapture and reconstruct conversations and events which occurred at a time when no one thought they would ever be called into dispute.

I may reasonably anticipate, Mr. Speaker, that it will be said: "Put the law into action", but I can only answer that I can find no law to put into action. I do not say this to escape an unpleasant situation or for purposes of expediency, for if I felt otherwise I would not falter for one moment to oppose this report. May I say to the house that if we continue to bandy this report about it will become the cemetery for the good names and honourable reputations of innocent people. In my respectful submission the house can accept this report without mortgaging its conscience.

Let me say this and only this. Less than two years ago I came into this chamber for the first time believing it to be the highest court in the land. I came believing it was a court not only of legislation but a court of justice and of honour. It is in that firm belief that I now invite the house to accept the report in the spirit and the letter in which it was tabled.

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, my delay in rising was that I had assumed that the hon. member for Bow River was getting to his feet to participate in this stage of the debate.

Before going into the main object of my remarks on this report I think as one who served on the committee I would first of all like to pay a word of tribute to the acting chairman. I think that perhaps save for his somewhat impassioned speech this afternoon all of us were quite impressed with his impartiality and his desire to see that all the matters referred to the committee were thoroughly explored. We all felt he was serving in a very difficult position. I personally felt that he did a very competent job, and I think I speak for all members of the committee when I say that we were impressed by the manner in which he conducted himself while he was the acting chairman.

However, Mr. Speaker, I really could not let his remarks this afternoon pass without dealing in some manner with his statements in which he referred to the action of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. He said in his remarks that the member had turned loose certain allegations, and he talked about reputations being trampled into the ground.

Frankly I heard nothing which would indicate that, and I was hoping he would go on to tell us who was trampling reputations into the ground.

I do not think it is in any way reasonable to try to obscure the serious aspects of this committee report by attempting to assess any blame against the member for Winnipeg North Centre. I think it is significant that when he moved the motion to refer the hon. member for Labelle could hardly get to his feet quickly enough to second it, and the Prime Minister also was very anxious to second it. I think the house was convinced at that time that a prima facie case had been established, and the motion to send the matter to the committee was carried unanimously, without a dissenting vote. Therefore I think it is superficial to attempt to lay any sort of blame or otherwise upon the person who moved the motion.

However, Mr. Speaker, this was an interesting committee. It was both interesting and

dismaying, and it verged from the comical to the serious. The first lesson which it seems to me the house should learn is that generally speaking the committee on privileges and elections is not equipped in any way to deal with an issue of this kind. It was the first inquiry of which I had been a part where there were 29 prosecuting attorneys; where each member of the committee was free to go his own way, pursue his own investigation, ask any questions he wanted and endlessly repeat questions everybody else had asked.

I think it is significant that under the present set-up the committee is simply not equipped to do the job. There is no way for anybody to lead the questioning; therefore we spent days and days going over the same ground. The chairman's authority is far too limited in conducting such an inquiry and dealing with questions as they come forward, and there is a lack of any clearcut lines at all in an inquiry of this sort.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, we had all the initial manoeuvring that took hours and hours and hours. It took a very long time to even decide what we were there trying to decide. Everybody had a different interpretation of the point of privilege, and it was a considerable length of time before we had any idea what we were trying to adjudicate upon. A great amount of time was spent in discussion trying to decide the order of witnesses and then, of course, we had the farcical, circus-like atmosphere that surrounded the lack of French reporters to take down the proceedings.

I do not want to review the terms of reference. The hon. member for Brant-Haldimand has already done that. We were trying to decide whether the statement of the hon. member for Labelle raised a question of privilege, and in doing that the testimony of the witnesses, of course, as has been pointed out, varied enormously. In fact the only thing the witnesses really agreed upon was that they met together on two occasions, once in a restaurant in Hull and once in the office of the hon. member for York-Scarborough. Other than that there was virtually no agreement in precise terms as to what had happened, what had been discussed, what had been agreed upon, what had been offered and what had not been offered. It was much easier to find out by the process of elimination those items that were not discussed than to find out what had actually taken place between the parties. So the evidence on the surface really does seem to be diametrically opposed.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think anybody who has dealt with this sort of thing before realizes one or two things. First, the most untrustworthy witness of all is the human memory. It is extremely difficult for anybody to recite in precise detail conversations and verbal statements that took place several months ago. This is why we terrible lawyers insist upon contracts being reduced to written form, and why international meetings insist upon written communiqués. Once the meeting breaks up everybody's interpretation of what happened or what was said is probably quite different.

The other thing that I think it is important to understand in going through the hundreds of pages of evidence is that it is not just what is said at a meeting but also how it is said and the impression it gives. It is the interpretation that members take out of the words of other people who were present; and knowing Mr. Davey and how he can say things, I can see where some interpretation would be taken which might not be warranted.

However, Mr. Speaker, I think all one can do in these circumstances is to try to sift through the evidence, try to assess what really happened and then decide whether this does raise a problem of bribery or whether it does raise a question of privilege. I have tried to do this, and I hope in what I now say I will be fair to all parties concerned. After sifting the evidence and trying to reconcile the differences I think this is essentially what happened. I think the hon. member for Labelle decided that his political future was not very bright in the province of Quebec under the Social Credit party.

An hon. Member: Which group?

Mr. Scott: The group to which he belonged at the time. That was his decision to make, rightly or wrongly. I think the hon. member then began to look for another home. He told us that his organizers in his riding instructed him it was their wish that he become a Conservative, and I think his own background led him in that direction as well. I think he then met these members quite by accident and communicated his decision to leave the Social Credit party and his desire and inclination to join the Progressive Conservative party.

Something he said or the way in which he said it led these members to believe that he was not of a firm mind. Consequently, with

his consent or certainly without his objection, telephone calls were made and a meeting was arranged with Mr. Davey. Again, I think a similar procedure followed at the meeting. The hon. member for Labelle said he only went to the meeting to please his friends. His friends said that the fact he went to the meeting led them to believe that his mind was not made up.

Who is to say who is right in circumstances like that? Again, at the meeting at which Mr. Davey was present there was a great deal of discussion about a flag and about some other things, but memories are very vague as to who said what and what took place. Again I say that in the circumstances, reading the evidence and trying to correlate it, obviously something that the member for Labelle said or the way in which he said it indicated that he was prepared to listen. Things were said to him about joining the Liberal party or what he might expect or what his position would be, and either at that conversation or at some other time he was led to believe that certain things would be available to him in the event that he joined this party. He himself admitted that he expected future meetings at which he would be consulted with regard to whether he had pondered these proposals.

I know you cannot reconcile all the evidence, but looking at it as a whole it is pretty clear there was a discussion, and there were to be subsequent meetings. It is significant that after negotiations broke down the member for Labelle then approached the Progressive Conservative party and announced his intention to join. I do not believe the facts are really very much in dispute. I do not think anyone would quarrel with that and, speaking again for myself, I do not see anything particularly sinister in that sort of thing taking place.

But, Mr. Speaker, is there anything we can learn from this whole sad affair? I want to suggest six things that I think might be of some benefit to us in the future. The first one I have already mentioned, namely that the committee on privileges and elections is not equipped and should not be expected to try to judge between the accuracy of the memories of various members of parliament with respect to verbal statements and discussions that took place at meetings months before. It is difficult enough for an impartial judiciary to make decisions of that kind on verbal evidence, much less to turn over such a matter to a political committee that is charged with all the partisan by-play that took place on the occasion in question.

Second, I am satisfied that there was no evidence of bribery disclosed. Certainly the member for Labelle never considered he had been bribed. Certainly the essence of bribery is the offer of something to corrupt. There was no evidence that anything had been offered to corrupt. Therefore I believe that bribery clearly is out.

The really sad aspect of the whole affair to me was the degree to which it showed how the two major political parties approached this matter. There was no discussion with the hon. member as to whether he believed in the principles of the Liberal party. There was no evidence that the program and principles of the Liberal party were even laid before the member so he could decide. All they talked about was nominating him and getting him re-elected; how the chances would be. Really, all they were after was another body on that side of the house.

To me it is a sad reflection on the way in which the Liberal party approached this whole matter. They were not interested in the philosophy or the principles of this gentleman in question. They never asked him whether he believed in the Liberal party. They just wanted somebody to go on that side of the house. I believe that is a sad commentary on the way in which this episode was conducted.

The chairman's ruling, of course, prevented us from going into the very interesting field of the negotiations which may have taken place on his entry into the Conservative party. Many members of the committee were anxious to explore this interesting aspect of the question. It was felt it was not germane; therefore we did not go into it.

The next thing is that I do not believe parliament should be asked to decide upon what are essentially political party matters. The occasion in question here was really something within the frame work of the political parties themselves. It never got beyond the vague organizing stage. I do not believe parliament should be getting to the point where we are mixing into the general political activities of parties. In many ways we try not to recognize parties as such in the house. All the members here have duties and responsibilities to their electors and to the country that vastly transcend any party partisan considerations.

I feel that one of the troubles here, therefore, was that this whole matter should have been dealt with on the party level. If Mr.

Davey was to have been reprimanded, he should have been reprimanded by the Liberal party. This affair should never have reached the point where we as parliamentarians were wallowing around in a party mix-up that took place outside of the house.

Then I do not believe there is any point in referring this matter back to the committee for further discussion. I do not believe there is any way in which we could make a finding that would be of any greater help than the one we have made. There is no point, either in referring this, as I understand my friends in the Ralliement Créditiste intend to move, to the attorney general for consideration of perjury charges. There is clearly no evidence of perjury here. It would be taking outside the authority of parliament control over its own affairs, and this is something for which parliament has fought for generations. If any action should be taken, it should be taken by the house itself as has been done on other occasions.

As I have said, the only unpleasant aspect of the affair to me was the approach taken in which there was no real concern or discussion of the principles involved. Perhaps this is because there is not any real difference between the two major parties; I do not know. Certainly in my opinion this is the only real, sad aspect of the whole sad affair.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Robert Beaulé (Quebec East): Mr. Speaker, first, I should like to congratulate the hon. member for Brant-Haldimand for the manner in which he performed his duties as acting chairman of the committee on privileges and elections.

However, while several members of the committee were present, we objected to the adoption of the report, and that for a number of reasons.

First of all, some people seem prepared to sit on the fence. The hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Scott) has just said that the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Girouard) was not sure he was going to join the Conservative party, while, on the contrary, the hon. member himself is reported as stating he was determined, even before the meeting, to do so. That is why the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) seems to be blamed for rising on a question of privilege, when at that time everyone agreed.

But to discuss objectively the meetings of the committee on privileges and elections, we must keep to the statement made by the hon. member for Labelle and the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

Therefore, we must go back to April 27. Now, at page 2583 of *Hansard* for that date we read this:

> Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. Last Friday, as reported on page 2538 of *Hansard*, the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Béchard) interrupted the debate to insinuate that my recent decision was due to political bargaining on my part.
>
> The remark of the hon. member for Bonaventure could have passed for a joke, but the hon. member forgot that wit is the mother of humour.
>
> I shall therefore take a few minutes in order to clear myself from the charge made against my integrity by the hon. member for Bonaventure. At the risk of disappointing members of the press gallery, I have decided not to mention the dates, places and names of certain Liberal members involved, because I refuse to become an accomplice of the chief Liberal organizer who would have allowed me to reflect on the political reputation of certain friends whose only mistake was to show their sincerity in this matter.
>
> About two months ago, I met publicly four Liberal members in Hull. In reply to one of their questions concerning my political future, I said that I was quite decided to join the ranks of the Conservative party.

That is a clear indication that even before the sittings of the committee on privileges and elections, he was quite decided to join the Conservative party, even if he did not know at that time that he would be accepted by that party. I resume my reading:

> At that very moment a Liberal member got up to make a phone call. When he returned to our table, he strongly insisted that I take no decision without having met Keith Davey, the chief Liberal organizer.
>
> I replied that my decision was final, that the organizers of my riding wanted me to be a Conservative and that such a meeting would probably be useless.
>
> However, urged by my colleagues, I agreed to receive in my office—you understand, in my office—

I emphasize these words:

> —the power behind the Liberal party. Another telephone call from a member of parliament and the meeting was set for the next morning. At eleven o'clock, the next morning—

I skip a few lines and I come here to the discussion which happened in the office.

> —but my first words to Mr. Davey were to confirm my intention of joining the Conservative party. I told him that if I had come to the meeting, it was only to please my friends.

Therefore, I understand that the hon. member for Danforth knew that the hon. member for Labelle was then well-intentioned.

> —if I had come to the meeting, it was only to please my friends.

There was then an animated discussion and the following benefits were outlined:

The benefits: a party in power and a fat electoral fund for the next election.

A week later, a Liberal member of parliament belonging to that same group approached me to tell me that he was very sorry but the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) had asked his chief organizer to cease all pressure because he, the Prime Minister, was sure to lose the regular support of the Social Credit party if he ever stole members from that party.

Mr. Speaker, I have never asked to join the ranks of the Liberal party and, as far as I know, none of my former colleagues have ever made such a request either.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, the following day, April 28, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre rose on a question of privilege, as reported at page 2645 of *Hansard* for April 28, and I quote:

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. My question of privilege relates to the fact that this house has been insulted in one way or another, if not in two ways. The basis for my statement is to be found in the remarks, under a question of privilege, that were made yesterday by the hon. member for Labelle. There are two aspects of that statement on which I found my question of privilege today. I shall come to each of them in a moment.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, may I draw your attention to standing order 79, which reads as follows:

The offer of any money or other advantage to any member of this house for the promoting of any matter whatsoever depending or to be transacted in parliament, is a high crime and misdemeanor, and tends to the subversion of the constitution.

I should like also to draw Your Honour's attention to citation 108, paragraph 5 of Beauchesne's fourth edition, which reads as follows:

The offer of a bribe in order to influence a member in any of the proceedings of the house, or of a committee, has been treated as a breach of privilege, being an insult not only to the member himself, but to the house.

It is the language of that citation that prompted me, in my opening words, to say it is the house that has been insulted. I should like also to draw your attention to section 100 of the Criminal Code of Canada. I shall not read all the section because all of it is not relevant, but I shall read the relevant portion:

Everyone who gives or offers corruptly to a person who holds a judicial office, or is a member of the parliament of Canada or of a legislature, any money, valuable consideration, office, place or 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 fourteen years.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre refers to the statement by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Girouard):

Mr. Davey was rather suggesting at that moment that I join the ranks of the Liberal party. He said he would take care of the defeated Liberal candidate and as for unsatisfied Liberal organizers, I only would have to change them.

[Mr. Beaulé.]

The benefits: a party in power and a fat electoral fund for the next election.

Mr. Speaker, it was on that ground that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre asked that the whole question be referred to the committee on privileges and elections.

—the member for Labelle has alleged in this house that he was offered a bribe, that he was offered certain advantages if he would take a certain position in this House of Commons. If that fact is true it is contrary to standing order 79 which I read, to citation 108, paragraph 5 and to section 100 of the Criminal Code.

If this has happened I say it is an insult not just to the hon. member for Labelle but it is an insult to this House of Commons. It is a breach of the privileges of this House of Commons, and the matter certainly ought to be investigated by this house through its committee on privileges and elections.

However, Mr. Speaker, if what the hon. member for Labelle said about things that happened outside this chamber is not true, or even if what he said is true, there is something else in what the hon. member said yesterday which gives offence to this house. It is an insult to one of the members of the house, and therefore is an insult to the house itself. I refer to the very next paragraph in the hon. member's statement, right after the ones I read a moment ago. That next paragraph reads as follows, on the same page 2583 of the English version of yesterday's *Hansard*:

A week later, a Liberal member of parliament belonging to that same group approached me to tell me that he was very sorry but the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) had asked his chief organizer to cease all pressure because he, the Prime Minister, was sure to lose the regular support of the Social Credit party if he ever stole members from that party.

Thereupon, Mr. Speaker, we met in committee on privileges and elections to discuss the statement made by the hon. member for Labelle. We cannot give evidence on what was said or what was not said because, as the members of the committee know, the witnesses were under oath but the testimonies were diametrically opposed.

That is why it is my duty to report these facts to the house.

As can be seen in No. 1, page 58, the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Fisher) asked the following question:

Mr. Fisher: In English, your statement in the house included this: The benefits: a party in power and a fat electoral fund for the next election.

Was that the sum of what Mr. Davey put to you? Were there other people there expressing the same attractions?

Mr. Girouard: No one else has made this accusation except Mr. Davey.

Mr. Fisher: Mr. Davey, to your mind, offered you the benefits of the party in power. Did he elaborate on that?

Mr. Girouard: Yes, up to a certain point. Only it was the main idea.

Mr. Fisher: Can you tell us just what these benefits were?

Mr. Girouard: You ask me what the advantages were. That is exactly what I said:

A party in power, a fat electoral fund.

And a little further:

Mr. Fisher: All right. I will turn to the next question which seems to me to be fundamental in this, and that is the question of:

A week later, a Liberal member of parliament belonging to that same group approached me to tell me that he was very sorry but the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) had asked his chief organizer to cease all pressure because he, the Prime Minister, was sure to lose the regular support of the Social Credit party if he ever stole members from that party.

Who was that member of parliament?

Mr. Girouard: A most sincere member of the Liberal party, the member for York-Scarborough.

Mr. Fisher: You have nothing to add at all to the thought which would in any way change the meaning of that?

In other words, so far as you are concerned you were clearly told this by the member from York-Scarborough. There was no confusion in your mind?

Mr. Girouard: I was told what was said.

Mr. Fisher: Did you do anything at all to check into the statement, I mean with your own party, that is, your party at that time, the Social Credit party?

Mr. Girouard: That question is out of order, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting Chairman: No, no. What was the question again?

Mr. Fisher: Did you do anything at that time, after receiving this information from Mr. Moreau, to see whether there had been any repercussion with the Social Credit party in connection with the matter?

Mr. Girouard: I did not say it.

The Acting Chairman: Are you prepared to answer?

Mr. Girouard: No, I did not say it. I think it is out of order.

And further on, here is the reply given to a question asked by the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Woolliams):

Mr. Woolliams: In respect of anything Mr. Keith Davey said at anytime, were you induced to join the Liberal party?

Mr. Girouard: If the word "inducement" means to tempt, to attract, yes; if it were to mean "bribe", the answer is no.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we take Mr. Moreau's testimony in No. 3, page 201, when he offers his argument before being questioned, here is what we read:

About two months ago, I met publicly four Liberal members in Hull. In reply to one of their questions concerning my political future, I replied that I was quite decided to join the ranks of the Conservative party. At the very moment a Liberal member got up to make a phone call. When he returned to our table, he strongly insisted that I take no decision without having met Keith Davey, the chief Liberal organizer.

I should just like to put on the record the fact that the matter of calling Mr. Davey had been discussed for approximately half and hour and that I made the telephone call with his full knowledge and consent, and I would not have called Mr. Davey had I not felt that he was indeed very interested in exploring the possibility of joining the Liberal party.

And further on, Mr. Moreau said:

I should like to review my recollection of the events that led to the phone call.

As I stated earlier, I offered to phone Mr. Davey if he wished me to and with his full knowledge and consent I made the telephone call. I called Mr. Davey about 10.30 on the night of the 17th—

Here I leave out a few lines and come back to where he himself said:

I returned to the table and reported to Mr. Girouard that Mr. Davey was prepared to talk to him and at this point of the discussion, Mr. Girouard said he did not want to go to the national Liberal party's office. We did discuss where we might meet. Mr. Girouard's office was ruled out for the same reason, that it was not wise. Mr. Girouard certainly did not want to be seen in the national Liberal federation office and it seemed that the same objection applied as far as Mr. Davey going to his office. It was agreed that we would meet in Mr. Macaluso's office which is quite near Mr. Girouard's office in the west block.

At this point I shall leave out some of the text to come back to the talk which took place in Mr. Macaluso's office.

During the earlier part of the meeting, a discussion about the flag issue arose. Mr. Girouard was quite concerned about what the Liberal party's decision on a distinctive national flag was. We reaffirmed, or indicated to him, that we were sure that our party was committed and we certainly all were committed to a distinctive national flag. Mr. Macaluso then returned to his office and got a letter which our whip has sent out indicating that this was the reply to flag letters that the P.M. was sending out.

At this stage, Mr. Speaker, I will leave out a few further paragraphs to come to a statement of the hon. member for York-Scarborough, who said:

I then felt that I should report this to Mr. Girouard, and I did. I would like to refer again to something in his statement of April 7 in which he said:

A week later, a Liberal member of parliament belonging to that same group—

—and later he identified that member of parliament as me—approached me to tell me that he was very sorry but the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) had asked his chief organizer to cease all pressure because he, the Prime Minister, was sure to lose the regular support of the Social Credit party if he ever stole members from that party. I have no such information. I did not make that statement to Mr. Girouard. It is my recollection that Mr. Girouard said to me on hearing the report that the reaction in Quebec had not bee particularly favourable, "Oh, well, I knew it would never come off anyway", and again for the reason that the Prime Minister would be afraid

to lose the support of the Social Credit party. I did not make that statement.

And at that moment the hon. member for Danforth asked the following question:

Mr. Chairman, as one of Mr. Moreau's constituents I have a couple of questions to ask.

Can you tell us if there were any discussions with Mr. Girouard about this matter before you actually met in Hull?

Mr. Moreau: I had a number of meetings with Mr. Girouard. I met him first at the privileges and elections committee meetings last session; he was a member of that committee. Mr. Girouard's office was very near to mine and on a number of occasions we discussed a very large number of matters. I was perhaps aware prior to the adjournment of the house at Christmas that Mr. Girouard was less than happy with his present state, but I do not think that any discussion specifically regarding his movement from one party to another had taken place. I do not know if that is a relevant matter to this in any case.

Mr. Nielsen: The answer is no, then?

Mr. Moreau: I should like to add something to my statement. I am sorry, Mr. Scott, that I left something out of my statement which is a very important point, as I am sure the committee will appreciate. I did not deal with the matter of the benefits of the party in power and a "fat electoral fund" at the next election.

I would like to elaborate and to deny categorically that any mention of campaign funds or the party in power was made in my office.

Mr. Rhéaume: By yourself?

Mr. Moreau: By anyone.

Mr. Scott: Are you referring to the meeting between Mr. Davey and the four other members when you say that?

Mr. Moreau: Yes.

Mr. Scott: You were present throughout all that time?

Mr. Moreau: I was present throughout.

Mr. Scott: Do you say, Mr. Moreau, that Mr. Davey never offered any campaign funds?

Mr. Moreau: The subject of campaign funds was never brought up.

Mr. Speaker, as recorded on page 206, the hon. member for Danforth asked the following question:

Mr. Scott: I do not want to repeat this, but from what you have told us you are saying that at no time did anybody mention campaign funds, fat campaign funds, or words of that kind.

Mr. Moreau: I deny that they were mentioned in any way at any time in my office that morning or the night before in Hull.

Further on, we read this:

Mr. Scott: Do you realize your evidence places us in a very, very difficult position. I want to be sure you are absolutely firm in your own mind on this point.

Mr. Moreau: I am very firm and I have thought about it a great deal.

Further on the hon. member for Danforth asked the following question:

[Mr. Beaulé.]

Mr. Scott: At the meeting ten days later, Mr. Girouard has told us—and we have heard his testimony—that you were the member who told him that the discussion had been called off because of something Mr. Pearson had said.

[*Text*]

Mr. Scott: On a point of order, I wish to correct the hon. member. I did not say the testimony of the hon. member for York-Scarborough placed him in a difficult position. I said it placed the committee in a difficult position. I think this should be on the record.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Beaulé: I continue to read, Mr. Speaker:

Mr. Moreau: I would like to add another thing to my statement:

Mr. Speaker, in his statement, the hon. member for York-Scarborough declares that he is not the one who stated that the Prime Minister would lose the support of the Social Credit, but the hon. member for Labelle.

I would now like to quote an extract of the evidence given by Mr. Keith Davey.

As can be seen on page 300 of No. 4, Mr. Davey said:

The only thing I want to say, Mr. Chairman, is that at no time in the meeting was there any discussion of money or campaign funds of any kind. I made no reference to a "fat electoral fund" for the next election; nor did I say that I would "take care of the defeated Liberal candidate"; nor did I say that "as for unsatisfied Liberal organizers" I would only have to change them. I did not use the phrase "The benefits: a party in power."

This is a summary of what took place during the sittings of the committee on privileges and elections which was instructed to study the question moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. If we concur in the report, as we are asked to, this would mean that the hon. member for Labelle may have or may not have told the truth, because at that moment the question of privilege was raised in regard to an attempt of bribery by offering the benefits of a party in power and "a fat electoral fund".

On the other hand, if we come to the conclusion that these statements were not made, then it means that the house has been misled by the hon. member for Labelle and that there must have been some untruths somewhere, especially if the hon. member for York-Scarborough and Mr. Keith Davey told the truth.

If the house concurs in the report, it will recognize that the statement of the hon. member for Labelle is not truthful.

In view of the contradictory evidence given before the committee on privileges and elections, I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire):

That the report of the committee on privileges and elections be not concurred in now, but that it be referred back to that committee on privileges and elections and that the said committee recommend to the house, in view of the apparent contradiction of the sworn statements, to have the record of evidence examined by the attorney general of Ontario, leaving it to him to take the necessary action or to make the appropriate decisions.

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order. Had the proposed amendment merely referred to the question whether this report should be sent to the attorney general of Ontario it would not, in my opinion, have been acceptable. However, the proposed amendment is to the effect that the report of the committee on privileges and elections be not now concurred in but that it be referred back to that committee to be dealt with as the committee may see fit and proper. I will, therefore, accept the amendment as proposed.

The question is on the amendment.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words about the amendment.

One fact seems obvious. On the face of it, it seems here as it seemed in committee that the two old parties have suddenly agreed to forget the whole business. There seems to be something which is rather smelly on the Conservative side and things do not smell any better on the Liberal side, considering the tentative accusations which were levelled at the Prime Minister.

In such a case, as it happened in the past and as it is bound to happen again, for the two old parties are pretty much of the same origin, they agree that it is better to forget the whole thing.

But one thing remains: this matter involves a bribery attempt. Was there an attempt or was there not?

The hon. member for Labelle rises and says: I was offered the benefits of a party in office and a substantial election fund.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre rises and says: If he has been offered that, the matter must be referred for consideration to the committee on privileges and elections because in such a case, there would have been a breach of the privileges of the hon. member for Labelle in the attempt to bribe him.

Now, the hon. member for Brant-Haldimand claims that there has been no bribery attempt.

But according to the minutes of the committee in question the hon. member for Labelle himself would have stated: It was tempting. That was like the worm used to bait the hook: It is tempting and the fish bites. Sometimes the fish does not bite because the bait is withdrawn too soon. That is somewhat what happened when the hon. member for York-Scarborough said to the hon. member for Labelle, according to his testimony: I am sorry but the deal is off; the Liberals do not want you.

But the hon. member for Labelle himself says: It was tempting.

He was offered the bait but it was withdrawn too soon. Since he could not bite, he went to another party.

The organizer of the Liberal party says: He asked us to take him but we rejected him.

The hon. member for Labelle says: No, they offered me election funds and the advantages of a party in office.

And yet it was stated that there had been no bribery attempt. Mr. Speaker, what is a bribery attempt if it is not to offer to an hon. member the advantages of the political party in power? Look in the report of the committee on privileges and elections where the question was asked on many occasions. What is the meaning of the advantages of a political party in power? The hon. member of Labelle did not say what they were, but everyone knows what it is all about. All the Liberals who are now in power and the Conservatives who held office previously know that patronage is involved. We have had examples of that with the lists of the Post Office Department: It is an advantage held by the party in power.

A fat electoral fund? It was tempting for a member of parliament who, without funds, would never be elected, but with a fat electoral fund—and I would like to point out to the leader of the Liberal party that it will have to be a fat one—

Mr. Martineau: Mr. Speaker, may I put a question—

Mr. Grégoire: It will take a lot of money to have him elected.

Mr. Martineau: May I put a question to the hon. member?

I would like to ask the hon. member whether he or his party are trying to assume office?

Mr. Caouette: In your case, definitely.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I would tell the hon. member for Pontiac-Témiscamingue that if, at the last election, I had been elected by a majority of only one vote, I would abandon any thought of winning back my constituency. A one-vote majority is nothing to brag about and holds not too much hope for the future.

Mr. Speaker, it was nevertheless an attempt at bribery. If one reads the report of the committee on privileges and elections, one sees that the hon. member for Labelle stated clearly that it was tempting. He admitted that it was tempting.

And there are people who would try and make us believe that there was no attempt at bribery. Mr. Speaker, we are not so naïve. If there are some who want to be naïve it is up to them.

Mr. Speaker, another problem was raised, and rightly so, by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

[*Text*]

Mr. Churchill: Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Grégoire: Certainly.

Mr. Churchill: I am wondering whether the hon. member is keeping a close watch on the time. Should he not be making preparations for his trip to Copenhagen?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that, realizing how stupid the Conservatives were on the flag issue, I said to myself: I am leaving. And when I was asked when I would come back, I said: when the Conservatives are through talking about the flag. Indeed, I think every intelligent person ought to let them speak by themselves, alone in this house, and go as far away as possible. I do hope that with the Atlantic ocean between me and the meaningless speeches of the Conservatives, I shall be rid of them.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad also, since the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) is raising this problem, to go and take part in this international meeting of parliamentarians. I do feel that I have to get some experience and I have no hesitation in saying that, in my opinion, the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre as well as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre have studied parliamentary procedure and are qualified in that field.

I am pleased to commend the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre for his competence as a parliamentarian. If I go to Copenhagen it is precisely in order to become as competent as he is and to be able to compete with him when we shall sit on the other side of the house.

Believe me, Mr. Speaker, this is not a bribery attempt on my part in order to get the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre to cross over to our side.

A further interesting point in all this is that the hon. member for Brant-Haldimand suggested it was not up to the committee to determine who was right or who was wrong.

Now, an accusation was lodged against the right hon. Prime Minister.

I heard the charge when the hon. member for Labelle said: the hon. member for York-Scarborough told me that the Prime Minister had allegedly mentioned to the Liberal national organizer that he was afraid that he would lose the support of the Social Credit party.

It reminds me of the man who had been listening to every Tom, Dick and Harry. You do not know where the truth lies.

But the hon. member for Labelle jotted all that down and then repeated it in the House of Commons, thus insulting the right hon. Prime Minister, as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre stated.

I appreciate that the Prime Minister denied it, but the hon. member for Labelle maintained his statement.

It is said that in the House of Commons, we must accept the word of an hon. member. Now, the hon. member for Labelle said one thing, and the Prime Minister said exactly the opposite. Where is the truth? It is rather difficult to know under those circumstances, and the truth should always be obvious.

As far as I am concerned, in view of the language used by the hon. member for Labelle, I cannot hesitate in believing the statement made by the Prime Minister. But since the matter was sent to the committee on privileges and elections, I think that the committee should have come to a clear conclusion instead of coming out with a most indefinite one.

Mr. Speaker, the matter was brought to a stop while under way. All witnesses were not heard. I heard some of my good Liberal friends say: It is better not to hear the four Liberal members, because inconsistencies might come out.

Frankly, I admit that it left a bitter taste in my mouth to know that not only the Tories and Grits would contradict each other, but that the four Liberal members would do so too.

Therefore, a most vague and general conclusion is brought forward, which does not compromise anybody, in spite of the accusations that were made.

And we have the hon. member for Port Arthur rising in the committee to move a resolution according to which there was no question of privilege involved, after the same hon. member had on many occasions repeated before the committee that the chief organizer of the Liberal party, Mr. Davey, was one of his personal friends. After soft-sawdering the Liberal party organizer, the hon. member for Port Arthur is the first to suggest that the whole thing be forgotten as soon as possible.

But what is more important and more serious—and I speak more especially of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Quebec East—is that the latter pointed out glaring contradictions in statements made under oath.

We do not want to hear: It is because we had forgotten. It is obvious that if the hon. member for Labelle states that he was offered an electoral fund, he remembers that well because last time he did not have any and, moreover, he would need one for the next time.

The national organizer for the Liberal party and the hon. member for York-Scarborough say: We never offered him an electoral fund. So, on the one hand, it is maintained that he was never offered one while on the other, he maintained that he was offered one.

On seven specific points the statements of two members are diametrically opposed, although they were under oath.

A newspaperman said: These can be called "apparent sworn contradictions" but in plain language this is called perjury. The members of the House of Commons are also here to set an example for the Canadian people. If a Canadian citizen perjures himself, he is condemned to prison; he is liable to prison under the Criminal Code. This section of the law dealing with perjury has been passed by the House of Commons. If there is some doubt as to a sworn statement made by a person, he will be prosecuted before the courts.

This is done in the case of high ranking persons, even in our judicial system. But anybody is considered innocent as long as he is not proven guilty by the courts.

When an ordinary citizen is involved, there is, at least, a charge laid against him, followed by an investigation and prosecution. But is there any difference when an hon. member is involved, who has to behave properly, or at least observe the law as passed by the House of Commons?

When a member of the House of Commons is involved I think that it is perhaps neither more nor less serious, but it is nevertheless as serious as when an ordinary Canadian citizen is implicated.

There is an example to be set. Shall we begin to observe the law ourselves or shall we violate it without having to bear the consequences?

A while ago the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Scott) said that the House of Commons —and not the attorney general of the province—would thus be authorized to render judgment upon its members. But will any member of the house, Liberal as well as Conservative, feel himself qualified to judge any action of his peers, when, from the first, he is imbued with partisan politics and will ask for nothing better than to deal in the worst possible way with a political opponent and do all he can for a friend?

To my mind hon. members in this house are not qualified to act in this way, but it is rather up to the judiciary to render judgment in such cases.

That is why we say that parliament should not ask the committee on privileges and elections to state that the hon. member concerned has committed perjury, but that everything be put in the hands of the competent authorities, that is, of the attorney general of Ontario so that the latter could proceed with an inquiry, go over the evidence and call in witnesses, after which he might render a decision himself without being politically involved like the members of the House of Commons would be.

It is true that parliament should as much as possible seek to direct its own affairs, as the hon. member for Danforth said, but in a case like this, parliament would be neither impartial nor objective, nor able to decide. Under the circumstances, the case should be left in the hands of competent and impartial authorities, that is, the judiciary.

Indeed, perjury in itself is not under parliamentary jurisdiction, but should be dealt with under the Criminal Code and the judicial system which, alone, have the necessary competence to render a decision with regard to perjury.

If there has been perjury, it did not happen in the house, but in committee. Then, the members involved accepted, of their own free will, to give up their privilege and testify under oath; they knew very well what to expect in so doing.

In my opinion, the situation at the present time is obvious. Throughout the country people have been informed of what transpired before the committee.

I have not the least intention to say who committed perjury. This is not my problem; it is not up to me to say. It is not up to us either. But it is incumbent upon us to point out the facts which took place. We do not want to decide by ourselves which one is guilty, and to what extent, but we believe that the House of Commons would fare better in the opinion of the public if the committee on privileges and elections were instructed by the house to leave the whole thing to the persons qualified to judge such cases. Then, people may have a better opinion of their representatives.

We are judging nobody, we are only asking that the facts be clarified to the satisfaction of each and everyone, and this not through prejudiced people, but through impartial people, whose task, entrusted to them by the parliament of Canada, is to see to it that the Criminal Code, and even the sections concerning perjury, passed by the parliament of Canada, be respected.

I am appealing to the members of the house, not with prejudice, since we shall have nothing to say then, but in an impartial way, so that parliamentary legislation, the reputation of the members and also the accuracy of the facts may be respected.

Mr. Gérard Chapdelaine (Sherbrooke): Mr. Speaker, since it is I who put before the committee on privileges and elections the motion to the effect that there had been no attempt at bribery and that the matter should be referred to the house for concurrence, I should like to say a few words first to assure the house that we agree on the report submitted to the house, because the question which was referred to the committee on privileges and elections was to inquire whether there had been any attempt at bribery.

Now, the evidence given before the committee on privileges and elections led us all to believe that there was no attempt at bribery and, in my opinion, the majority of members are satisfied with this report concerning this aspect of the question.

The problem raised by the Ralliement Créditiste is not to know whether or not there was any attempt at bribery, but rather if there was perjury.

An hon. Member: Both.

[Mr. Grégoire.]

Mr. Chapdelaine: Now, whether or not there was perjury is not a question which should be discussed by the committee on privileges and elections.

What strikes me most, Mr. Speaker, is that the members of the Ralliement Créditiste tried by all possible means to get an individual at the committee on privileges and elections and when they could not succeed and when they realized that the committee had no authority to grant their wish they now resort to another means, namely the introduction of an amendment, so that the whole thing would be referred again to the committee on privileges and elections, in order to examine and inquire whether or not there was perjury.

In my opinion, this reason or this attitude on the part of the members of the Ralliement Créditiste is easy to explain. First, I feel that it is merely a vicious revenge against an individual who refused to follow the policy of the Ralliement Créditiste because its members diassociated themselves from the national Social Credit party.

I do not think such an attitude could inspire noble motives of justice because usually, for those people, it is completely beyond their capacity to render an equitable judgment on a decision of the committee on privileges and elections—

Mr. Caouette: You pass such good judgment.

Mr. Chapdelaine: All were agreed in the house and also in the committee that there was no attempt at bribery, except the members of the Ralliement Créditiste who actually remind me of that mother who, seeing the regiment going by, said that only her son was in step.

What amazes me even more, Mr. Speaker, is that suddenly they have such a craving for justice concerning a few members of the house while, generally, we all agree that there was no breach of the privileges of the house.

If some member of the house feels aggrieved by the stand taken by the committee on privileges and elections, I suggest that he lodge a personal complaint which he will have to prove.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. To date, we tried to stick to the subject matter of the motion now before the house. We did not blame any political party, but rather we asked that the case be judged not by us but by someone else.

I do not think that the hon. member for Sherbrooke, who attended very few sittings of the committee on privileges and elections, is in a position to discuss what happened, because he is completely beside the point.

Mr. Chapdelaine: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I think that even if I did not attend all the sittings of the committee, I can read and am able to find out what happened. Besides, I attended one sitting and I noted that the members of the Ralliement Créditiste were filibustering and were out to get a certain individual. I could see that they wanted to wreak vengeance on a former colleague.

After hearing all the evidence in order to decide whether there was an attempt at bribery, we came to the conclusion that there was none. It was then that the hon. member for Lapointe, who wanted the committee to lay a charge of perjury—

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. What the hon. member for Sherbrooke said—

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Chair has been quite lenient, especially on the rule of relevancy, in the hope that we can get on with the business before the house. Is the house ready for the question?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Grégoire: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, about what the hon. member for Sherbrooke has just said to the effect that we wanted to bring an accusation of perjury. I want to say that the hon. member for Sherbrooke lied because the motion at that time was to refer everything to the attorney general of Ontario in order to decide who had lied to the committee and not to judge that question ourselves.

The hon. member for Sherbrooke is distorting the facts and he lies shamelessly to the house. If he had been present at the committee, he would have realized that the motion was to the contrary.

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order. I would ask all hon. members to restrict themselves to the amendment before the house. Is the hon. member for Sherbrooke finished?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chapdelaine: No, Mr. Speaker. On the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Lapointe, I have just been accused of distorting the facts. All hon. members who attended the committee meetings surely realized that the aim of the hon. member for Lapointe was to have a charge of perjury brought against one or the other of the members who had testified before the committee. I do not think I lied to the house when all I did was to report the facts which took place at that meeting of the committee on privileges and elections.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to say I am satisfied with the report submitted by the committee and that, in my view, the amendment is not in order inasmuch as those who want to bring charges should do so under their own names and not on behalf of the whole Canadian government.

[*Text*]

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise to say just a word or two on the amendment, but I rise also for another purpose which I will indicate in a moment. For the reasons that were stated by my colleague the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Scott) even before the amendment was moved, we do not feel that the house would be well advised to accept this amendment to refer this matter back again to the committee on privileges and elections. We think that committee has had enough of it, and we are not satisfied that enough of the ingredients of perjury are before us to support this kind of motion. There is also the question whether we want to delegate to the attorney general of a province a measure of authority over what goes on on parliament hill. Surely we should look after these things ourselves.

However, Mr. Speaker, I rose also at this point because now that an amendment has been moved the hon. member for Brant-Haldimand can speak again. Quite seriously I invite him to do so, because I believe that in his initial statement he registered implications that he would not want to have stand, being the fair minded person that this house has acclaimed him to be. He referred in his opening remarks to my part in moving the original motion on the 28th of April, and during the course of his remarks he used the phrase "synthetic point of privilege" and he suggested at one point that I raised it out of a misunderstanding of what was involved in a point of privilege. There seemed to be a suggestion that the whole mess we have gone through is somehow to be laid at my door. May I suggest, and I suggest this very seriously to the house, that if no account had been taken by the House of Commons of the remarks that were placed on the record

on the 27th of April by the hon. member for Labelle we would have been derelict in our duty. Furthermore, when I raised my point of privilege on the 28th of April there was competition in the house to second my motion. I indicated that my leader was prepared to second it, but the hon. member for Labelle was on his feet asking to second it, and the Prime Minister offered to second it. When you, sir, later put the motion and started to name the Prime Minister as the seconder several Conservative members protested and said no, it was the member for Labelle who should have the right to second it.

The house supported the motion unanimously, which is a clear suggestion that the house felt at that time that whatever the committee on privileges and elections might do, it should look into the matter. I am prepared to accept the judgment of the committee on privileges and elections now that it has made an investigation, but I suggest that the kind of implication the hon. member for Brant-Haldimand made should not have been made, and that he should now take advantage of this opportunity to speak again to correct that impression.

Mr. Pennell: Mr. Speaker, may I say I acknowledge freely that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is entitled to the greatest respect at my hands. As he pointed out quite properly, I voted for the motion that he introduced. I wish to make it meticulously plain that I am not suggesting that his motion was a synthetic point of privilege. I was just putting forward the general principle that in future the house ought to satisfy itself before we embark on these committee inquiries. I trust I have satisfied the hon. member. I was not reflecting upon him, because all members of the house stand in great debt to his unrivalled knowledge of the rules of practice and procedure, and I am pleased to make this statement in his presence.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Vincent Drouin (Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes): Mr. Speaker, may I say—

[*Text*]

Mr. Pennell: Is there any suggestion in the hon. member's mind that I am still reflecting upon him?

Mr. Knowles: Not at all. The hon. gentleman has withdrawn the reflection, and I accept his withdrawal.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Drouin: Mr. Speaker, may I say that I am in complete agreement with the report which the committee on privileges and elections submitted to the house for approval and which stated that there had been no bribery nor any bribery attempt regarding the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Girouard).

However, I was particularly impressed by the contradictory testimony given before that committee. As stated earlier by the hon. member for Brant-Haldimand (Mr. Pennell) and the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Beaulé), the testimony was rendered under oath and had it been given before a court of justice, I am sure the presiding judge would have applied sanctions to one or more witnesses who testified or he would have referred the case to the crown attorney for careful consideration.

As already pointed out, it is extremely difficult for the house to penalize one of its members. It is still more difficult to undertake a thorough investigation; in fact, this was realized during the proceedings of the committee on privileges and elections.

At the beginning of the meetings, we did not even have a bilingual stenographer. The proceedings of the committee had to be delayed to find a stenographer who was qualified to take down the evidence given by the witnesses.

In addition, I feel that the hon. members are not in a position to criticize the attitude or conduct of some of their colleagues. I also believe that to do justice to public opinion, it would be advisable to submit the evidence heard before the committee on privileges and elections to the attorney general of Ontario, in order that he may decide whether it would be advisable to institute proceedings against one or several of those who appeared before the committee on privileges and elections.

However, Mr. Speaker I would not want my intervention to support the remarks made by the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire). In fact, I dissociate myself completely from the insinuations he made with regard to the two traditional parties of this house. There has been, neither within nor outside the committee, any collusion between the Conservative and the Liberal parties with regard to those questions. Besides, no member of the Liberal party received any instructions concerning his vote in the committee or in the house, and this is evidenced now by the stand I am taking.

Mr. Speaker, I understand my colleagues who supported the report now before the house, and I also understand their attitude in the committee as well as in this house.

With a great deal of generosity, they reconcile the conflicting evidence given before the committee. Maybe I am less generous than they are, but I find it more difficult to explain that evidence. In my opinion, the public has the right to know who lied before the committee and it also has the right to demand that those who committed perjury should suffer the consequences.

I am not afraid for my colleague from York-Scarborough (Mr. Moreau) who testified before the committee. I followed with great interest and regularity the proceedings of the committee and I examined the minutes carefully enough to know that the hon. member for York-Scarborough was sincere in his evidence. Indeed, the hon. member for Labelle said as much before the committee on privileges and elections.

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, before the question is put, I should like to make a few brief remarks regarding certain statements made today, as well as others made in the committee on privileges and elections.

After hearing the statements and the discussions, it is obvious that a meeting was held between prominent members of the Liberal party and the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Girouard). Everyone is convinced of this. Since the report also mentions it, I feel bound to intervene at this time. I am convinced that the hon. member for Labelle was approached by the Liberal organization, and that he was also approached at the same time, no doubt, by the Conservative organization. However, I am not prepared to admit that perjury was committed by either side. But I am prepared to suggest that one side or the other has lied barefacedly in this house.

I feel that this question should not have been submitted to the house and it is precisely the irresponsible attitude of the hon. member for Labelle which is to blame. He behaved like a six-year old boy, with as much sense as an eight-year old no doubt. He boasted, showing off, that all the political parties wanted him to join their ranks and it is probably following a meeting with a member of the Liberal or the Conservative party that the hon. member for Labelle saw that it would be wise for him to make in parliament a flamboyant and untimely statement charging that the Liberals had tried to bribe him, promising him large election funds and the advantages of the party in office.

Mr. Speaker, I wish also to point out to the house that at the beginning of the proceedings of the committee on privileges and elections, the hon. member for Labelle once again showed his irresponsibility and replied rudely to the questions put to him by the members of the committee.

There again he acted as a six year old child, with perhaps, the reasoning of a two-year old. He believed he was even more important than the committee itself. He paraded like a "smart alec" before the committee members and he must bear the full responsibility for it. And if, today, his reputation is blemished in any way he only has himself to blame.

The hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Chapdelaine) was saying a moment ago that we wanted to get him. Not at all Mr. Speaker. On the contrary, we want to "get" somebody else.

The hon. member for Sherbrooke also said that we moved an amendment because we wanted to bring out the truth out of revenge. There again, Mr. Speaker, this is false. I feel no animosity whatsoever against the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Girouard) or against the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Chapdelaine) and if we are proposing an amendment, it is not out of revenge.

As a matter of fact, as you said a while ago, Mr. Speaker, this amendment recommends that this report be referred back to the committee on privileges and elections and we suggest that, if judicial steps are to be taken, it is not up to the members of parliament to do so. This will be a matter for the courts, should the matter come to that.

As I pointed out a while ago, I do not think there was perjury on either side, in the literal sense of the word; but there were fibs on both sides. I suggest that both parties lied to the house, that they tried to show astuteness and wiliness, as it is the old parties' characteristic to act in such a way.

We do not want to be taken in by lies; neither do we want to be the accomplices of this extraparliamentary or parliamentary action. We do not intend to favour one party more than the other and that is the reason why I maintain that the whole responsibility must be assumed by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Girouard). He behaved like a six-year old child.

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Is the house ready for the question?

The house divided on the amendment (Mr. Beaulé) which was negatived on the following division:

Division

YEAS

Messrs:

Beaulé
Caouette
Dionne
Drouin
Gauthier
Grégoire
Laprise
Plourde
Rondeau—9.

NAYS

Messrs:

Alkenbrack
Badanai
Balcer
Barnett
Basford
Batten
Béchard
Benson
Berger
Bigg
Brewin
Brown
Byrne
Cadieu (Meadow Lake)
Cadieux (Terrebonne)
Cantin
Cardiff
Cardin
Carter
Chapdelaine
Chatterton
Churchill
Clancy
Coates
Côté (Longueuil)
Cowan
Crossman
Cyr
Danforth
Deachman
Deschatelets
Diefenbaker
Doucett
Douglas
Dubé
Dupuis
Fane
Favreau
Fleming (Okanagan-Revelstoke)
Forgie
Foy
Francis
Gelber
Godin
Granger
Greene
Groos
Guay
Gundlock
Habel
Haidasz
Hales
Hamilton
Harkness
Harley
Hays
Hellyer
Honey
Horner (The Battlefords)
Howe (Hamilton South)
Jewett, Miss
Kennedy
Klein
Knowles
Korchinski
LaMarsh, Miss
Lambert
Lamontagne
Laniel
Laverdière
Leblanc
Leduc
Lessard (Lake St. John)
Lessard (St. Henry)
Lloyd
Loiselle
Loney
Macdonald
MacEachen
MacEwan
MacInnis
McBain
McCutcheon
McIlraith
McMillan
McWilliam
Madill
Martin (Essex East)
Martin (Timmins)
Martineau
Mather
Matheson
Matte
Millar
Monteith
Moore
More
Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria)
Mullally
Nesbitt
Nicholson
Nixon
Noble
Nowlan
Nugent
O'Keefe
Ormiston
Otto
Ouellet
Patterson
Pearson
Pennell
Pepin
Peters
Pickersgill
Pilon
Prud'homme
Pugh
Rapp
Regan
Ricard
Rinfret
Rock
Rouleau
Roxburgh
Sauvé
Scott
Sharp
Simpson
Smallwood
Southam
Starr
Stefanson
Stenson
Stewart
Tardif
Turner
Walker
Watson (Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie)
Webb
Webster
Whelan
Willoughby
Winch
Winkler
Woolliams—146.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

Mr. Ryan: I was paired. Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. Speaker: The question is on the main motion. Shall the motion carry?

Mr. Caouette: On division.

Motion agreed to, on division.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

CHANGE IN NAME OF MEMBER FOR GRENVILLE-DUNDAS

Mr. Eric A. Winkler (Grey-Bruce): I rise on a question of privilege. Because the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas has changed her name to Mrs. Jean Wadds I request, Mr. Speaker, that you take note so that all the necessary changes may be made.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether I am in order, but I should like, if I may, on behalf of those on this side to welcome this new member to the house, and to assure her that while she was away something of beauty and charm was missing from our deliberations. Mr. Speaker, the exuberance of my observation has nothing to do with the fact that perhaps her new happiness and new domestic responsibilities will prevent her standing for parliamentary office.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, if one is allowed to speak on an occasion such as this, to join in the felicitous words that have been uttered by the Prime Minister, and to show that unanimity for which this house from time to time becomes famous, I should like to say how very happy we all are about the hon. member's happiness. The only source of disagreement is in the last suggestion made by the Prime Minister. We on this side of the house want her to continue to represent her constituents.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

DUMPING OF RAW SEWAGE INTO GREAT LAKES

Question No. 717—**Mr. McMillan:** (Supplementary)

In connection with the strong recommendation by the international joint commission to cease dumping raw sewage and other waste products in the great lakes system (a) what program has been decided on in Canada to this end (b) how many American and Canadian communities dump raw sewage, directly or indirectly, into the great lakes system (c) have the American people assumed any time limit on any program to clean up the water in the great lakes system by sewage disposal plants, elimination of detergents and other wastes etc.?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): (b) 159 communities in the United States with a population in 1960 of 356,596 are discharging untreated or raw sewage into the great lakes basin. (c) Although no time limit has been set for these communities to provide sewage treatment, some of them will soon be doing so in accordance with state schedules, assisted by provisions of the federal water pollution control act. Under this act, financial assistance is extended through construction grants for building municipal treatment works under priority programs established by the states.

PATENT OFFICE RECORD

Question No. 1,408—**Mr. Caouette:**

1. How many copies of the Canadian Patent Office Record are printed each week?
2. What does a weekly printing of this publication cost?
3. Is this publication published in the two languages or in English only?
4. For what reason do members receive an edition in which only the cover is bilingual, the rest being in English?
5. Are there plans to make this publication a completely bilingual one in order that French Canadians may benefit fully from it?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): 1. On the average, 950 copies of the Canadian Patent Record are printed each week.

2. Weekly publication costs vary between $3,000 and $4,000 depending on the number of patents delivered during the week and the number of pages of each issue.

3. The publication includes a descriptive memorandum of each patent in French or English as the case may be. The summary of the patent is printed in the same language as the descriptive memorandum (specification) which, under section 20 of the regulations, must be entirely in English or in French.

4. It is not true to say that there is an English edition only. In fact, there is but one edition which is printed in English and in French depending on the language used, in each case, in the patent application. The cover is in both official languages.

5. At present such an edition does not seem a necessity since the demand for this publication is very limited. Moreover since a translated document is legally binding just like an original one, the risk of mistakes could give rise to serious litigations considering the technical nature of the summaries.

[*Text*]

RESEARCH INTO NEW USES FOR COAL

Question No. 1,545—**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria):**

Has the government made any progress with its announced program to give special attention to step up research into new uses for coal and, if so (a) what is the nature and the extent of any steps taken in this regard (b) in what way does the government think that any such steps will halt the rapid decline in the economy of communities dependent on the coal industry?

Hon. W. M. Benidickson (Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys): (a) The Department of Mines and Technical Surveys has been unable, due to an increasing demand for more research in all of its disciplines, to assign more of its facilities toward a stepped-up program of research into new uses for coal. We have continued to maintain essential services to the coal industry and the dominion coal board as well as to improve the design of combustion equipment to slow down the rate of loss of the thermal power market.

(b) Provision is made in this year's estimates for an expenditure by the dominion coal board for professional and special services. It is intended that this provision should be used in research projects to support present markets and develop new outlets. In this development, consideration will be given to new uses for coal.

All research directed to the maintenance of existing markets and the development of new outlets has an effect on coal production. 2½ per cent over 1962 while figures for the six months ending June 30, 1964 show a further increase of 4½ per cent over the same period in 1963.

INUVIK AIRPORT—RUNWAY CONSTRUCTION

Question No. 1,546—**Mr. Cyr:**

1. In what year were the runways built in Inuvik in the Northwest Territories?

Questions

2. What amount of money did the Department of Transport allocate for the purchase of lands and the construction of runways including engineering services?

3. Did any private industries contribute to the cost of this project?

4. What amount of money has the Department of Transport allocated to the maintenance of the runways at Inuvik since the commencement of operations?

5. What amount of money did the Department of Transport receive from airlines using the runways?

6. How many people reside in the immediate vicinity of Inuvik?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): 1. Commenced 1956 and completed 1959.

2. $5,500,000.

3. No.

4. The accounting system does not bring out the costs of maintenance of the actual runway, but total expenditures for operation of the airport from commencement of operations in the fiscal year 1958-59 to March 31, 1964, amount to $314,324.

5. To March 31, 1964, $31,097.

6. According to dominion bureau of statistics, 1961 census, there were 1,248 persons in the local improvement district of Inuvik. The airport, however, serves as distribution point to a much larger area.

CONTRACT METHODS FOR D.E.W. LINE SUPPLY

Question No. 1,579—**Mr. Nugent:**

1. Is the contract for D.E.W. line supply for the western and central Arctic sectors negotiated and is the contract for the eastern sector tendered?

2. If so, what are the reasons for the difference in methods followed?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): 1. See answers to questions 797 and 798 in *Hansard* of May 4 and May 6, respectively.

2. Differences in method result from the differences in the areas served, routings followed, availability and experience, as well as from the nature of the arrangements with the U.S. authorities.

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

Question No. 1,615—**Mr. Mullally:**

1. What was the federal contribution to the province of Prince Edward Island for each of the following fiscal years, 1961-62, 1962-63, 1963-64 and 1964-65 (estimated) under the following: (a) unconditional grants—itemized (b) conditional grants—itemized (c) payments to individuals (i) unemployment payments (ii) family allowances (iii) old age security (iv) all others?

2. What is the total amount of all payments for each fiscal year mentioned above?

3. What is the per capita contribution in each category and how does this compare with the per capita contribution to the other nine provinces?

Mr. L. T. Pennell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance):

1.	1961-62	1962-63	1963-64	1964-65
				preliminary estimated
		(in thousands of dollars)		
1. (a) Unconditional grants				
Statutory subsidies	657	657	657	657
Tax rental payments[1]	1,776	355	—	—
Payment in lieu of provincial succession duty	—	50	72	107
Equalization	2,811	3,073	3,821	4,558
Stabilization	193	−252	—	—
Atlantic provinces adjustment grant	2,500	3,500	3,500	3,500
50 per cent of federal income tax on certain public utilities	54	52	54	58
Sub-total	7,991	7,435	8,104	8,880

[1] The federal government ceased to rent the provincial income tax field on January 1, 1962, and the provincial succession duty field on March 31, 1962.

Questions

	1961-62	1962-63	1963-64	1964-65
				preliminary estimated
			(in thousands of dollars)	
1. (b) Conditional grants				
i. Agriculture				
Agricultural lime assistance	71	69	66	66
Farm labour agreements	5	5	5	5
Freight assistance to royal winter fair	3	4	1	1
4-H clubs	4	2	2	2
Compensation for disease losses	195	—	—	—
ARDA	—	15	90	115
Crop insurance	—	11	25	100
Crop loss—compensation	—	—	54	—
Sub-total	278	106	243	289
ii. Health				
Hospital construction	18	134	80	147
General public health	141	171	169	
Tuberculosis control	29	29	30	
Mental health	95	74	74	
Professional training	26	15	19	274
Cancer control	15	16	16	
Medical rehabilitation and crippled children	13	11	13	
Child and maternal health	7	11	7	
Disability advisory services	—	1	1	1
Sub-total	344	462	409	422
iii. Hospital insurance	1,382	1,674	1,922	1,900
iv. Welfare				
Old age assistance	249	375	395	454
Blind persons allowances	40	47	47	55
Disabled persons allowances	259	312	311	361
Unemployment assistance	173	194	400	275
Rehabilitation of disabled persons	3	3	12	15
National welfare grants	—	—	—	8
Sub-total	724	931	1,165	1,168
v. Fitness and amateur sport	—	30	9	46
vi. Vocational training, etc.				
Student aid	6	6	5	5
Apprenticeship training	—	—	10	10
Vocational high school training	44	28	47	47
Technician training	—	—	—	—
Trade and occupational training	40	23	100	100
Training in co-op with industry	—	—	—	15
Training of unemployed	29	88	80	100
Training of disabled persons	1	2	3	5
Training of technical teachers, etc	1	2	2	5
Training for federal departments, etc	—	—	—	5
Capital assistance—technical schools	80	826	1,420	550
Language instruction of immigrants	—	2	1	1
Sub-total	201	977	1,668	843
vii. Highways and transportation				
Trans-Canada highway	300	66	500	460
Airport development	150	—	—	—
Hillsborough bridge—demolition	—	200	—	—
Sub-total	450	266	500	460

Questions

1. (b) Conditional grants—concluded

	1961-62	1962-63	1963-64	1964-65
			preliminary	estimated
		(in thousands of dollars)		
viii. Resources development				
Construction of fishing vessels	29	—	11	7
Industrial development—fisheries	—	5	12	10
Reforestation	25	21	23	
Forest fire protection	3	6	5	40
Forest access roads	—	1	2	
Forest stand improvement	—	12	10	
Camp ground and picnic area	8	—	10	20
Roads to resources	954	904	900	1,000
Sub-total	1,019	949	973	1,077
ix. Civil defence	16	17	30	34
x. Municipal winter works	11	110	108	150
Total	4,425	5,522	7,027	6,389
1. (c) Payments to individuals				
i. Unemployment insurance benefits	3,290	3,408	3,158	N.A.
ii. Family allowances	3,205	3,260	3,274	3,287
iii. Old age security	5,152	5,963	6,493	6,572
iv. Others				
War veterans pensions	1,814	1,829	1,801	1,800
War veterans allowances	919	1,005	999	1,000

2. The above federal contributions to the provinces or individuals resident in the provinces for the following fiscal years are set out below:

	1961-62	1962-63	1963-64	1964-65
			preliminary	estimated
		(in thousands of dollars)		
Unconditional grants	543,366	275,198	252,818	326,327
Conditional grants	606,453	846,202	880,992	902,058
Unemployment insurance benefits	454,739	403,191	365,655	N.A.
Family allowances	519,537	530,225	537,045	544,735
Old age security	624,668	733,857	807,827	881,425
War veterans pensions	163,462	161,777	159,537	156,800
War veterans allowances	75,019	81,398	82,708	84,600

Questions

3. Per capita contributions to (a) Prince Edward Island, and (b) Other nine provinces.

	1961-62		1962-63		1963-64 preliminary		1964-65 estimated	
	(a)	(b)	(a)	(b)	(a)	(b)	(a)	(b)
	$	$	$	$	$	$	$	$
Unconditional grants	76.10	29.59	70.14	14.53	75.74	13.05	82.99	16.63
Conditional grants	42.14	33.27	52.09	45.63	65.67	46.61	59.71	46.92
Unemployment insurance benefits	31.33	24.95	32.15	21.70	29.51	19.33	N.A.	N.A.
Family allowances	30.52	28.53	30.75	28.60	30.60	28.47	30.72	28.54
Old age security	49.07	34.23	56.25	39.51	60.68	42.74	61.42	45.83
War veterans pensions	17.28	8.93	17.42	8.68	16.83	8.47	16.82	8.12
War veterans allowances	8.75	4.09	9.48	4.36	9.33	4.36	9.34	4.38

* OPERATION OF AUTOMATIC ELEVATORS, WEST BLOCK

Question No. 1,636—**Mr. Watson (Assiniboia):**

1. How many are employed in the west block to operate the automatic elevators?

2. How many of the employees were experienced elevator operators when first employed as operators in west block?

3. What was the cost of the automatic elevators?

4. Were tenders called for non automatic elevators and, if so, what was the lowest tender?

5. What is the justification for having operators to operate automatic elevators in the west block when they operate much quicker when on automatic?

Mr. G. Roy McWilliam (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works): 1. Seven.

2. Seven.

3. $185,675.

4. No.

5. When the building was occupied in September 1962, operators were supplied for the elevators. This is normally done on new installations in order that the occupants can familiarize themselves with the equipment. The operators remained on duty until the close of the session. When the House of Commons opened in September 1963, elevator operators were not provided. However, representations were received from various members of parliament which resulted in assigning experienced operators to the elevators on October 15, 1963.

PUBLIC WORKS POSITIONS UNFILLED AFTER ADVERTISEMENT

Question No. 1,639—**Mr. Aiken:**

1. What positions with the Department of Public Works in Ottawa have been advertised for competition by the civil service commission but remain unfilled?

2. What is the reason, in each case, for inability to find a suitable applicant?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): 1 and 2—

Position	Reason position unfilled
Librarian	Applications still being received
Economist	Interviews not yet completed.
Assistant chief, emergency planning	This position is to be readvertised by the civil service commission, as it was necessary to change the qualifications.
Assistant purchasing and stores officer	Appointment delayed due to appeal by an unsuccessful candidate.
Building construction inspectors	This position was advertised as part of a group which also included positions at Vancouver, Edmonton, Winnipeg, Toronto, Montreal. It is expected that an offer of employment will be sent by the civil service commission to the successful Ottawa candidate shortly.

Questions

Position	Reason position unfilled
Automatic control technicians—heating and air conditioning	Interviews recently completed. Successful candidate will be advised shortly.
Survey and construction supervisor—harbours and rivers engineering	None of the applicants met the qualifications required for this position. It will be readvertised by the civil service commission.
Supervisors 3, building services	Interviews not yet completed.
Job evaluation and organization analyst	The successful candidate is employed by another government department. The date of his assignment is being negotiated.
Mechanical engineer—controlled environments	The offer has been sent to the successful candidate by the civil service commission.
Planning and research officers	Applications now being received.
Building services engineers—mechanical	This position was advertised as part of a group which also included vacancies at Vancouver, Montreal and Halifax. Applicants are presently being interviewed.
Supervisor of construction accounting—bilingual	Applications now being received.
Public information officer 2—French	None of the applicants met the advertised qualifications.
Senior personnel and staff development officers	Applications now being received.
Bilingual engineers and bilingual architects	Applications now being received.

APPROVED ARDA PROJECTS

Question No. 1,653—**Mr. Noble:**

1. How many projects have been approved for aid under ARDA?
2. How many of these are located in Ontario?
3. How many are located in each of the other nine provinces?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): 1. The number of projects approved under the ARDA agreement to July 31, 1964 total 476.

2. The number of approved ARDA projects located in Ontario total 29.

3. Approved ARDA projects located in the other nine provinces are as follows: Newfoundland, 38; Prince Edward Island, 21; Nova Scotia, 40; New Brunswick, 29; Quebec, 122; Manitoba, 51; Saskatchewan, 98; Alberta, 29; British Columbia, 19.

LABOUR RETRAINING PROGRAM

Question No. 1,656—**Mr. Douglas:**

[Mr. Deschatelets.]

1. What is the total amount paid to a single person under the federal-provincial labour retraining program?
2. What is the total amount paid to a married person under the federal-provincial labour retrainvincial labour retraining program?
3. What allowance is made for each dependant under the federal-provincial labour retraining program?
4. How many persons are presently registered under the program in Canada?
5. How many drop-outs have there been for each month since December 31, 1963?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): 1, 2 and 3. Allowances paid to persons attending retraining programs (training of unemployed) are determined by individual provinces with approval from the federal Minister of Labour under the terms of the technical and vocational training agreement. These provincial allowances are reduced by the amount of any unemployment insurance benefits received by students while in training. Current allowances provided in the various provinces are as follows:

Questions

Province	Single at home	Single away	Heads of families at home	Heads of families away
	$	$	$	$
Newfoundland	up to 30	60	30	60 per month
Prince Edward Island	" " 10	15	30	40 per week
Nova Scotia	" " 10	20	35	45 " "
New Brunswick	" " 8	15	19	24 " "
Quebec	" " 15	30	35	50 " "
Ontario (see below)				
Manitoba	" " 12	17	44	50 " "
Saskatchewan	" " 18	18	25	36 " "
Alberta	" " 2	3	7	10 per day
British Columbia	" " 15	30	35	50 per week
Yukon	" " 50	100	110 to 140	160 to 190 per month
Northwest Territories	Actual cost of room, board and transportation, clothing allowance up to $150 plus $15 to $30 per month for personal expenses.			

Ontario	Rate per day
	$
Category A, single or equivalent trainees who, in the opinion of the appropriate provincial authority, need not move to take training	5
Category B, single or equivalent trainees who, in the opinion of the appropriate provincial authority, has had to move to take training	6
Category C, trainee with a wholly dependent person who, in the opinion of the appropriate provincial authority, need to move to take training	9
Category D, trainee with a wholly dependent person who, must, in the opinion of the appropriate provincial authority, maintain a second residence as a result of moving to another centre to take training	11

4. As of May 31, 1964, 19,311 persons were registered.

5. Drop-outs occurred as follows: January, 1964, 450; February, 1964, 613; March, 1964, 452; April, 1964, 2,254; May, 1964, 1,493.

SUBSIDIES UNDER MARITIME COMMISSION

Question No. 1,662—**Mr. Barnett:**

What, for each of the fiscal years commencing with 1920-21, are expenditures made through the subsidies branch of the Canadian maritime commission on the (a) Atlantic seacoast of Canada (b) Pacific seacoast of Canada?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): The Canadian maritime commission advises as follows:

The steamship subventions branch of the Canadian maritime commission, since its inception, has paid the following sums to operators of Atlantic and Pacific coast services as follows:

Fiscal Year	Atlantic seacoast	Pacific seacoast
1948-49	$ 396,367	$458,000
1949-50	357,346	405,000
1950-51	1,671,779	445,000
1951-52	1,974,458	491,555
1952-53	1,924,381	432,500
1953-54	2,300,996	362,499
1954-55	2,340,262	325,000
1955-56	2,485,847	325,000
1956-57	2,774,938	562,000
1957-58	3,049,497	331,567
1958-59	3,281,278	257,165
1959-60	4,234,454	277,736
1960-61	4,361,762	292,500
1961-62	5,111,178	388,000
1962-63	5,227,238	400,000
1963-64	5,293,839	400,000

Steamship subventions for preceding years were paid through the Department of Trade and Commerce as follows:

Fiscal Year	Atlantic seacoast	Pacific seacoast
1920-21	$ 181,658	$ 87,595
1921-22	219,170	88,083
1922-23	216,655	89,185
1923-24	195,867	107,205
1924-25	164,572	83,350
1925-26	163,572	90,396
1926-27	189,821	98,250

Questions

Fiscal Year	Atlantic seacoast	Pacific seacoast
1927-28	172,746	89,907
1928-29	186,602	90,800
1929-30	198,784	91,692
1930-31	194,288	90,800
1931-32	170,841	77,680
1932-33	177,110	57,797
1933-34	158,805	57,797
1934-35	154,325	52,000
1935-36	223,763	52,000
1936-37	193,402	52,000
1937-38	174,317	52,000
1938-39	162,515	47,000
1939-40	117,400	47,000
1940-41	162,931	47,000
1941-42	159,944	62,000
1942-43	115,098	62,000
1943-44	112,773	62,000
1944-45	221,385	62,000
1945-46	224,444	62,000
1946-47	335,484	89,000
1947-48	349,867	435,855

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BENEFITS TO CANADIANS WORKING IN MAINE

Question No. 1,687—**Mr. Perron:**

Is it the view of the Department of Labour that there is no longer any hope for an agreement, between the unemployment insurance commission, and the Canadian government on the one part and the social security authorities of the state of Maine, under which Canadians working in that state could claim unemployment insurance benefits upon their return to Canada?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): After a prolonged period of negotiation between the Canadian unemployment insurance commission and the Maine employment security commission the latter advised on October 30 last that it did not feel it would be in the best interests of Maine to enter into an agreement at this time.

In communicating this decision the Maine employment security commission expressed the hope that the matter might be re-examined some time in the future.

In all of these negotiations the unemployment insurance commission has had the support of the bureau of employment security at Washington but since unemployment insurance is a state matter the concluding of reciprocal agreement with Canada is the sovereign right of the state.

It is the opinion of the unemployment insurance commission, therefore, that prospects for the concluding of an agreement with Maine in the foreseeable future are dim.

[Mr. Pickersgill.]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

CYPRUS—CANADIAN REACTION TO INTERVIEW BY MR. KHRUSHCHEV

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether his department is giving study to the contents of the momentous interview between the Canadian, Lord Thomson of Fleet and Mr. Khrushchev, and in particular reference to Mr. Khrushchev's acceptance of the need for a summit conference to arrive at an agreement regarding nuclear disarmament. Second, what has the government to say regarding Mr. Khrushchev's suggestion that in so far as Cyprus is concerned the British forces there should withdraw, as well as Mr. Khrushchev's threat, if I might use that expression, to Turkey, all of which were dealt with during the course of the interview?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the interview which Lord Thomson, formerly a Canadian, had with Mr. Khrushchev was, of course, a very interesting bit of news which came to us over the week end. We will want to give careful study to what Lord Thomson had to report about Chairman Khrushchev's proposal for important meetings after November next.

We will also give careful study to the statement attributed to the Soviet union in respect of the action that the Soviet union would take in the event of further intervention on the part of Turkey. However, it is noteworthy that what the Soviet union, and Mr. Khrushchev in particular, had to say on this subject is conditional. It appears that the Soviet union has given an undertaking to Cyprus on a conditional basis. I think this underlines the vital importance of United Nations efforts to consolidate the cease fire, since in view of the position now taken publicly by the Soviet union it is more than ever obvious that a recourse to violence must at all cost be avoided. Second, the public position taken by the Soviet union points up the difficult nature of the political balance of forces in the security council.

I would not want to go beyond this without careful analysis of the statement and an opportunity of examining all the circumstances involved. But I thank my right hon. friend for directing the attention of the house to these important statements.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a supplementary question. Is the minister in a position to say whether any representations have been made to the Soviet ambassador here regarding the request on the part of Archbishop Makarios for Soviet assistance, and the rather unusual reaction thereto on the part of Mr. Khrushchev, that such assistance would be given, which is certainly a situation completely inconsistent with the commonwealth relationship?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, the ambassador of the Soviet union is on leave, but on Friday last I asked the chargé d'affaires of the Soviet union if he would be good enough to come and see me. We had a long talk on Friday afternoon about this and other matters.

CYPRUS—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON PRESENT SITUATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): I have a supplementary question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Can the minister give us any report now as to the outcome of the meeting between the secretary general of the United Nations and the nine participating forces? Have any decisions been reached with reference to the extension of the terms of reference for the United Nations forces, and are representations to be made, as a result of this meeting, to the government of Cyprus?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian government, of course, has made representations on this question. My hon. friend will recall the report I made on Friday. We are now waiting to hear further from the secretary general.

Mr. Douglas: I should like to ask a further supplementary question. I think the minister has misunderstood me. I am not asking whether he has made representations, but asking for the outcome of the meeting which was held last week between the secretary general, U Thant, and the nine contributing nations. The minister told us that at this meeting they would be discussing an extension of the terms of reference. Has any agreement been reached by which the secretary general of the United Nations will be making representations to the government of Cyprus for an extension of the terms of reference of the UN peace keeping force?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I made a report on this last Friday, indicating that the secretary general has not yet made a reply to us about representations which he himself is making to the government of Cyprus through General Thimayya and through Mr. Galo Plaza, whom he dispatched to Cyprus primarily for this purpose.

Mr. Douglas: In view of the fact the minister stated in his report the other day that the meeting had only begun an hour before he made the report, I am wondering whether he has a final report to make as to the final outcome?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): No. When I made my report the other day, the meeting had taken place the day before. The secretary general was continuing his discussions and had indicated that he was communicating through Mr. Galo Plaza and General Thimayya with the government of Cyprus. The meetings with participating countries will be continuing.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a supplementary question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Does he have comments or a statement to make concerning the statement of the premier of the Soviet union to the effect that the Turkish attack against Cyprus villages had to be made with the support of members of NATO, particularly of the United States and Great Britain and consequently of the Canadian forces?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, the right hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) asked me what was my reaction to Mr. Khrushchev's statement and I answered him. Consequently, I have no further comment to make for the moment.

[*Text*]

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Has the Secretary of State for External Affairs been in touch with the secretary general of the United Nations, either yesterday or this morning, with regard to the unfortunate illness of the mediator, the eminent Finnish diplomat, who was apparently taken seriously ill in Geneva? Can the Secretary of State for External Affairs tell us whether or not this gentleman will be able to continue his duties at the present time, which are obviously of some urgency, and if not is consideration being given and has there been consultation with the Secretary of State for External Affairs by the

secretary general with regard to the appointment of a new mediator as quickly as possible?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the house generally regrets the very serious and untimely illness of the mediator who was on his way to Athens to report on the vital negotiations which have been taking place in Geneva, negotations which carry with them, I believe, some hope. What action the secretary general will now take with regard to the mediator I am not now in a position to say. Our ambassador has been in touch with the secretariat. However, the decision as to a successor is one which, under the security council resolution, rests entirely with the secretary general.

Mr. Nesbitt: A further supplementary question. In this regard I cannot ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs to divulge the name or names of the person or persons who might be under consideration, but has the secretary general of the United Nations consulted in this respect with the Secretary of State for External Affairs?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, there have been consultations between our ambassador and the secretariat.

NATO—INQUIRY AS TO WITHDRAWAL OF GREEK FORCES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether he can now give the house any information in connection with the reported withdrawal of Greek forces from NATO command, the implications of this action as far as the Cyprus situation is concerned and also as far as the general situation of NATO is concerned.

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): My hon. friend said Greek withdrawal?

Mr. Harkness: Yes.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Does the hon. gentleman mean the withdrawal of certain Turkish air force units?

Mr. Harkness: Mr. Speaker, I understand through the press gallery that this afternoon the Greeks announced that they had withdrawn some, if not all, of their forces assigned to NATO.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I shall have to take this question as notice.

[Mr. Nesbitt.]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

RETIREMENT OF REAR ADMIRAL OF ATLANTIC FLEET

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence. Is he in a position to confirm or to deny the news to the effect that he forced Rear Admiral Brock, chief of the Canadian Navy in the Atlantic, to retire? Could he also give us explanations in that connection and tell us that the statements made by this officer during a sitting of a committee on national defence in Halifax are not the reason of his forced retirement?

[*Text*]

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, one consequence of the integration process is the fact that we now have on strength more officers than we have positions for. It is therefore necessary to retire some in advance of the normal compulsory retirement age. Rear Admiral Brock has a distinguished war record. He has served this country well and long. It is therefore a matter of regret that we have to retire officers of his calibre. I can assure my hon. friend that his retirement is in no way connected with the visit of the parliamentary committee or anything which may have transpired at that time.

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary North): A supplementary question. I wonder whether I might ask the minister why this particular officer, who is one of the most outstanding of all of the senior officers in the Canadian forces, is being retired at the age of 51, with still four years of his normal service to go, with the consequent considerable increase in cost to the taxpayer through payment of his pension, when ordinarily he would have received his pay, which some other officer will be receiving in the meantime? It would seem a most peculiar way of dealing with senior officers in the Canadian forces—retiring an officer of this distinction at such an age, with the consequent loss of his abilities which are very necessary to the forces, and at the same time bringing about a great increase in the cost of the services to the taxpayer.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Speaker, we have indicated all along that it was necessary to effect economies in the Department of National Defence.

Mr. Diefenbaker: There is no economy in that.

Mr. Hellyer: As a result of the integration process we will be able to undertake our tasks quite satisfactorily with fewer people. This proposition has been widely applauded not only in this house but across the country. I do not think it was ever understood—I would be surprised if it was—that the reductions would only take place in the junior ranks; the reductions will take place right across the board at all rank levels. It is unfortunate that experienced people, whether they be of junior or senior rank, must be retired in advance of normal compulsory retirement age. The alternative is to keep on the strength of the Department of National Defence personnel for whom there is no further employment.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Where is the economy in this action?

Mr. Hellyer: The economy is that there are fewer personnel required, so there are consequent savings which can be diverted to the acquisition of equipment. I think all hon. members agree that the cuts should be proportional throughout the rank structure, and not applied just to junior ranks.

Mr. Harkness: A further supplementary question. In view of the fact that officers of the rank of commodore and brigadier, and equivalent, have been and are being promoted to the rank of rear admiral, and equivalent, which is the rank of Admiral Brock, how can there possibly be any savings by retiring a man four years before his normal retirement age, a man of outstanding abilities, and promoting somebody else from a lower rank essentially to take his place?

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Speaker, there are two points I should make here. First of all, the total number of senior officers under the integrated service and as a result of integration at national defence headquarters will be substantially less. A lesser number are required and fewer will be on strength. In respect to promotion of some younger men, we have a problem which must be faced. Many of our best wartime commanders are coming to the compulsory retirement age at approximately the same time. There is some variation of course, but within a rather narrow band of years a very high proportion of the most skilled second world war commanders will reach compulsory retirement age. One thing we must do if we are to maintain the competence and the operational effectiveness of our forces through future years is to promote some younger men, some junior officers, to give them command experience so that they will be able to carry on the distinguished capability of the Canadian armed forces in the years which lie ahead.

Mr. Harkness: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the minister would now give us some definite reasons for this, I think, completely indefensible move, because all he has given us so far is generalities.

Mr. Brewin: A supplementary question—

Mr. Martineau: I have a supplementary question for the minister—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Greenwood on a supplementary.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask the minister if the enforced retirement of Admiral Brock had anything to do with his expressed views about the role the Canadian navy should be playing? Otherwise I must say I would find this retirement quite inexplicable.

Mr. Hellyer: As I have already stated, Mr. Speaker, that was not the reason for his retirement. The views expressed to the committee at the time of the visit had no direct relationship to the matter.

Mr. Brewin: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Pontiac-Témiscamingue.

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): Can the minister state if the decision to retire Admiral Brock was taken before or after his expression of views?

Mr. Hellyer: It was taken before that visit, Mr. Speaker. I think it is fair to say that many factors enter into these judgments and I do not think it would be the least bit helpful to the morale of the forces or to any of the individuals concerned to expose them in detail.

Mr. Martineau: Can the minister say when the decision was taken?

Mr. Hellyer: Not precisely.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The same old alibi.

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

Mr. Knowles: You have to be recognized.

Mr. Brewin: I have a further supplementary question.

Mr. MacInnis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I do not see any possible opportunity for raising a point of order.

Mr. MacInnis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I am giving the floor to the hon. member for Cape Breton South.

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, I was about to bring up a point of order because of a remark by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre to the effect that I had not been recognized. Possibly his remark is on *Hansard*. I have a supplementary question for the Minister of National Defence. Is it not true that the man who is replacing Admiral Brock is senior in years, so under those circumstances how could he qualify to replace Admiral Brock?

Mr. Hellyer: I do not recall the exact ages offhand, Mr. Speaker, but I can assure my hon. friend that the Royal Canadian Navy will be in good hands and that the flag officer designate, east coast, is a man of excellent experience and will be a first class commander.

Mr. MacInnis: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In effecting the economies which the minister so often brings before the house is it the intention of the department to delete the position of one of the ministers of national defence?

Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Pictou): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the retirement of Admiral Brock, forced or otherwise, anything to do with a disagreement with the Associate Minister of National Defence?

Mr. Hellyer: I can say categorically that there is no disagreement whatsoever.

[*Later:*]

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): I have a question for the Minister of National Defence which may appear to arise out of some earlier questions that were asked but, in my mind, it does not. It is related to the question of the reorganization of the Department of National Defence and the consequential reduction in the number of employees. I should like to ask the minister if it is the policy of the department that any jobs which have heretofore been performed by civilian employees will henceforth be performed by members of the armed forces?

[Mr. MacInnis.]

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): There is no policy to that effect, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact, the policy is that to the extent possible we will maintain the present relationship. I understand there have been some individual cases, however, where jobs previously performed by civilians are being presently performed by servicemen. This is something we will look into in the process of reorganization to ascertain whether they can best be performed by civilians or servicemen. The present circumstances, therefore, can be regarded as temporary until we have had a chance to look at the over-all organization.

Mr. Barnett: May I ask a supplementary question? Does the minister not think it would be much more satisfactory for some over-all policy to be developed rather than have civilian employees replaced, without regard to their seniority within the civilian establishment of the department.

Mr. Hellyer: The general policy, Mr. Speaker, is to employ the civilian or military personnel, having regard for the requirements of the job. Some jobs can best be performed by civilians, and this was commented on by the royal commission on government organization. There are other jobs which, for obvious reasons, have to be performed by military personnel, and this includes some categories of jobs where personnel are required to do certain things in an emergency which one would not expect, nor could one enforce, civilians to do; but the over-all policy will be to determine the actual requirements for the job and fill it accordingly.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question which arises out of the questions that have just been asked. Is it the intention of the government to grant to public service employees, on the termination of their services, benefits similar to those being granted to military personnel? I ask this in view of the resolution recently passed by the national defence employees association, a resolution that appears to be eminently fair and reasonable.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Speaker, I think this question was answered earlier in the session. I do not have the exact *Hansard* reference at the moment, so perhaps I could send it to my right hon. friend later.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am referring to a resolution passed within the last week or so by the national defence employees association, seeking similar benefits. It certainly was not dealt with prior to the meeting of the association. Is this resolution receiving consideration on the part of the government, because it seems eminently fair?

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Speaker, I think the decision of the government which was previously promulgated was that it would not be possible to have the same benefits for civilian employees because of the effect this would have on civilian employees in other areas of the government service. That is the decision as I recall it. I am sure, however, all the resolutions passed by the national defence employees association will be studied by the department when they have been submitted to us.

INQUIRY AS TO REVISION OF QUEEN'S AND REGIMENTAL COLOURS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of National Defence or the Associate Minister of National Defence whether either one of them has issued instructions to any person or persons to develop designs for the present Queen's and regimental colours for the purpose of eliminating the union jack on such colours?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): The answer is no, Mr. Speaker. With respect to the Queen's and regimental colours no such thought has been given.

Mr. Churchill: Will the minister assure the house that no action will be taken to alter the Queen's or any regimental colours by eliminating the union jack on any such colours?

Mr. Hellyer: Yes, Mr. Speaker. There is no thought of that whatever.

Mr. Churchill: I wonder if the Associate Minister of National Defence will give the same assurance?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Associate Minister of National Defence claims equality with the Minister of National Defence in the performance of his duties. I am entitled to ask him that question and get an answer from him. I repeat, will the Associate Minister of National Defence give the same assurance as was given by the Minister of National Defence?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of National Defence answered that question he was speaking for the government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

HAL BANKS—FAILURE TO APPEAR IN COURT

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, if I may change the subject, I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Justice.

Is he in a position to inform the house of the results of the police action taken in order to retrace Hal Banks, and to tell us whether the latter appeared in court this morning to answer the charge of having induced seamen to abandon ship, in October last?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that this morning Hal Banks did not appear in court, as he was ordered to and that, consequently, warrant for his arrest was issued by the court. But I am not aware of the efforts made to date—

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a supplementary question.

Can the Minister of Justice tell us, for instance, whether Mr. Banks has been traced? Does the Department of Justice know where Mr. Banks is at the present time?

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, I do not know, at the present time, the whereabouts of Mr. Banks.

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Justice.

In view of the failure of Mr. Banks to appear, will the Department of Justice decide finally to cancel the other bail granted to him?

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, this question is under consideration and the decision which will be taken will have to be consistent with the best interests of the crown and of justice. But the fact that a bench warrant was issued in another case might affect the decision.

[*Text*]

Mr. D. V. Pugh (Okanagan Boundary): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has Banks' bail been estreated?

Mr. Favreau: You mean in the case where he was to appear this morning?

Mr. Pugh: Yes.

Mr. Favreau: I have not been advised as to the disposal made with regard to his bail. All I know is that a bench warrant has been issued.

Mr. Pugh: Will the minister look into that?

Mr. Favreau: I will.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

PARLIAMENT HILL—PICKETS AT ENTRANCES TO WEST BLOCK

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Gerald A. Regan (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. My question arises out of the presence of pickets at all entrances to the west block of the parliament buildings. As there are many members who very much dislike crossing picket lines, I wonder whether the minister is able to report to the house on the reasons for the presence of pickets around the west block today?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the reason for the current picketing is a protest on the part of a local union against a subcontractor who is alleged not to have asked local unions to provide labour and also alleging substandard wages. The fair wage division of the Department of Labour is investigating the matter because the contract is a federal one.

TRADE

POSSIBLE INCREASE IN OILSEED EXPORTS TO JAPAN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reynold Rapp (Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Could the minister inform the house as to what the findings and recommendations were of the oilseed trade mission which went to Japan for the purpose of looking into the possibility of increasing our oilseed trade with that country? Is there a growing market for Canadian rapeseed and flax, and what were the recommendations of the mission?

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

Mr. Rapp: Mr. Speaker, the mission has returned and I am sure the farmers of the west will be interested in their recommendations.

Mr. Speaker: The right hon. Leader of the Opposition.

CANADIAN FLAG

REQUEST FOR TENDERS FOR PENNANTS WITH THREE LEAF DESIGN

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 Minister without Portfolio and ask him whether or not within the last two or three days his office has been inquiring from one or more manufacturers for prices for the delivery of 100,000 4x6 three leaf pennants? At whose request are these tenders or suggested tenders being sought and on whose behalf is he acting in this connection?

An hon. Member: Speak tenderly.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Yvon Dupuis (Minister without Portfolio): I would like to thank the Leader of the Opposition for the great interest he takes in what I do. I did ask what it would cost to get bumper strips, as they say in Shakespeare's tongue, showing the new flag design which is now proposed to the house.

I did it as a private individual and I would be happy if they were available soon so that I could buy some myself, not for the government but for myself, because I am proud of that flag.

[*Text*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, the interest of the hon. gentleman is of course very much appreciated. Were these 100,000 bumper strips for his constituency or whom were they for?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dupuis: I asked for 100,000 because I thought the Conservative members would probably want to buy several of them.

[*Text*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, that is a very frivolous answer—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: —and also a fatuous one. I ask the minister: Is this a personal purchase? If it is, no questions will be asked, but it came from his department.

An hon. Member: He has no department.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dupuis: If my hon. friend was listening he heard that I sought this information for my own personal use.

[*Text*]

PUBLIC WORKS

OTTAWA—LEASING OF SPACE IN UNFINISHED BUILDINGS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): I was asked on Friday by the Leader of the Opposition to table certain documents. The officials of my department are collecting this information and I shall be able to table these documents tomorrow. Because of the delay of one day, I think I will be able to table more information than was requested by the Leader of the Opposition.

INDUSTRY

PETERBOROUGH, ONTARIO—REPORTED REMOVAL OF PLANT TO U.S.

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. A. Webb (Hastings-Frontenac): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance or his parliamentary secretary. On August 12, the minister stated in reply to a question of mine concerning the move of C. W. Fisher, precision manufacturers, from Peterborough to the United States, that the principal reason for this move was the level of United States tariff. I should like to ask the minister if he is aware of the fact that Mr. Fisher has denied his statement. Mr. Fisher has said, "We would not have considered moving part of our operations to the United States in the foreseeable future if it had not been for the sales tax."

I should like to repeat my question. Will the minister advise the house what steps are being taken to prevent further movement of such industries to other countries and protect skilled labour in Canada?

Mr. Speaker: I suggest, in view of the information desired, that this is a question for the order paper.

AGRICULTURE

TURKEYS—POSSIBLE OUTBREAK OF COMMUNICABLE DISEASE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Will the minister check into the cause of the death of 10,000 turkeys out of a flock of 16,000 in western Canada, and will he consider reporting to the house his findings in order to avoid a repetition of this sort of thing, if there is an indication that a communicable disease might be transmitted from one flock to another?

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): I would be glad to look into the situation for the hon. member if he will give me the source of his information.

Mr. Korchinski: I will give the source.

HAY—SUGGESTED RESTRICTION OF EXPORTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. D. Alkenbrack (Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. Because of the relatively poor hay crop in eastern Canada and because of the continuing need in the coming winter season for fodder for the cattle of eastern Canada, will the minister consider taking steps to prevent the export of hay from Canada to other countries until such time as we are assured that our own livestock will have sufficient feed for the coming winter?

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I met the minister of agriculture from Ontario and his deputy several days ago, and I would suppose many of these programs or suggestions would have to be initiated by the province. So far they have not made this sort of representation.

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): As a supplementary, has the minister received a request for assistance for farmers in similar circumstances in western Quebec, from the government of the province of Quebec?

Mr. Hays: Not as yet, Mr. Speaker.

CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENT METHOD AT DOMINION-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): May I direct a question to the Prime Minister. Is the Prime Minister now in a position to answer my questions of Thursday and Friday relating to the possible amendment of the Canadian constitution, and whether this would be done in another country or in Canada, in the light of our own sovereignty over our own affairs?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the information I have received from those who are competent to advise on

this constitutional and legal question is as follows:

It is true that the parliament of Canada, that is to say the Queen, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, did in 1952 enact a measure in direct amendment of the British North America Acts. However, the authority to make this amendment was conferred on the parliament of Canada by the British North America (No. 2) Act, 1949 which was enacted by the Queen, by and with the advice and consent of the lords spiritual and temporal, and commons, assembled in the parliament of the United Kingdom.

Mr. Diefenbaker: What year was that?

Mr. Pearson: It was 1949. The authority of the parliament of Canada to amend the British North America Acts is therefore derived from and limited by this 1949 act of the United Kingdom parliament.

Any amendment outside the scope of section 91 (1) is therefore beyond the authority of the parliament of Canada, and must still be enacted by the parliament of the United Kingdom.

A further amendment to establish a complete amending formula, or to re-enact the British North America Acts as a statute of the parliament of Canada can, in my view, be made at the present time only by the United Kingdom parliament. Of course, if an appropriate amending formula were so enacted, a new constitution could be enacted pursuant thereto.

Mr. Knowles: In view of this answer, I wonder if the Prime Minister does not agree that the matter should be discussed at the Charlottetown conference, not only the getting of the constitution home to Canada, but the way we do it? Would it not be desireable to find a way so that at the earliest moment we could make our own enactment, even if we had to do that after the United Kingdom had acted?

Mr. Pearson: Indeed, I do. I have every hope that, not only will this matter be discussed at the Charlottetown conference beginning in September, but that progress will be made there.

Mr. Diefenbaker: In view of the latter statement made by the Prime Minister, I should like to recall when we were endeavouring to bring this about there were two provinces, Quebec and Saskatchewan, that would not consent. Have Quebec and Saskatchewan now indicated that they are prepared to agree to the repatriation of the constitution?

Mr. Pearson: All I can say is that I have some reason to hope we will be able to agree on a formula very shortly which will overcome the difficulties which my hon. friend and the provincial premiers of that date experienced. I know he will be as happy as I, if that could be done.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The Prime Minister did not answer the specific question. Have there been consultations with the governments of Quebec and Saskatchewan to remove the basis upon which they more or less vetoed action in this regard?

Mr. Pearson: There have been consultations with all the provinces, including Quebec and Saskatchewan, and particularly in regard to the obstacles that were encountered at the last meeting.

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): Is the Prime Minister contemplating the convening of a special meeting of the provincial and federal governments to deal with the repatriation formula?

Mr. Pearson: There will be a meeting within a short time at Charlottetown, and I cannot imagine a better place or a better time in which to make progress on these matters. If as a result of that meeting a special meeting is required, I am sure we can arrange that. I hope that at the forthcoming meeting real progress can be made.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): May I ask a supplementary question? Will the Prime Minister give this house the assurance that any change in the formula proposed by the previous government—and I certainly hope there will be a change—will be made known to this house before it is discussed with the provinces?

Mr. Pearson: I think the customary procedure should be followed in this matter. We should take advantage of the forthcoming meeting to discuss this matter. When the heads of the governments of the provinces met a week or so ago in Alberta, they took advantage of their meeting to discuss the matter informally. I was delighted that they did. I can assure my hon. friend that if and when a formula is agreed upon which is acceptable to all the provinces and the federal government, it will certainly then be brought to the house.

LABOUR RELATIONS

POSSIBLE IRREGULARITIES RESPECTING S.I.U. ELECTIONS

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

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

Can the hon. gentleman confirm or deny the report to the effect that the vice president of the international seafarers union is taking steps to prevent free elections within this union?

[*Text*]

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, this question is on the same subject as was raised by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas) last Friday. Since that time I have made inquiries regarding the reports mentioned on that date concerning candidates for election to office in the S.I.U. of Canada. I have learned this morning from the board of trustees that Mr. Andre Bansept the officer of the S.I.U. of Canada dismissed on Friday by the executive board of the S.I.U., has been ordered reinstated by the board of trustees pending investigation of the circumstances of the dismissal. The board of trustees are also investigating the movement of other members of the slate of officers proposed to run in opposition to the existing elected officers of the union. Where such movements may limit the effectiveness of any campaigning for office, the trustees will take appropriate action.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): On a supplementary question has the Minister of Labour's attention been drawn to the fact that René Turcotte of Montreal has been moved to Newfoundland just at the precise moment that he was running as a candidate for the position of executive vice president, following in the footsteps of the two people I referred to on Friday and will the minister give us some assurance that this matter will also be looked into by the board of trustees?

Mr. MacEachen: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe this must be one of the two additional cases under investigation by the board of trustees.

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Ralph Cowan (York-Humber): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State. Since the C.B.C. is engaged in a competitive business and the C.B.S. has bought the New York Yankees, what team is the C.B.C. going to buy for us?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

CANADIAN FLAG

OFFICIAL ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW DESIGN

The house resumed, from Thursday, August 13, consideration of the motion by Mr. Pearson:

> 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 the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Diefenbaker, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. More.

Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent, Ont): Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in this most important debate and I make no apologies to anyone for occupying the time of the house with my contribution. I wish to say at the outset that I am going to speak in full support of the amendment and the subamendment.

I am fully aware of the gravity of the problem and of the gravity with which the people of Canada are beginning to look on this entire question. I am also well aware that my speech will not go down in the records as a great piece of oratory, nor will it be taken up by the press and radio and spread from coast to coast. It will not contain a great amount of research work on all the flags that have been flown in Canada. It may not contain the great principles that have been expounded by the leaders of the various parties, but I say in all honesty I regard myself as just an ordinary citizen of this country, and if in this debate I can convey to the house the feelings, thinking and beliefs of the ordinary man in the street, the man in the barbershop, the man in the bakeshop, the man in the corner grocery, the man who has been retired, the school teacher—all the men who form this great middle class of the people of Canada, of which I have the honour to be a part—if I can do this and convey their thoughts to the house, I shall feel I am justly fulfilling my responsibility as a representative of the Canadian people.

We have heard various speeches made in this house. We have heard a great deal from members who represent the great province of Quebec. I must pay tribute to these men because they spoke I feel, in all sincerity; they tried to the best of their ability to put forward the feelings of the citizens they represent concerning this flag question. They have been very eloquent and they have pointed out in no uncertain terms the feelings of the people of Quebec. Mr. Speaker, there are nine other provinces and today I propose to do the best I can to deal with the question as seen from my segment of Ontario.

Like many other members, I have prepared a flag speech. Like many other members I have spent weeks in research on this subject, knowing its importance to Canada and to the Canadian people. I do not intend to use that speech today. I say this because I have been in my riding and in other ridings in northwestern Ontario in the past few week ends talking with the people on the streets and trying to find out what they think of the actions of parliament and of the government in connection with this matter. What do I hear on every street? The ordinary Canadian says: What in the world is going on in Ottawa? What concessions are we making to the province of Quebec? Are we, in fact, making concessions? We hear talk of a federal state of Canada. We hear talk of a republic. We hear talk of changing the names of various crown corporations. What is going on? We in Ontario have the right to know. What do the people of Quebec want? Where will it end? These are the questions the people in Ontario are asking today. This is what they are saying. They are asking: Have these people from Quebec a grievance? Is it a grievance which has grown up over the years? Can we meet and solve this problem? How serious is it? What is this great division which is building up in this country of ours? This is what they want to know. They want to know whether the people of Canada are being sold out by this government.

They are asking: What about the filibuster? What is this filibuster of which the newspapers speak? Mr. Speaker, the people of Canada have a wrong conception of this debate because they cannot get the facts. They speak of a filibuster. It is interesting to note that in this entire session we have devoted less than 30 hours to this flag issue. How can that be considered as a filibuster? We have devoted just 30 hours to a matter as important to the people of Canada as the issue which is now before us. A filibuster indeed. Mr. Speaker, the ordinary man wants to know what is going on and the only way he can find out is through a debate in this house during which the principles are brought out.

A question I have often been asked, indeed the question I was asked most when I talked to the people I have the honour to represent was: How in the world did the government get itself into such a mess? I try to be honest. I try to give them the facts. I said no government could get itself into such a mess without constant practice. And this is what we have seen.

We talk about news. I am very interested in the news on this flag issue. At the beginning of this debate we saw what was called a march of flags on parliament hill. I went out to see this march of flags because I was interested. I saw what took place that night in the drizzling rain. I saw a file about six people wide—

Mr. Favreau: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I must rise at this point and submit that now he has clearly announced the trend of his speech, the hon. member who has the floor is out of order.

The only matter which is presently before the house is the subamendment presented on August 13 by the hon. member for Regina City (Mr. More) the text of which can be found at the bottom of page 6807 of *Hansard* for August 13. We all remember that the amendment is to the affect that the question of the flag be referred to the people of Canada for their opinion by way of a plebiscite. The subamendment reads as follows:

> That the amendment be amended by adding thereto the words:
>
> "and that in such a plebiscite among the questions to be placed before the people should be the following—

And there are four questions listed for inclusion in the form of questionnaire to be sent out.

My point of order is as follows: The only question before this house concerns whether, assuming this matter is to be referred to the people by plebiscite, it is desirable that the four questions proposed by the hon. member for Regina City be included in the questionnaire.

When the first amendment was submitted by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker), although there was objection from this side of the house to the debate veering on to a subject other than that of the amendment itself, the Chair ruled—and I bow to that decision—that since the amendment by the

Leader of the Opposition was in the nature of an alternative proposal to the original motion, debate should be entertained simultaneously on the two questions. If we admit the principle of this decision, that the two principal questions be discussed at the same time, it does not prevent our maintaining that the present position is far different. There is no question that the amendment to the amendment is not an alternative to either the first or to the second motion. It amounts, in effect, to a restriction of the amendment. So, I repeat, the only question before us is whether or not, assuming the amendment should carry, it would be desirable that the four questions sugegsted by the hon. member for Regina City in his amendment to the amendment be included in the questionnaire.

Therefore, I suggest that until such time as the amendment to the amendment has been disposed of, any discussion or debate pertaining to matters other than the questions mentioned in the subamendment to the amendment would be out of order.

Mr. Lambert: I am frankly amazed at the virginal purity of the minister in putting forward this argument this afternoon. I find his choice of timing rather singular. I would draw to his attention the nature of the speech made by the hon. member for Hamilton East (Mr. Munro) on Thursday night—

Mr. Pickersgill: That was before the amendment.

Mr. Lambert: It was on the amendment, at the time of the amendment. That was a very general speech. It went into a great deal of philosophy. It treated with the whole subject.

Mr. Pickersgill: That was before the amendment.

Mr. Lambert: It was before the subamendment, as the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) would know if he had been listening. I say that my remarks were to the effect that the hon. member for Hamilton East (Mr. Munro) made his speech at a time when the discussion was on the amendment. If I follow the argument of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau), the speech of the member for Hamilton East at that time was on the whole general philosophy of a flag, and it had no relationship at all in a limiting sense. Therefore it is rather singular for the minister to come in now and attempt to pick at a speech and limit the debate in the way he has done. If this applies in this debate, Mr. Speaker, it should have applied at all times.

May I say that the minister and his colleagues, with all due deference to the Chair, have been permitted to range far and wide in all types of debate. Relevancy is a most difficult thing, and a past master of this art is the Minister of Transport who, and I give him full credit, endeavours to follow the rules. In this regard he will recognize that when I occupied the chair you now occupy I did follow the rules in respect of relevancy much more closely than heretofore by some of my predecessors.

The Minister of Transport quite rightly indicated that one can make excursions and be relevant, because we are debating the whole question of a flag. Even a debate in respect of the purport of the subamendment is relevant. If I interpret the hon. member's remarks correctly, he is leading the discussion to the subject of choices, because the subamendment refers to four choices available within the amendment. Therefore, I put it to Your Honour that everything the hon. member for Kent (Ont.), (Mr. Danforth) said has been entirely relevant. I suggest to the Minister of Justice, if he now wishes to put forward this argument: Physician, first heal thyself. If you are going to suggest such a policy, then let us make sure everyone complies, and I hope the Minister of Justice will rise in his place as the leader of the government and instruct his colleagues to bear in mind the question of relevancy in all debates.

Therefore I submit that the remarks put forward by the Minister of Justice on this occasion are far too restrictive and have had no application in practice or otherwise in this house.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, since the the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) has drawn my name into this discussion, I should like to make a few remarks. The hon. gentleman says that the hon. member for Hamilton East (Mr. Munro) had discussed the whole question of the flag generally as, I understand, have other hon. gentlemen, pursuant to a judgment made by Mr. Speaker in respect of the right hon. gentleman's amendment.

Since the hon. member for Hamilton East spoke, the hon. member for Regina City (Mr. More) moved a subamendment. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau) pointed out that this subamendment was in an entirely different category from the amendment of the right hon. gentleman, and that the right hon. gentleman's amendment, according to the decision of the Chair, which we accepted when it was made, was an alter-

native to what we were putting forward, and that the debate on the two could not be separated. Anyone who can read can see that the limiting and restricting subamendment, which the hon. member for Regina City chose to tack on to his leader's amendment, deals with the nature, and only with the nature, of a plebiscite to be held, should the house decide in favour of a plebiscite.

Under our rules we are not supposed to have repetition of debate. We have had a debate on the right hon. gentleman's amendment, and on my right hon. friend's motion. The debate continued up until the hon. member for Regina City chose, as he had a right to do, to restrict that debate by moving a subamendment. It seems to me that my hon. friend, the Minister of Justice, would have been derelict in his duty, when the hon. member for Kent (Ont.), (Mr. Danforth) commenced to speak about a range of subjects including parades on parliament hill, had he not drawn attention to the rules of the house with the intention, as the hon. member for Edmonton West well knows, to prevent undue and improper repetition of debate.

The Minister of Justice drew attention to the fact that there was only one question before the house, and that was the subamendment of the hon. gentleman for Regina City, and suggested we should confine our debate to that question until the house is ready to settle it. Once that question is settled we will then go back again to a debate on the right hon. gentleman's amendment, and the ruling of the Chair in regard to that amendment would then apply thereto as long as that debate should continue.

It seems to me, sir, if we are just going to have subamendments moved one after another in order to allow hon. gentlemen to pursue the same general debate, we are totally defeating the purpose of the rules of the house. Therefore it seems to me my hon. friend the Minister of Justice did the only thing which as house leader he should have done, in drawing the attention of the house to that point.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, this is simply a repetition of the objection raised earlier.

Mr. Lambert: You will have difficulty salving your conscience as of now.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau) has stated that an amendment to the motion permitted a general discussion, in consequence of the ruling made some time ago by Mr. Speaker. He is supported by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill). He stated that what was done when the hon. member for Regina City (Mr. More) moved the subamendment was to limit and restrict the ambit of the amendment. Nothing of the kind was done.

Mr. Pickersgill: I said the debate.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Nothing of the kind was done. The subamendment is a means whereby the amendment is amplified and, in this case, an explanation of the actual wording of the plebiscite placed therein. I am not going to deal with the argument in this regard. I do not intend to enter into that debate. The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) will do that.

To follow the suggestion of the Minister of Justice would be contrary to all the decisions made in this house since I have been here, and would be restrictive beyond justice in every way. It would apparently have the purpose in mind of denying the fullest of discussion in this house. There is no question about that.

This is a matter of great seriousness and importance, and if a decision is to be made I suggest Mr. Speaker should be in the chair. It would be most unfair to ask you, sir, the incumbent at the moment, to make a decision in this regard.

Mr. Pickersgill: That is a reflection on the Chair.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman with his usual garrulousness says this is a reflection on the Chair. It is nothing of the kind. When a matter as important as this is being considered it is unjust to place you, sir, in a position of having to make a decision of such importance.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order raised by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau), coinciding with the return to the house of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill), who was absent for a week or so, during which period the house carried on very successfully without him, I should remind the house that now the Minister of Transport has nudged the elbow of the Minister of Justice and has urged him to exercise some restraint on the debate that is proceeding. He is trying to do it through a very narrow interpretation of the rules, and has suggested the subamendment, which simply is enlarging the amendment, should have a restriction placed upon it.

Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the fact we are familiar with the general debates in this house, and when two amendments

cover the same area at the same time the discussion is not restricted in any way, shape or form. The debate ranges over the whole field. The same is true when we are on the budget debate.

In this particular instance I do not see how it is within the competence of the Chair to restrict the debate on the subamendment without making it extraordinarily difficult to carry on a debate in this house. The subamendment, which deals with four suggested proposals to put before the Canadian people, draws into the debate all the reasons for and against these proposals. When I speak in the course of this debate, and on the subamendment of course, I am entitled to say why we are proposing that the present official flag of Canada, the red ensign, be one of the samples put in front of the people. I am entitled to say why some advocate an addition to that red ensign. I am entitled to discuss why we would suggest that the present three-leaf design be put in front of the people; and also why it should not, because you can put both sides of the question. So how in the world can you limit a debate on this particular subject just because the Minister of Justice has the idea that a subamendment should be restrictive in the course of debate here in the house? If debate is restricted, then what are we to talk about? I suppose the usual suggestion will be made—"Let's not have any debate at all; let's have a vote". That is the type of indirect closure which is constantly being attempted to be imposed in this house. I suggest that the hon. member for Kent (Ont.) was on the point of developing his thesis and leading up to the various reasons why the subamendment and the amendment should be supported, and I cannot for the life of me see how it would be possible to effect a restriction.

With regard to what has been said by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) earlier concerning the speech we heard the other night, I would draw the attention of the Chair to page 6801 of *Hansard*. The hon. member for Hamilton East (Mr. Munro) apparently spoke on the amendment, but no restriction was imposed upon him at all. At page 6801 appears a learned discourse, which we doubt was prepared by him, on the bitter irony in the current attempt—

> —to becloud the issue by the effort of many to convince the Canadian people that any manifestations of nationalism on their part are not only belated but are primitive expressions of a backward people.

How the hon. member was able to relate that to the debate on the flag escaped the attention of the entire house. But he was permitted to go on; the Minister of Justice did not intervene then and say: "This colleague of mine must be restricted because we are speaking to an amendment dealing with a plebiscite concerning the flag". No objection was raised then by the Minister of Justice and I say that he should not raise any objection now.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, this is another of those occasions where on principle I have to take a position which I wish I did not have to take. I deplore the length of this debate. I deplore the suggestion that it may be continued by further subamendments and all that sort of thing. But even so, Mr. Speaker, we do have to have regard for the rules. The rules which were there when we started, which we have observed thus far, must be the rules throughout the debate.

May I draw Your Honour's attention to citation 201 of Beauchesne's fourth edition which was quoted by Mr. Deputy Speaker when he ruled on the amendment to the main motion on June 16 of this year. Citation 201 makes it clear that when there is an amendment before the house the debate may range over the whole subject. Let me read the last few words of citation 201:

> In that case the debate that follows is not restricted to the amendment, but includes the motives of the amendment and of the motion, both matters being under the consideration of the house as alternative propositions.

I am hesitating for a moment while taking cognizance of the fact that Mr. Speaker himself has now taken the chair.

Before Your Honour came to the chair I was pointing out that this is another occasion where on principle I have to argue for something for which I wish I did not have to argue. Despite my feeling that I should like to see this debate brought to a conclusion I am contending that, when an amendment and a subamendment are before the house, it is in order for the debate to consider all of the propositions which are before the house at that time. This happens time and again in this house. I have just read from the latter part of citation 201, which indicates that that is clearly the case when what is before us is an amendment to the main motion. That was the citation on which Mr. Deputy Speaker rested his case when he made the ruling on July 16, 1964, which is to be found at pages 4382 and 4383 of *Hansard*. On that occasion there was a question raised by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau) relating to the amendment to the main motion.

In case some on the government side, such as the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill), were to contend that this is a subamendment rather than an amendment, I would draw the attention of Your Honour and the house to citation 202 of Beauchesne, where there are quite a few comments about subamendments. I am not going to take the time of the house by reading all these comments, but in the middle of citation 202(2) is this sentence:

An amendment, when undergoing alteration, is therefore treated throughout as if it were a substantive motion upon which an amendment has been moved.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the present situation is analogous to the situation which we had on June 16. What we have before us is a subamendment to an amendment, and citation 202(2) says that in this instance we have, in effect, a main motion to which there is an amendment. If citation 201 applied on June 16 I suggest it applies now.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, there are other ways in which we might find it possible to shorten this debate. I would hope that self-discipline might apply and that we might be able to reach some kind of agreement. But as far as the principle and the rules are concerned, I suggest that the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Transport are taking the wrong track and I hope they will reconsider their position.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to rise and challenge an opinion on parliamentary procedure given in this house by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), who is so well known as an authority on this subject. However, it did happen in the course of my law lectures—not too often but sometimes—that a student had drawn my attention to the fact that I might not have been completely accurate in one of my statements on the law, and I trust that here I might be allowed to take the same position today.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Hamilton East (Mr. Munro) has been allowed, with no objection on my part, to deal both with the substantive question on the resolution and with the matter of the principal amendment. I am not going to repeat what I said previously, but this was precisely in accordance with your ruling, Mr. Speaker, to the effect that the main amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition was in the nature of an alternative and in the particular case of an alternative the debate takes place on both the original question and the amendment concurrently. This is exactly the situation provided for by citation 201 of Beauchesne, fourth edition, which has just been referred to by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and which deals with a special subject, that of an amendment where all the words after the word "that" are deleted and a whole new alternative is proposed. I think that very citation defeats the argument which is proposed to the Chair in that at the bottom of page 168 we read:

In that case—

In that special case.

—the debate that follows is not restricted to the amendment, but includes the motives of the amendment and of the motion, both matters being under the consideration of the house as alternative propositions.

The very citation is predicated on the assumption that when you have an amendment to a question debate is restricted to the amendment as being a substantive question. It is only in the case where an amendment is in the nature of an alternative that, as the citation says, the debate that follows is not restricted to the amendment. But in the case of a subamendment we read the following in citation 202, paragraphs 1 and 2, which in my respectful opinion disposes completely of the question:

202 (1). To an amendment, when proposed from the Chair, an amendment may be moved; but only two amendments can be proposed at the same time to a question.

(2) As the proposal of an amendment to an amendment originates a fresh subject for consideration, the new question thus created must, to prevent confusion, be disposed of by itself. An amendment, when undergoing alteration, is therefore treated throughout as if it were a substantive motion upon which an amendment has been moved. The original motion, accordingly, is laid aside—

The original motion accordingly is laid aside.

—and the amendment becomes for the time a separate question to be dealt with, until its terms are settled.

The position is very simple, Mr. Speaker. As long as the amendment is not one that calls for deleting all the words after "that", as long as the amendment to the amendment is not an alternative, then the amendment becomes the principal question before the house and the subamendment is one that must be dealt with purely and simply. The main resolution is laid aside leaving the way open for a debate which is restricted to the subamendment now being proposed.

When the hon. member for Hamilton East spoke and made the speech to which it is said I raised no objection, I would point out that it will be remembered, as appears in *Han-*

sard, that he spoke before the amendment to the amendment had been proposed and he therefore spoke under the ruling laid down by Your Honour when Your Honour decided that the main amendment was an alternative that was to be discussed at the same time as the main resolution. I rose on the occasion of the first speech made or attempted to be made in the house since the subamendment was moved for the purpose of objecting and suggesting that debate be narrowed to the subamendment. Therefore I did raise this question at the very first and only appropriate time.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to repeat the argument advanced earlier because you were not present at the time. Epitomized, it is in general that presented by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. What has happened here is that objection has been raised by the Minister of Justice to the hon. member for Kent (Ont.) dealing in general with the flag problem. It has been said that if we were on the amendment the discussion could be wide ranging but that the subamendment delimits the discussion to the matters contained therein. I submit that is a completely untenable position and if followed could only mean the application of the guillotine unjustly and unfairly.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Speaker, I regret having to rise a second time but I will be very brief. First of all, I would draw to the attention of the Minister of Justice the fact that his argument, if he wishes to be consistent, must apply at the time of supply motions, must apply at the time of the budget debate and must apply at the time of the throne speech debate because subamendments in varying forms are introduced on those occasions. Amendments are introduced, some of which strike out all of the words, and yet debate has always ranged far and wide within the ambit of the main motion and the subamendment.

Even if, and it is a very big "if" the Minister of Justice were right at this time and in effect the main motion is to be laid aside in that there is a sort of progression under citation 202 (2) whereby the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition in effect becomes a substantive motion and the subamendment becomes an amendment, nevertheless the subject matter is so wide within the terms of the flag debate that the hon. member for Danforth—

Mr. Churchill: Kent (Ont.).

Mr. Lambert: Kent (Ont.); I apologize to the hon. member—cannot be said to be transgressing in any way at all in his remarks. I might say to the Minister of Justice that if he is able to persuade Your Honour that the argument he has advanced is a valid one, then I suggest that in future His Honour will have the gravest difficulty in enforcing such a restrictive interpretation of the rules of debate. With the greatest respect Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you it will be impossible to do so.

Mr. Speaker: It is my pleasant duty to try to render a decision in the face of a great deal of interesting and valuable advice from experienced parliamentarians, but in reaching a conclusion I must base myself on the authorities as I try to understand them. I am much impressed by the arguments made by various members and also by the Minister of Justice. I should like to cut short my decision and come to the point but I think it might be of use at this time to review some of the factors which enter into a decision as to relevancy of debate. It is a fundamental rule that debate must be relevant to the question being considered.

Mr. Lambert: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, is Your Honour reading from a prepared judgment, or citations in regard to this matter?

Some hon. Members: Order.

An hon. Member: Shame.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I think I will have to take my own responsibility in this regard.

> Stated generally, no matter ought to be raised in debate on a question which would be irrelevant, if moved as an amendment, and an amendment cannot be used for importing arguments which would be irrelevant to the main question.

That comes from May, sixteenth edition, page 421.

> A member, while speaking to a question, may not introduce a matter which is irrelevant to that question.

That is May, sixteenth edition, page 451. Again, in May, sixteenth edition, at page 421, it is also stated:

> The effect of moving an amendment is, rather, to restrict the field of debate which would otherwise be open on a question. This is not obvious in the case of the type of amendment which proposes to leave out all the words of a question and substitute a different (but of course relevant) proposition. But it is true even in this case. For such an amendment, by concentrating debate on the main question and the amendment as alternative propositions, tends to exclude the consideration of other relevant alternatives.

Now, today we had Beauchesne cited, citation 202, fourth edition, subsection 2, which it might be advisable to read:

As the proposal of an amendment to an amendment originates a fresh subject for consideration, the new question thus created must, to prevent confusion, be disposed of by itself. An amendment, when undergoing alteration, is therefore treated throughout as if it were a substantive motion upon which an amendment has been moved. The original motion, accordingly, is laid aside; and the amendment becomes for the time a separate question to be dealt with, until its terms are settled.

Then, in the same citation, paragraph 3 reads as follows:

Since the purpose of a subamendment is to alter the amendment, it should not enlarge upon the scope of the amendment but it should deal with matters that are not covered by the amendment; if it is intended to bring up matters foreign to the amendment, the member should wait until the amendment is disposed of and move a new amendment.

Now, along the same lines, in May's sixteenth edition, pages 424 and 425, it is stated, and I quote:

Another proceeding may also be resorted to, by which an amendment is intercepted, as it were, before it is offered to the house in its original form, by moving to amend the amendment first proposed. In such cases the questions put by the Speaker deal with the first amendment as if it were a distinct question, and with the second as if it were an ordinary amendment. The original question is, indeed, for a time laid aside; and the amendment becomes, as it were, a substantive question itself. Unless this were done, there would be three points under consideration at once, viz. the question, the proposed amendment and the amendment of that amendment—

Therefore, if the principles concerning the relevancy of debate as set out in the two authorities, Beauchesne and May, which I have just quoted are to be observed, the debate is now to be restricted to the questions which must be submitted in the proposed plebiscite.

Mr. Diefenbaker: With the greatest of deference, sir, I find it difficult to understand how Your Honour is in a position to have a judgment prepared, as was the case recently when the flag resolution was divided. I find this difficult to understand, with the greatest of deference, and the fact that the judgment was prepared in anticipation of the argument being raised causes me to appeal against your direction. This, to me, is quite incomprehensible.

Mr. Speaker: I do not wish to get into a debate with anyone. There is no mystery about these things. After all, I have been to school and I am able to think for myself on occasion.

Mr. Diefenbaker: How did Your Honour know in advance what was going to be raised this afternoon?

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Speaker: I will answer that question immediately. Of course I did not know what was going to be raised this afternoon, but it does not take a genius to come into the house and grasp the situation. It does seem to me quite reasonable, especially in view of the authorities which are set out in citation 202, subsection 2. As I understand the situation, and I can put it in a few words, the original motion was made, the amendment was then made and it gave the alternative method to the original motion. Now we have an amendment of the amendment. I must say I did not find any great difficulty in arriving at a decision. I may be wrong, but at least I am entitled to reach my own decision.

Now I should like to clear up another matter, because there is no mystery about this. In so far as the splitting of the flag resolution is concerned, it was not so simple to reach a conclusion, but I did considerable homework and made up my mind without benefit of advice from anyone except the man upon whom I am entitled to rely, namely the Clerk of the House of Commons.

The house has heard the decision of the Chair from which the right hon. Leader of the Opposition has appealed. All those in favor of sustaining the decision of the Chair 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 before the house is an appeal from a ruling of the Chair which is as follows:

A point of order having been raised relative to the subamendment before the house the Chair ruled:

that in accordance with section 2 of citation 202 and also May's sixteenth edition at pages 424 and 425, when a subamendment is proposed the amendment is for the time being treated as a substantive question and in consequence thereof debate must be relative to the question referred therein—

Is it the pleasure of the house to confirm the Speaker's decision?

Mr. Lambert: That is not the ruling—that the Speaker's decision be maintained—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Lambert: With the greatest of respect, I am rising on a point of order.

Mr. McIlraith: You cannot raise it at this time.

An hon. Member: It seems you have changed the ruling.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Edmonton West—

Mr. Lambert: If this is an interpretation of Your Honour's ruling, I rise because this decision will be recorded in *Votes and Proceedings* and may have some very clear implications for the future. I would submit to Your Honour that the purport of your ruling was that the debate would be limited to the points in the subamendment and not the amendment. It is not a question that they should be relevant, because relevancy and limitation are somewhat different.

I should like to have it clearly understood that we have the precise purport of Your Honour's ruling as expressed in this question which is now before the house.

Mr. Speaker: Certainly the intention of this ruling is that debate shall be relevant to the subamendment. I think that is quite clear. Perhaps the wording here is a bit clumsy. Perhaps the house will give me two minutes in which to review it with the Clerk.

With the consent of all hon. members, I should like to be very clear on this because I agree with the hon. member for Edmonton West that this is an important ruling.

A point of order having been raised to the effect that debate shall be relevant to the subamendment now before the house, the Chair ruled as follows:

That in accordance with section 2 of citation 202 and also of May's sixteenth edition at pages 424 and 425, when a subamendment is proposed the subamendment is for the time being the question before the house and in consequence thereof debate must be relevant to the question covered by the subamendment.

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:

YEAS

Messrs:

Asselin (Richmond-Wolfe)	Cantin
Badanai	Caouette
Barnett	Cardin
Basford	Caron
Batten	Carter
Beaulé	Côté (Longueuil)
Béchard	Cowan
Benson	Crossman
Berger	Cyr
Blouin	Deachman
Boulanger	Deschatelets
Byrne	Dionne
Cadieux (Terrebonne)	Drouin
	Dupuis

Émard	McMillan
Eudes	Martin (Essex East)
Favreau	Matheson
Foy	Matte
Francis	Moreau
Frenette	Mullally
Gauthier	Nicholson
Gelber	Nixon
Godin	O'Keefe
Gray	Otto
Greene	Patterson
Guay	Pearson
Habel	Pennell
Haidasz	Pepin
Harley	Pickersgill
Hays	Pilon
Hellyer	Plourde
Jewett, Miss	Prud'homme
Klein	Regan
Konantz, Mrs.	Rinfret
LaMarsh, Miss	Robichaud
Lamontagne	Rondeau
Laniel	Rouleau
Laprise	Roxburgh
Laverdière	Ryan
Leduc	Sauvé
Lessard (Lake St. John)	Sharp
Lessard (St. Henry)	Stewart
Loiselle	Tardif
Macaluso	Temple
Macdonald	Walker
MacEachen	Watson (Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie)
McIlraith	Whelan—94.
McLean (Charlotte)	

NAYS

Messrs:

Alkenbrack	McCutcheon
Brewin	Madill
Cadieu (Meadow Lake)	Martin (Timmins)
Cardiff	Millar
Churchill	Monteith
Clancy	Moore
Coates	More
Crouse	Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria)
Danforth	Nesbitt
Diefenbaker	Noble
Doucett	Nowlan
Douglas	Nugent
Fane	Ormiston
Fleming (Okanagan-Revelstoke)	Peters
Flemming (Victoria-Carleton)	Pugh
Girouard	Rapp
Gundlock	Ricard
Hales	Scott
Hamilton	Simpson
Harkness	Smallwood
Horner (The Battlefords)	Southam
Kennedy	Starr
Knowles	Stefanson
Korchinski	Stenson
Lambert	Vincent
MacEwan	*Wadds
MacLean (Queens)	Webb
MacRae	Webster
McBain	Willoughby
	Winch—59.

*Formerly Mrs. Jean Casselman—Member for the electoral district of Grenville-Dundas.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the decision confirmed.

Mr. Brown: Mr. Speaker, I was paired. Had I voted I would have voted to sustain the ruling.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ouellet: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the hon. member for Matapédia-Matane (Mr. Tremblay). Had I voted, I would have voted against your ruling.

[*Text*]

Mr. Danforth: Mr. Speaker, may I call it six o'clock?

At six o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Danforth: Mr. Speaker, this afternoon when I was interrupted by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau) on a point of order I had been dealing with the march of the flags on parliament hill. Had he been able to curb his impatience for just one more sentence he would have learned that I would have said that the fact that both flags were presented on parliament hill in such numbers was an indication that no one knew an actual desire for a distinctive flag, and in my humble opinion a plebiscite would be necessary to make these flags known. Had he not been so impatient he would have learned that I did intend to stick directly to the terms of the subamendment. But I hasten to point out that in the very terms of the subamendment, which asks—

1. Are you in favour of the Canadian red ensign?
2. Are you in favour of the Canadian red ensign with changes made thereon to show the main heritages of both founding races?
3. Are you in favour of the three maple leaves design?
4. Are you in favour of a one maple leaf design?

—I shall show that there has been a mad shambles made of the business of this parliament; that there has been hypocrisy in the claim which is made for the desire for legislation; that this government did deliberately misrepresent the facts to the people regarding a distinctive flag; and that the utter chaos and impasse this parliament is faced with today can only be laid at the doorstep of one man, and one man only—

Some hon. Members: Diefenbaker.

Mr. Danforth: —who in a statement to the radio stated—no, I am speaking of the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) of this government now in power. This man said on the radio in an interview that it would be unfortunate if this question was made an election issue because it would cause an unfortunate division in the country. How naïve can a leader of the country be when he believes that this will not be an issue in an election, whether that election is held three months or three years from now. I have never experienced a time when the Canadian population, especially in my area, has been so aroused over an issue as they have other this one.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, are they in favour of the red ensign? They show in the most determined way that they are in favour. They believe that the only way this matter can be solved is by a plebiscite. For in spite of the legal arguments put up by government speakers that there should not be a plebiscite, I am of the opinion that since this issue was deliberately placed into partisan politics by a political party, the only way that we can get it out of politics and have a responsible decision made is by letting the people of the nation decide the matter for themselves.

Are they in favour of the red ensign? We have had claims of all kinds made in this house. Who is to know whether 83 per cent favour the red ensign or 3 per cent favour the red ensign? Who is to know whether 83 per cent favour a distinctive flag or 3 per cent favour a distinctive flag? We have heard claims made in this house, but have we any valid proof of them? I have heard hon. members opposite say that the ethnic groups in this country are solidly behind a new flag. I challenge this statement, because I have spoken, both in my own riding and in other ridings, with members of ethnic groups and I find that this matter is a sore subject with them. Many of these people come from countries where it is said that the disintegration of symbols and the taking away of traditions has been the first step in the downfall of a nation, the first step in a loss of independence. They do not want to see this happen here. They see this as a danger, and when hon. members opposite stand up and tell me that the ethnic groups are in favour of a distinctive flag—this distinctive flag—I challenge them to furnish me with some proof. So far I have not heard or seen any.

Then we hear the claim that the youth of the nation are in favour of a distinctive flag. This is a deliberate misrepresentation. I say to you, sir, that the youth of this country are in favour of a distinctive Canadian flag

when the question is put to them; but the question "Are you in favour of this distinctive Canadian flag?" is never put to them.

I have had only one letter from a student, who told me that gentlemen are coming round to his school and asking: "Are you in favour of a distinctive Canadian flag? If you are, Canada should have one; write to your member of parliament and say that you want to support Mr. Pearson's flag". Mr. Speaker, is this the support that the youth of the country are giving this flag? I say that this is deliberate misrepresentation. The very fact that these people say "a distinctive flag" and not "this distinctive flag" causes me to think that there should be a plebiscite. Let the people decide between the flags. Let the people make up their own minds what they want.

I can appreciate the position the government is in. I can appreciate why the government does not want a plebiscite; it is beginning to realize the awful truth—that perhaps the majority of the people in the country do not want this Pearson flag. What a horrible position this issue has placed the government in. And if I ever had respect for the parliament of Canada it is now, Mr. Speaker, because with a power group in this House of Commons determined to impose this flag on us, and with the realization that perhaps the majority of the people of Canada do not want it, here in parliament a determined opposition has a chance to make itself heard —that is, if we are not placed in the position where we cannot debate, where we are limited in debate, or if we are not held down in the manner we experienced this afternoon.

Mr. McIlraith: Order.

Mr. Danforth: We want to get the facts on the record, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): The hon. gentleman is now making a reflection on a ruling by the Chair confirmed by the house. I suggest he confine himself to the question before the house.

Mr. Danforth: Mr. Speaker, I will, of course, abide by your ruling in this matter. But the fact still remains that when we want to put facts on *Hansard* we run into trouble. And why? Are the facts damaging?

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Danforth: Is this government afraid of the truth? Can they not stand on their own feet? Can they not take the credit for doing great things for Canada? Are they afraid? Do they think the flag issue is of such magnitude that the government is going to stand or fall on it? Is this what they are afraid of? Is this why we are having violent opposition to this flag?

I will deal with another point: Are you in favour of the three maple leaves flag?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Danforth: Hon. members opposite applaud. If the people of this country want or could want the three maple leaf flag, why must the government put on a public relations campaign to sell this flag? We speak of the traditions of the Canadian flag. What tradition can be found on the posterior of a bikini bathing suit on television? What tradition can be found on a blanket of a racehorse? What tradition can be found on the dresses of three college students? Are these the traditions of the Canadian flag we are asked to adopt? Is this the way?

This afternoon we heard in the house about 100,000 bumper stickers. Is this the way we earn a Canadian flag? This is college calisthenics. This is in the same category as the colouring books, the pigeons and all the rest of it. The people of Canada will not accept this.

Miss LaMarsh: Simmer down.

Mr. Danforth: The Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss LaMarsh) says "simmer down". I am glad she made that interjection, Mr. Speaker. In the campaign she came into my riding—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Danforth: Mr. Speaker, I will change my words. I will say that I wish to thank the minister because if it had not been for her remarks about the Canadian red ensign, remarks which ensured my re-election to the House of Commons, my campaign would have been much more difficult.

Miss LaMarsh: On a question of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker, I challenge the hon. member, who has now said I made remarks with respect to the red ensign, to produce proof of same in the house. It is not true that at any time within the county of Kent I made a speech on that particular subject. My remarks were directed more particularly with respect to the voting record of my hon. friend previously and not the flag at that time. I challenge him to produce such evidence before he makes such allegations.

Mr. Danforth: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to get into a personal argument with my hon. friend—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Danforth: —but perhaps she will recall a certain tea party where questions were asked on the red ensign—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order.

Mr. Lambert: Well, now, wait a minute.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): I am sure the hon. member would not want to continue too long in this vein and will soon get back to the resolution before us.

Mr. Danforth: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order that has been raised, surely I have the right to answer a question posed to me by the minister.

Mr. Lambert: On a phony point of privilege.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. The hon. gentleman does have the right to reply. I was only suggesting to him that possibly he would not stay too long on this particular topic and that he would get back to the motion before the house.

Mr. Danforth: I do not have to stay too long on it because the candidate was asked a question on the red ensign and he hedged, but the hon. lady did not hedge and that is the reason I am here today.

Miss LaMarsh: Mr. Speaker, on the question of privilege, I remember no occasion, except for one which was a private matter, when my hon. friend was present at any meeting at which I was present. I assume my hon. friend knows the rules of the house and that when he makes such remarks he makes them on his honour, and challenges remarks which I make on my honour as a member of the house.

Mr. Danforth: Mr. Speaker, I am certainly prepared to let the matter drop. The minister has made her statement and I have had the opportunity to make my statement. I rely on my statement and if necessary will furnish proof of my statement. Mr. Speaker, because of the fact statements have been made that this is a deliberate concession to the province of Quebec, because statements have been made that the government has sold out, because all these statements cast doubt on this country of ours and could create a division, I sincerely believe that the only way in which these doubts can be resolved is to have a plebiscite based on the subamendment and let the people show whether or not they are in favour of this new Canadian flag. I am convinced that the people of the province of Quebec are unjustly accused—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Danforth: —because all they are doing is asking the government to live up to its campaign promises, and nobody in Canada should be penalized for that. Unless we have a vote of this nature we have no idea whether the majority of people in Quebec, Ontario or any other province are in favour of this flag or the red ensign, or a combination of compromise, or perhaps the one maple leaf flag.

I am very sincere and most serious about this matter because, as I have stated before, the people of Canada are very much concerned about the outcome and about the way the matter has been handled. Too many people are being unjustly accused of acts for which they are not responsible. There are accusations and counter accusations and this problem must be solved. Here in parliament we must find a method of solving it that will work to the advantage and meet the wishes of the majority of the Canadian people.

If the people of Canada are given a chance to make their views known I believe they will not accept one flag of one man, of one particular party. There is too much of the future of Canada at stake. I am absolutely amazed at the number of people in this country who are concerned about the fact that any man in Canada would dare to remove the crosses from the Canadian flag. Why do they want to remove the crosses? People take a very serious view of this. Where are we going in the design of this flag?

May I say I hope a way can be found out of this impasse. Let the people decide. Is the government afraid? Do you not dare to let the people decide?

Mr. Favreau: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think that the decision which was rendered, appealed and confirmed after appeal, is so fresh in our minds that we have no reason to have forgotten it and we should not depart from it. Under that decision the question is not whether or not we should have a plebiscite.

Mr. Churchill: Yes, it is.

Mr. Favreau: This is a matter which is theoretically assumed on the basis of the decision. The only question is, granted we should have a plebiscite, are the four questions submitted in the subamendment proper for inclusion in the questionnaire? I submit

respectfully that all discussion of whether we should have a plebiscite instead of a vote by the responsible members of parliament is out of order on the basis of the decision rendered this afternoon.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order we heard the ruling this afternoon and Mr. Speaker read from Beauchesne. We do not need to repeat those passages. I have read Beauchesne as well, and the rule says that when there is a motion in front of the house and an amendment and a subamendment the main motion in effect is set to one side, the amendment becomes the substantive motion and the subamendment is in amendment of that. According to the rules the amendment plus the subamendment are the subject for debate—

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Lambert: That is what you argued this afternoon.

Mr. Churchill: —so the hon. member is within his rights in talking about the value of a plebiscite.

Mr. Danforth: This is the second time I have been interrupted. I have tried to abide by the ruling and keep directly within the terms of the subamendment. I would say this. The subamendment asks if you are in favour of the Canadian red ensign or of the three maple leaf design. We have heard hon. members state why they are not in favour of the red ensign. I listened to their deliberations quite respectfully in silence, because I was interested in hearing their views. I have come to the conclusion that when they make their choice they will be doing something that no enemy of Canada has ever been able to do, that is lower the red ensign.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Danforth: I will go one step further, Mr. Speaker. I can say when they make their choice I will be wondering if it is not pure irony that the mad pursuit of this change will settle nothing. The province of Quebec will still fly the flag of Quebec; the province of Ontario will still fly the red ensign; the province of Newfoundland will fly the union jack and British Columbia will fly the union jack. This is an impasse. This is a horrible situation in which Canada finds itself. I hope there will be statesmen in this house who will stand up and say what they believe is best for Canada rather than what is best for a local headline.

Mr. C. F. Kennedy (Colchester-Hants): At this stage of the debate, Mr. Speaker, I should like to put forward a few of my views on this question, a question which should be at least of some concern to all Canadians. I am very much aware that it is of vital concern to a great number, and the indications that I have received from my part of the country are to the effect there is little or nothing wrong with our present flag. As a matter of fact, it has been and still is flown very proudly.

It is a matter of regret that this question has come before the country at this time when some elements seem to be in a state of unrest with regard to racial and economic matters. It seems to me that changing our flag at this time, especially in the manner that it is being pursued, will not ease tensions or create unity. Much of our national and historic pride is wrapped up in historic symbols which are now displayed on our flag, the Canadian red ensign.

I cannot believe that the majority of the people of this country wish to destroy the symbols and historic attachment for those symbols for which so many young men and women suffered and gave their all. I do not suggest that these young people went to war only because of a flag. They did so to fulfil their heartfelt obligations to the principles they have inherited and went quite prepared to lay down their lives to defend them. If the youth of this country feel that these historic symbols are no longer important, and I do not believe for one minute that they do —as a matter of fact, indications reaching me are to the contrary—then it must be because our educational system has failed to indoctrinate them with an appreciation of what has gone before. After all, education is an accumulation of what has been revealed in the past.

I was born in this country and under our present flag. During my lifetime, I have experienced some of the difficulties which one would expect to encounter in a growing and changing country. However, never once have I blamed these difficulties on my forebears, or the symbols which they produced. I still have to be convinced that the offspring of any race, whether born in this country or adopting this country and truly understanding the principles for which our symbols stand, would willingly seek to destroy them.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, some compromise is necessary and, as a legislator, I must not close my mind to this possibility. But in the light of the strong feelings evident on the measure which is before this house today, I

beg of the Prime Minister and his government that they reconsider this matter. After all, I am sure that if those with strong views had an opportunity to air their views and to hear the strong views of others, no matter how contrary, all concerned would feel much better.

Before this house at the moment is an amendment and subamendment. These two amendments taken together, if accepted, would refer the choice of a flag to the people themselves. Since the people already have a flag, there is no urgency and a plebiscite could be conducted conveniently and without cost, during the next federal election.

In closing, I again appeal to reason, because in this case time is not necessarily of the essence. Should this house vote on this matter without the expression I have referred to and our symbols of the past disappear, I shall deeply mourn their passing. I commend to all people words which are contained in the new brochure of parliament issued on the occasion of Canada's recent birthday. I quote:

> Walk proudly through the home of all our freedoms. Feel yourself welcomed. Stand silently amid the brave, proud ghosts of men who forged our nation. Look thoughtfully on word-drenched walls, thick with a hundred years of history. Breathe deeply of an air that is, to you and yours, the very breath of life itself—for being Canadian, your breath of life is freedom. Guard carefully this heritage, that freedom's house may stand.

I emphasize the last line by repeating it:

> Guard carefully this heritage, that freedom's house may stand.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I had decided some time ago to take part in this debate and I thought it would be useful to prepare some remarks on the general scope of this subject concerning a national flag and the events that led to the present situation.

However, since there was an attempt to stifle us and since the situation has changed a little, I shall, therefore, change my speech.

Now, I accept the ruling given by the Chair although I do not agree with it at all. The Chair can impose a ruling upon us but not its reasoning. Therefore, I hope the house will not have cause to regret the decision made this afternoon. Let us get back to the subject now before us.

[*Text*]

Just in case somebody has some observations in regard to what they feel are the limitations of this afternoon's decision I would suggest that the first paragraph of the subamendment be read and it will be seen that the subamendment cannot stand by itself. It says:

> —that in such a plebiscite among the questions to be placed before the people should be the following—

There is a reference to a prior clause. There is full discussion of a plebiscite "and that such a plebiscite" should contain certain questions.

Notwithstanding the remarks of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau) there is no doubt whatever in my mind that both the amendment and the subamendment may be discussed, and that was the purport of the ruling, that the discussion should be relevant, and that is what I intend to be and what my colleagues intend to be.

During the course of certain remarks this afternoon it was indicated by some hon. members that they felt there had been sufficient discussion. Hon. members opposite are quite prompt to try to close down debate. We see comments in the press and elsewhere; and across the way they use that word "filibuster," which sounds so nice. But you know, Mr. Speaker, there are those in a democratic regime who believe in freedom of speech. Hon. members opposite profess they believe in freedom of speech as long as they are speaking or they intend to speak, but if anybody else wishes to express an opposite point of view, then of course the discussion is closed. These comments were made this afternoon and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is right to comment upon them. I have said what I want to say about them, but let it be quite clear that I reject them entirely.

I would like to hear the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Roxburgh) and a lot of others get us and speak on this question, and that brings me to the question, why a plebiscite? Do hon. members feel that they themselves are expressing the views of their constituents, that because of certain personal characteristics—

Mr. Favreau: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think it is my duty, so long as it seems quite clear that the ruling made by the Speaker is not being respected and applied, to rise on a point of order, and I shall so long as I think I should. The decision which was rendered by the Chair this afternoon, and which I repeat was appealed and confirmed on appeal, was to the effect that the discussion is to be limited to the subamendment. The only question before us presently is whether or not, if there should be a plebiscite, it would be in order and appropriate that

the four questions submitted by the hon. member for Regina City (Mr. More) be included in the questionnaire. This is the only point before this house, and what the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) has just said is that he intends to depart from the ruling which was rendered this afternoon. I submit respectfully on the face of his very assertion that any part of any speech in the house which does not concern that particular question ought to be ruled out of order.

Mr. Lambert: Well, Mr. Speaker, I reject entirely the argument of the Minister of Justice, and if he would read the subamendment he would see the word "plebiscite" is contained in it, and that is what I intend to discuss.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It was the feeling of the Chair that the remarks being made by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) at this point were rather of an introductory nature and that he would get to speak to certain aspects of the plebiscite in due course. That is why the Chair did not feel it should intervene at this point. I know the hon. member who has the floor, now knowing the purport of the decision rendered by the house this afternoon, will want to abide by it.

Mr. Lambert: I think I fully understand the purport of the ruling this afternoon as well as the Minister of Justice. I also think I know my rules a little better than he does.

In so far as the plebiscite is concerned, I maintain that the Minister of Justice himself is not one who can personally say that he can determine for the people of his constituency that there shall be one design, and that one design only shall be the flag of this country. I fail to see how an hon. member, on such a matter so personal to himself and to the people, can say that the flag shall be one design and one design only. That is all that is being presented to us. This, in essence, is the only choice before the members of the house, either to accept the flag or bring about the downfall of the government.

The Minister of Justice may think he has curbed debate as a result of what he did this afternoon, but what he has done is actually to split speeches into two or three, because these points will be brought out.

Mr. Favreau: At the proper time.

Mr. Lambert: Well, if the minister was trying to improve, or sort of get the debate moving along, I can assure him from experience that what he has done is merely going to reverse that.

Mr. Robichaud: Is that a threat?

Mr. Lambert: The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Robichaud) asks, is that a threat. He used to sit over on this side and we could hear him quack quacking from the top of the fence. That is what he is doing now. He is not even in his seat. Let us not hear from the Minister of Fisheries.

In so far as what should appear in a plebiscite, the first question we propose is, are the people of Canada in favour of the red ensign? That is a very simple question. It is not like some of the polls that were taken during the course of the last few months which asked, "Are you in favour of a red ensign as against a distinctive national flag?" They did not say what was a distinctive national flag. It was the red ensign against the field. That is one question we are asking, and from the mail I have received I can assure hon. members that there are great numbers who insist upon the red ensign. They have the right to do so, the same way as other people have the right to insist on another design.

I do not wish to force a design on any person. This is something which is personal, something which derives from family antecedents, the part of the country in which one was brought up, or in which one now lives, or perhaps because of military experience. I myself was profoundly impressed by the red ensign this summer while with the maple leaf tour in June from Caen to Nijmegen. I attended the ceremonies at the Vimy memorial and on that particular day, and in that particular setting, with the Canadian red ensign flying across the Vimy memorial, the effect was most moving. It was a proud flag, joined there with what is possibly the proudest memorial to the men of this country who gave their lives for freedom. It was a symbol of Canada. That is how it struck me on that occasion.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lambert: The red ensign was flying, also, at the cemeteries in Normandy, in the Pas de Calais area, at Ypres—all historic names—as well as at the cemetery where my own comrades lie. Then again, it was flying at Canada square in Dieppe and at the Dieppe cemetery.

This is how it affects some people. I will admit there are others who do not share these sentiments. My mail indicates a di-

vergence of opinion. It is predominantly in favour of the red ensign, though, as has been shown by other polls. But I come to the conclusion, and I have tried to be as fair as I can, that the division within the country is very close as between the red ensign and a—I repeat the word "a"—distinctive national flag. Thus, if the three maple leaf design which is now proposed by the government were to have support of only 55 per cent of the people of the country, or 51 per cent, does this mean it is likely to command the support and affection and the loyalty of the rest of the people of Canada? This is what bothers me with regard to the division which has been indicated during this debate.

I have been talking about the red ensign. The next suggestion is a modified form of red ensign showing the British connection by the union jack and the French partnership in this country by the symbol of the fleur de lis. This may be one form to be considered. There are others which are proposed. We have seen a great number of designs combining the union jack with the fleur-de-lis on a red background. Let it be known that the red background gives a certain dignity and, shall we say, posture to a flag which is not apparent in many other designs.

The third design mentioned is that put forward by the government, the three maple leaf design. This whole flag business has been introduced at this time in order to give the country what some people have sought, namely a distinctive national flag. But we have to look at the word "distinctive". What does it mean? I looked it up in Webster's dictionary. The definition given is "Distinguishing from others; characteristic". Take the first meaning—"distinguishing from others". Is it suggested that the red ensign is not distinguishable from others? I have here a chart of the flags of 110 nations, members of the United Nations in December, 1962. If we look at this chart from the point of view of whether the red ensign is distinguishable from others, let me say there is not one flag that approaches it. This cannot be said for many other of the flags which appear on this chart. I could show hon. members many instances where there are almost identical flags with colours reversed or a slight change in design. Here they are—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. May I bring to the attention of the hon. member that it is not customary in this house to use documents, or exhibits, if I may use that term, of the type the hon. member is now using. He showed this exhibit and the Chair said nothing. But I know he would not wish to use it extensively. The hon. member might refer to a recent ruling of Mr. Speaker when flags were exhibited in the house. At that time Mr. Speaker ruled that they should not be so exhibited. I feel it would be very bad practice if members were to bring into the house for the purpose of supporting their arguments exhibits of the type the hon. member is now using in his speech.

Mr. Lambert: I realize certain difficulties which might arise if flags were spread all over desks, as was done on the occasion of the recent ruling, but I think a comparison between bananas and oranges is being made here. On the other hand, I am faced with a printing problem. I could ask that this chart be appended as an appendix to *Hansard* but the colours would not come out and therefore I could not make my point.

I have a list of the similarities here but I shall not go into the details. May I simply indicate that many of these flags are similar in appearance. And I am talking now about national flags; I am not talking about merchant marine flags or secondary flags where there might well be similarities. After all, because of the limitations imposed by the designs themselves, there are bound to be some similarities.

Let us consider the other part of the definition—"characteristic". Take the three maple leaf design. First of all, I am told on good authority that this is a botanical impossibility. Let us consider whether this design is characteristic of all Canada. I am only repeating an argument which is well known, but—

Mr. Matheson: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Lambert: Oh well, I know the hon. gentleman is the authority who put them together. May I suggest that the maple leaf is not characteristic of Canada as a whole. It is only characteristic to a limited region of the country. I think one could make as good an argument that because the buffalo once roamed in millions and millions on the western prairies, yet did not exist in eastern Canada, the buffalo is as characteristic to Canada as a whole as the maple leaf is to Canada as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, there is some difficulty in arguing that the maple leaf is characteristic to Canada as a whole.

Mr. Matheson: Why did the Meighen government recommend that the maple leaf emblem be adopted?

An hon. Member: You have already had the opportunity of making a speech.

Mr. Matheson: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the hon. member why the Meighen government recommended to His Majesty, King George V, that the maple flag—three leaves on one stem—should be the emblem of Canada?

Mr. Lambert: I feel there is some difficulty in associating some of these representations with any particular party or government. If one looks back to the antecedents of the red ensign one will find them in the time of Sir John A. Macdonald, and in various forms until 1904 when it was taken down by a minister in the Laurier administration. The hon. member has referred to a particular administration and I will mention another. The red ensign was taken down and replaced by the union jack during the Laurier administration.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to discuss the aesthetics of the maple leaf design. I should like now to deal with the fourth alternative. Perhaps I should not refer to it as an alternative because my hon. friend, shall we say a linguistic purist, suggests that the four choices should not be considered as alternatives, and I concede him that point. In any event, I find the fourth choice, the single maple leaf design, preferable to the three leaf design. Unfortunately the three leaf design has been supported by what I consider to be a very artificial argument, that is, that one leaf represents the Anglo-Saxon population.

Mr. Matheson: Nonsense.

Mr. Lambert: One leaf of the three leaf design represents the Anglo-Saxon side, one leaf represents the French side and the third leaf represents the other people of Canada.

Mr. Matheson: Nonsense.

Mr. Lambert: It was your own Postmaster General who used that argument.

Mr. Matheson: He was wrong.

Mr. Lambert: You say the minister was wrong, and I agree with you. This argument is a most artificial and unsupportable one, yet is the one that has been trotted out on occasion by the government to buttress this choice.

Mr. Matheson: Oh, no.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Speaker, the reasons I have given, make it possible for me to believe a far better and more acceptable design is that of the single maple leaf which represents unity of Canada. I would think far better of something which represents oneness or unity in Canada than of something which will permanently imprint a division in the minds of the people of Canada.

An hon. Member: It would only do so in your mind.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Speaker, someone suggests it would only imprint this division in my mind, but I suggest that was the reaction to the argument used by a government spokesman in respect of the choice of this symbol.

I think the official opposition has been eminently fair in putting forward these four choices. We have not rejected the choice of the government. We feel it should be put forward to the people as one of the four choices. The opposition has accepted as a choice a design with one maple leaf, which seems to have had its most enthusiastic sponsorship from hon. members to my immediate left. We have also accepted the red ensign as a choice. We have accepted also a modified form of the red ensign. We have done so in order to give the people of this country a chance to have some features included which they would like, and eliminate others which they feel should not be included. I think the opposition has been eminently fair in regard to the four choices.

I find myself, representing a large and populous riding, in a great dilemma in so far as the choice of a flag is concerned. Mr. Speaker, I conducted a poll in which I asked the constituents of my riding the following questions: Are you in favour of the proposed maple leaf flag? Are you in favour of the red ensign? Are you in favour of some other distinctive national flag? Those questions reasonably approximate the questions to be put to the people on this plebiscite. I chose the individuals to whom I wrote in this regard in an attempt to have a good cross section of the constituents from the standpoint of age, income level, ethnic origin, religion, urban and rural, yet answers were quite clear. In so far as the question in respect of a distinctive flag other than the red ensign, of approximately 100 people answering, 48 were against and 38 were in favour. In so far as the question regarding the red ensign, 58 were in favour and 32 were against. Approximately 60 people were against the adoption of a maple leaf design and 25 were in favour.

I also asked whether this whole question in respect of a distinctive Canadian flag would be divisive or promote national unity. Of ap-

proximately 100, 75 thought it would be divisive and 25 thought it would promote national unity. The people contacted were evenly split as to whether a referendum should be held or not.

Mr. Speaker, I think the poll I conducted was very fair. I think the method I used was more conducive to an accurate result than asking the people the one question: Are you in favour of the red ensign as against a distinctive national flag? A national poll has indicated that more people are in favour of the red ensign than of an unknown distinctive national flag.

Mr. Speaker, I feel the many other points I wish to speak on should be reserved for another occasion. I should like to say this, Mr. Speaker. We have given a fair choice to the people of Canada. We have been fair from a political point of view. The three maple leaf design has been politically motivated, or at least it was born under partisan political conditions. We have accepted the N.D.P. suggestion as one choice, because we do not want to make a partisan political proposal in respect of a flag. To do so would be entirely wrong. I do not believe a national flag of Canada should be born under partisan political pressures; yet this is the method proposed to us and the method by which it is to be adopted. There was no choice offered. I should say there was a choice: Take it or leave it.

On that note, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the people of Canada should be asked to adopt a flag on a take it or leave it basis, and it is for that reason I ask hon. members to support the subamendment.

An hon. Member: Oh, yes.

Mr. Lambert: That suggestion is much better than any made by the hon. member who sits there muttering in his beard.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Drouin: Would the hon. member allow me a question?

Mr. Lambert: Certainly.

Mr. Drouin: Could the hon. member tell us what would be his views on the flag issue if he had to reply to the four questions suggested by the hon. member for Regina City (Mr. More) in a referendum? What would be his opinion then?

Mr. Lambert: At present, as representative of my constituents, I fully support the red ensign.

[Mr. Lambert.]

[*Text*]

Mr. Matheson: Would the hon. member permit a question. He referred during the course of his remarks to a number of historic battles which occurred in the first world war. He also referred to his own comrades, and we know he is a veteran of the Dieppe raid. Did I understand him to suggest that we ever saw action under the Canadian red ensign before June 1944?

Mr. Lambert: I certainly did not. I said that I saw the sites of those battles in 1964, with the red ensign there representing Canada. There was never any suggestion that it was otherwise. But I certainly never made any pretence that I rode into battle under the red ensign. Whoever does so is going to draw fire right away. It would be ludicrous. After all, we are not back in the fourteenth century.

Mr. A. D. Alkenbrack (Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Speaker, I am appreciative of the privilege to rise in this chamber at this time to make my contribution to this debate. Someone has said that no question since that old contentious question years ago out west—the execution of Louis Riel, who incidentally would not have been executed had he not previously caused Thomas Scott to be hanged—has been more controversial in this divided country than the question of this Canadian flag. I am sure you would agree that that is true. I am not taking a pessimistic view of the matter, because I think in the end good thinking and the proper use of compromise in the interests of all the people concerned will prevail, and that we will work out a solution to this contentious question.

Today this modern question of the flag is born of the same reasons that that old question out west was born. The former controversy, now far back in antiquity, was a needless development. It was born of bad politics, of hatred, of one man's lust for power and a certain amount of misunderstanding. A lot of those things apply today in this debate. Some men become so imbued with a lust for power that they are determined to ride roughshod over the sentiments, civil rights, institutions and emblems of God fearing citizens. Is it any wonder that this party, the Queen's loyal opposition, is taking an active part in this debate when these dangers are present? Riding roughshod—that is what the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) is trying to do, and will do, if he can get away with it. His politics—those of the Prime Minister and his party—are bad at the present time, Mr. Speaker. He

and his party as well as all other parties promised the people a distinctive Canadian flag.

At this point I want to cite the bad politics, the shiftiness, the deception finally and actually implied in this promise. The people of Canada—and I mean the majority of the people of Canada—calmly agreeing in the last election campaign to this, did not expect the resulting so-called distinctive flag to be one from which both the union jack and the fleur-de-lis would be absent. I am sure that every hon. member here will agree that that was not the general expectation of the people of this country. They expected to see those two old and honoured emblems, the union jack and the fleur-de-lis, on the promised so-called distinctive flag. But what a political play hon. members opposite have made of that word "distinctive", Mr. Speaker. Did Your Honour—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I hesitate very much to interrupt the hon. member. His speech is, of course, very interesting but before he goes on I feel I should read to him for his guidance the ruling of Mr. Speaker, which was sustained by the house this afternoon; I am sure the hon. member would want to limit his remarks in the light of the decision. His decision is in these words:

> That in accordance with section 2 of citation 202 and also May's sixteenth edition at pages 424 and 425, when a subamendment is proposed the subamendment is for the time being the question before the house and in consequence thereof debate must be relevant to the question covered by the subamendment.

I realize that the hon. member has to start somewhere and that to begin with his remarks have to be general. However, I would suggest that eventually he should come to the point of the question before the house.

Mr. Alkenbrack: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, My remarks though general at the start, are not at the present time general. With all due respect and courtesy to you the paragraph I am citing now from my notes applies to paragraph 2 of the subamendment, which reads:

> Are your in favour of the Canadian red ensign with changes made thereon to show the main heritages of both founding races?

That is the subject about which I am talking at the present time. I am sure that simplifies that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I do not wish to argue —indeed I cannot—with the hon. member, but surely his argument cannot be that because there is a reference in the subamendment to the Canadian red ensign he can say anything about the Canadian red ensign. The question before the house is, what should be contained in the proposed plebiscite; whether the plebiscite proposed should include certain specific questions. My understanding of the ruling made by the house this afternoon is to the effect I have just stated. In any event I have read the decision which was made. I am not trying to make a general ruling, but if there is any difficulty I would be pleased at that time to give my opinion whether or not the hon. member is in order.

Mr. Alkenbrack: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With all due respect to Your Honour, if you were listening to my words you would see that I am in order. Did Your Honour or any other member of this house ever anticipate, previous to our being informed of the Prime Minister's private choice of the trifoliate twig on a bedsheet as the Canadian flag, that it would be an emblem devoid of the emblems of the two great peoples who founded and developed this country? This relates to the second paragraph of the subamendment which asks:

> Are you in favour of the Canadian red ensign with changes made thereon to show the main heritages of both founding races?

If you can make anything else out of that, Mr. Speaker and hon. members, it is beyond all comprehension of any parliamentary procedure ever invented by British institutions and handed down to us today.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): Don't stop; read on.

Mr. Alkenbrack: You will get your chance to make your speech. It is too bad the hon. member does not take part in this debate. I think the answer to the question I just asked is no. What is it, Mr. Speaker, that motivates this policy? I think I can tell you. In his hunger for political histrionics and mastery of the stage, and for a sweep of 75 possible seats in Quebec, he would sell the birthright and the sacred symbols of the other remaining nine provinces. Hon. members will all remember Cowper, the famous English poet of the 18th century. I think his words apply this evening. He said:

> 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 state of affairs this country is going through at the present time. I urge my colleagues from Quebec, and I hope they are here in goodly numbers, not to be seduced by this gesture on the part of the Prime Minister and his administration, for there will be a day of

payment if you are. There will be a future price you will have to pay if you dance to his fiddle.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. In spite of the objections raised by the hon. member for Prince Edward-Lennox a moment ago to the call to order from the Chair, I feel that the hon. member is completely irrelevant at the moment and I would advise and entreat him to keep in mind the decision of the house, not necessarily the decision of the Chair, which was reached by a vote this afternoon. The decision of the house is that the question before us now is the subamendment and certainly I cannot see how the hon. member can relate the points he is now making to the subamendment. They might be very relevant to the main question or might even be relevant to some extent to the amendment, but quite sincerely I do not think they are relevant to the amendment.

Mr. Starr: Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak to the point of order. The subamendment moved by the hon. member for Regina City last Thursday is in these words:

—and that in such a plebiscite among the questions to be placed before the people should be the following—

Then four possibilities of choice by the people are listed including the red ensign, the red ensign modified, the three maple leaves flag and the one maple leaf flag. Surely you are not saying, Mr. Speaker, that anyone speaking on the subamendment cannot discuss the advantages of voting for any one of these flags and compare the method of a plebiscite on four possibilities with the method suggested by the Prime Minister. If you were to so rule then surely there would be no point in a member saying he was in favour of the subamendment, and saying nothing else. I think a member should be able to compare the plebiscite method with the method proposed by the government and to point out the advantages with regard to the choice of flags. Surely if an hon. member prefers one of them he can, with all due respect, give us his opinion. Surely he is not going to be deprived of the opportunity of voicing his opinion as to which flag he prefers among the four listed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I think it is rather useless for the Chair to try to argue with every member who disagrees with a ruling made by the house, but to my mind the question before the house now is the propriety of putting certain specific questions in a plebiscite. To my mind that is obvious and I would suggest that as much as possible the hon. member deal with that matter. As an example I would cite the speech made by the hon. member for Edmonton West which to mind appeared to be relevant and I considered it to be relevant because it dealt with these four specific points. If the hon. member will frame his speech within those confines I am sure he will have no difficulty with the Chair.

Mr. Alkenbrack: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Clause 2 of the subamendment is in these words:

Are you in favour of the Canadian red ensign with changes made thereon to show the main heritages of both founding races?

We have been discussing the lack of symbols on the suggested new flag, such as we expected would show the heritages of the two founding races. I exhort my hon. friends on the back rows of the Liberal benches, who by supporting this implacable flag policy of their leader remind me of a herd of trained seals on an ice floe that is rapidly breaking up, that they had better leave while they can.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Alkenbrack: Because of their actions their ice floe is breaking up. It is melting away and it is soon going to become uninhabitable in the gulf stream of truth. I appeal to them, Mr. Speaker, because of the untenable national position of their party as a result of the new low they have reached in the opinion of the majority of the people of the country.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Alkenbrack: I swing back to clause 1, "are you in favour of the Canadian red ensign". What a play they have made on the word "distinctive". According to the dictionary "distinctive" means "marking a difference or separation". That is an ominous explanation, for by playing on the word "distinctive", which has been endlessly repeated by the Liberal party for the past year or so, they have certainly marked out a separation in this country. That honoured flag, the Canadian red ensign, is more than distinctive. It might better be termed "distinguished". It marks out no difference or separation in this country but nobly represents the symbols, aspirations and personal patriotism of every citizen of Canada.

What are the attributes of this distinguished flag? What are the synonyms of "distinguished"? Prominent, conspicuous, noted, glorious, illustrious and famous. Hon. mem-

bers will agree that right here on the hill the appreciative lenses of thousands of cameras are pointed every day to capture the glory of this flag high up on the peace tower.

I swing to clause 3 of the subamendment, "Are you in favour of the three maple leaves design"?

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Alkenbrack: This reminds me of a comparison that took place right out on the east lawn. On the day that the Prime Minister authorized the trial flying of his flag, the three maple leaves design, on a special pole in front of the Senate, a friend of mine, Mr. Brian Blackstock of Toronto, a schoolteacher, was showing two university professors from Texas the sights of parliament hill. They inquired as to what the meaning was of this flag flying on a pole while at the same time the Canadian red ensign was flying on the peace tower. Their comment was: Surely you are not going to adopt this for your country's flag in preference to the beautiful banner flying from above. They said that to them the new flag looked like the flag of one of the emerging nations of Africa or resembled a flag of commerce, advertising a product for sale.

An hon. Member: Soap flakes.

An hon. Member: Imperial oil.

An hon. Member: Molson's ale.

An hon. Member: Canada Packers.

Mr. Alkenbrack: The youth of Canada, many of whom know the meaning of the component features of the red ensign, are asking the government and parliament especially to maintain this distinguished flag as the flag of our country. There are thousands of our people, especially those who in their youth have been boy scouts, girl guides or wolf cubs, who have learned the meaning of this flag and its features. They have learned to honour and respect this flag. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, who the base, arch conspirator would be on the right hand side of this chamber over which you preside who in years past has told the youth of this country and indicated to them by the example of action and use, "This is your country's flag flying over this hill and the public buildings across the country, the Canadian ensign", but who now says "This is not your country's flag; I have another one which I ask you to honour from now on". This is just like taking good parents away from a child, substituting another set of parents, and asking the child immediately to love and honour the new parents while the real ones still exist.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Alkenbrack: Hon. members opposite may laugh, but I think it is a good comparison. The youth of this country say, do not give us a meaningless flag; do not give us this pale creation which is one man's choice.

This is the reason we need a plebiscite.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dupuis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

You have already called to order several times the hon. member who has the floor. Now this afternoon, a question was put to the house and the house asked that we restrict our discussion to the subamendment now before us. So I wonder how many times the Chair will have to repeat the same thing. The comments being made by the hon. member who has the floor are completely irrelevant. Therefore, I feel you should ask the hon. member to stick to the subamendment.

[*Text*]

Mr. Smallwood: I rise on a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I do not believe the hon. member has any right to get up and start lecturing our members. He has no point of order at all.

Mr. MacInnis: I rise on a question of privilege. I wish to bring to your attention at this time the discrimination shown by the Chair against members on this side of the house.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. MacInnis: In support of my statement I can quote no better authority than your ruling, Mr. Speaker, of May 4. I quote from *Hansard*, page 2892:

> My understanding of the practice in these debates is to consider both the amendment and the subamendment at the same time and not to be too restrictive so as to eliminate all discussion which might not be strictly relevant to the subamendment.
>
> I think we should take into account that in order to be acceptable the subamendment must relate in some way to the main amendment. This would indicate that remarks of the type now being made by the hon. member for Coast-Capilano are relevant.

These two paragraphs I have just quoted from your remarks indicate that the Liberal members of this house are enjoying privileges which are tonight being denied the members on this side of the house. I do bring before you, sir, a very sound question of privilege.

Canadian Flag

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I recognize that the decision to which the hon. member refers was actually rendered by the Chair. I remind him also that the decision with which the Chair now has to contend is a decision of the house itself. The Chair was quoting, for the benefit of hon. members who had the floor from time to time, the decision reached by the house this afternoon.

In so far as discrimination is concerned, it seems to me that what the hon. member has quoted is proof of just the opposite. The decision which was reached at the time was really in favour of the hon. members who were speaking from the left of Mr. Speaker and was to allow them a little bit of latitude. I feel that at the moment the hon. member is entitled to some latitude. The reason I have interrupted from time to time was simply to quote the decision of the house for the guidance of all hon. members on both sides of the house.

Mr. MacInnis: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Why then was the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Dupuis) permitted to rise, and without recognition by the Chair, interrupt the hon. member in his remarks?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Minister without Portfolio rose on a point of order and the hon. member who had the floor yielded the floor by sitting down. The minister had a right to raise a point of order, just as the hon. member for Cape Breton South had a right to raise a point of order. I think we would make better progress and it would be to the advantage of all concerned if we allowed the hon. member to continue his remarks.

Mr. Smallwood: You keep quiet and listen over there; perhaps you will learn something.

Mr. Alkenbrack: I was talking about the request of the youth of this country to give them a live flag, a flag that could grow with the country. They say, do not give us a dead flag. This trifoliate flag cannot be added to. The three maple leaves on the white background are confined by the two blue bands at the end. This flag cannot grow. Whatever heraldic balance it possesses, that is the way it must stay down through the ages. We need a flag like the red ensign that has evolved, grown and developed with the country and whose make-up can accommodate further growth. The Northwest Territories and the Yukon will soon be provinces, so some day these provinces will need symbols on our flag.

[Mr. MacInnis.]

Paragraph 3, Mr. Speaker, asks, are you in favour of the three maple leaf design? In looking over this scheme of collusion between the government and certain provincial components of the country, I note that hon. members on the government side have been most anxious to get the Prime Minister's flag through as quietly as possible. They reveal themselves by their own, individual actions. Orders have been given to their back benches: Do not debate the question; let the opposition founder against our rocks of silence; when the opposition carries on the debate long enough, then we will accuse them of obstruction. For some time now Liberal strategy has urged members to keep quiet regarding the flag, and this has been illustrated tonight.

Paragraph 2 of the subamendment asks, are you in favour of the Canadian red ensign and changes made thereon to show the main heritage of the founding races? We are urged not to say anything to hurt the feelings of Quebec because of the fear of dividing the country. Now, Mr. Speaker, how deceptively naïve can you get? How deceptively naïve are the occupants of the government benches? How gullible do they think we are? How gullible do they think the rest of the country is? There is a cause for every effect and this debate, no matter how long it may take, is the effect of a cause. The cause is the bad performance, the deceptive politics of this government. The cause has already divided the country as it has never been divided hitherto and the scars will take many years to heal.

Referring to paragraph 3 again, Mr. Speaker, and the three maple leaf design, I may say this:

Canada is often portrayed as a muscular Jack Canuck in high boots, tight breeches, khaki shirt open at the chest, and felt hat, a doughty, durable, indestructible character, the twentieth century epitome of the pioneer, and the indomitable spirit that built this country under the surveillance of law and the union jack and red ensign. But this portrayal is not the true Canada. Canada is fragile, as the Prime Minister has lately learned. Canada is a 4,000 mile assembly of many races, many regional interests, many creeds, each often on a different curriculum, but of course all studying at the same school of life, Canada, and of many varied economies, but all working together. That is what we should be doing here.

The Liberal party has hurt Jack Canuck and the picture of Jack as I have just given

it. It has hurt this country and now, by this ill founded flag measure the Liberal government proposes to inflict more wounds on Canada, wounds that may never heal. I say to the Prime Minister, "Stay your knife, let the noble banner that with faith, justice, patience and charity helped build this country continue to wave over us and we will go on to greater unity and greater accomplishments." Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe that in the end we can work out something that will suit all the people of this country.

I have mentioned the tactics of the government and the lack of debate from the government benches. If this trifoliate white sheet is any good, if it is worthy of succession as Canada's flag, one would assume it was worthy of support on the positive side of this debate. But no, it is a conspicuous fact that by the silence of most of the Liberal party—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order please. I am sure the hon. member will agree with me that at this point he is beyond the limitations of the debate when he discusses whether there have been contributions or not from another part of the house.

Mr. Alkenbrack: I was just saying, Mr. Speaker, that it is quite evident this trifoliate flag gets little support from members on the Liberal benches.

Mr. Sharp: Let parliament decide.

Mr. Alkenbrack: The Toronto *Telegram* of Thursday, May 21, portrays the Canadian red ensign, our flag, trampled and torn, its flag staff shattered, lying on the muddy field of politics. It has no business there. The Prime Minister and his administration which put it there have much to answer for and will certainly pay for their actions when the people of this country are given the opportunity of judging their acts.

Why is it that more Ontario Liberals do not take part in this debate? I have here a clipping from the Campbellford *Herald* of Wednesday, July 29, showing a survey which reveals Northumberland county wants the ensign. The Cobourg *Sentinel-Star* conducted a survey and makes this comment:

> Mr. Foster Russell, editor of the Cobourg *Sentinel-Star*, in a recent editorial chided Dr. Jewett, member of parliament, for her stand on the Pearson flag issue, saying that she did not represent the wishes of her constituency in her stand for the discard of the red ensign.
>
> To prove his point, he conducted, at his own expense, a survey of the county, making a spot check of 662 citizens in a house to house canvass—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order please. I think I have to try again to make the argument I made to the hon. member a moment ago, that although this might be relevant in another part of the debate it seems to me it is not relevant to the specific question before us now.

Mr. Alkenbrack: With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, this clipping is relevant to clause 1, clause 3 and clause 4 of the subamendment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order please. I would ask the hon. member to co-operate with the Chair. It is the Chair's opinion that this article may be of great interest and may be relevant on some other occasion, but I believe that though it does relate in some way to either clause 1, clause 3 or clause 4 of the subamendment, that is not the point before the house. The question before the house is that the amendment be amended by adding thereto certain words, and the question is whether these words should be added to it or not; and I would ask the hon. member's co-operation.

Mr. Churchill: On the point of order, earlier Your Honour suggested that members might indicate the propriety—that was your word—of listing the four subjects for the plebiscite. The hon. member who now has the floor is indicating that there is a need to ask the question about the red ensign, because of the desire of the people to express their wishes on that. I took that to be the substance of the article he was reading.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The argument made by the hon. member is interesting but I still feel that it is a little far fetched for the hon. member for Prince Edward-Lennox to claim that what he is reading now is relevant to the subamendment before the house. I do not think it is necessary for me to read again the question before the house or the authorities cited by the Speaker this afternoon, but perhaps I might take one minute to refer to the main citation, No. 202(2) in Beauchesne's fourth edition, which states:

> As the proposal of an amendment to an amendment originates a fresh subject for consideration, the new question thus created must, to prevent confusion, be disposed of by itself. An amendment, when undergoing alteration, is therefore treated throughout as if it were a substantive motion upon which an amendment has been moved. The original motion, accordingly, is laid aside; and the amendment becomes for the time a separate question to be dealt with, until its terms are settled.

I have read the question which was put by Mr. Speaker this afternoon and on which there was a vote of the house. I think that the argument the hon. member is now making

is not relevant to the question before the house.

Mr. Alkenbrack: In short, Mr. Speaker, the people of Northumberland, like the people of all our districts in that part of Ontario, want their wishes known in this chamber. The results of the survey were: ensign; 300; union jack 92; maple leaf 132, other flag 45, no opinion 57, total 626, which is almost five to one against the three leaf Pearson flag.

I am also convinced that this proposed new flag design is unacceptable to the people of Leeds, and I deplore the ill founded policy of nothingness, and nihilism, advocated by the hon. member for that riding. Of course, he being the architect and author of this three leaf flag, this heraldic hallucination—

Mr. Matheson: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege.

Mr. Alkenbrack: —which he and the Prime Minister will substitute—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Leeds has the floor on a question of privilege.

Mr. Matheson: Mr. Speaker, I think I have been gratuitously involved in this discussion and I think the hon. member, if he considers this matter with any honesty at all, appreciates there is no Pearson design, there is no Matheson design; there is simply the advice taken on the grant that was accepted by the former Conservative government and which is now the heraldic law of this nation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson) was rising on a question of privilege. I doubt whether it was a question of privilege. The hon. member was making an argument, and I would point out that he has a right to rise later on in the debate to explain what he may have said in order to clear up what might have been a misrepresentation. But I do not think there is a question of privilege here and I would ask the speaker who has the floor to continue his remarks.

Mr. Churchill: I rise on a point of order with regard to an expression used by the hon. member for Leeds. He implied that the hon. member for Prince Edward-Lennox (Mr. Alkenbrack) was not speaking with honesty and I would ask the hon. member for Leeds to withdraw that imputation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Certainly no hon. member can impute dishonesty to another member, and I am sure the hon. member for Leeds would wish to explain to the house that the words he used went beyond his thoughts and that he did not intend to impute dishonesty to the hon. member.

Mr. Matheson: Certainly I hasten to withdraw anything which would impute any suggestion of dishonesty to an hon. member who is also my friend and neighbour in Ontario. But I do think in fairness to myself I should be allowed to put this point before the house—that the government be authorized to take such steps as may be necessary—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: As I said a moment ago, the hon. member will have an opportunity to speak again in the course of this debate. If he feels there has been some misunderstanding or misinterpretation, he may speak again by way of explanation. He has now withdrawn any imputation which may have been contained in or inferred from his remarks and I suggest that the hon. member who now has the floor be allowed to continue his speech.

Mr. Alkenbrack: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was discussing this heraldic hallucination, this piece of nothing which the hon. member for Leeds and the Prime Minister have substituted for something. That is all. I can agree that nihilism, or nothingness, is his doctrine and his forte. "Do away with everything we have found to be good" he says "and in its place let us have nothing". By the same Mathesonian token this means we should go further and formulate and adopt a new language having no connection with either French or English and no trace of tradition or old values. Hooray for the nihilistic new Liberal policy—nothing.

An hon. Member: That will suit the N.D.P.

Mr. Alkenbrack: I should like to point out to the government if they would avoid capsizing on the shoals of fact, that Canada is only as strong, as united, as unanimous and as happy as are the several provinces. One of the provinces namely Manitoba, in disagreement with the position taken by the government regarding the flag has already named the red ensign as its provincial flag. Seven other provinces are flying the red ensign from all their public buildings and their citizens fly it from the verandahs and rooftops as never before. Newfoundland, as is its ancient and honourable usage and custom flies that great and respected banner, the union jack. What is the reason? They have finally come to life. They have realized they are in danger of losing this emblem which is so dear to

them and which has meant so much to their fathers and mothers down through the years.

I respectfully suggest to the government that the value of the opinions of the premiers of the provinces be recognized in deciding this vital national question. The government need have no fear of politics being a factor in present circumstances when four of the provincial governments are Liberal, four are Conservative and two are Social Credit—a very fair balance sheet which I think would yield a lot of wisdom. I suggest this should be done even if it should be decided to take a referendum. Let us first have the advice of these men. They could help select a flag which would take nothing away from the recognition of either of the founding peoples.

I have here an article from the Ottawa *Journal* of Wednesday June 17, 1964. It states:

> The Prime Minister appeals for everyone to accept the decision of parliament, whatever it is. But there will be more chance of general acceptance if the flag of Canada is selected with reflection and careful choice. Democracy demands that dissenting voices be heard before the will of the majority prevails—

This house tonight does not seem to be too willing to grant this democratic privilege.

> —perhaps including the method suggested in these columns on June 3—a postponement of decision long enough to allow a meeting of premiers and party leaders to give their views on the flag. Our thought was that even should such a conference fail to attain unanimity it would enable the federal government to demonstrate clearly it had sought unanimity.

I am in favour of the amendment and of the subamendment, particularly of the paragraph which asks: "Are you in favour of the Canadian red ensign?"

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have to interrupt the hon. member. I may say his time expired some five minutes ago but he was given this additional time in view of interruptions and points of order which were made while he was speaking. Unless he has the unanimous consent of the house to continue his remarks—

An hon. Member: We have suffered enough.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I regret the hon. member cannot continue without unanimous consent and there definitely is not that.

Mr. F. J. Bigg (Athabasca): Sometimes I wonder, with all due respect, whether the House of Commons is here to decide the affairs of this nation or whether we are simply here on a hair-splitting expedition. This man Beauchesne is a very learned gentleman, but I do not think his book was ever written in order to throttle debates in this house. I do not see how we can discuss the subamendment and the amendment unless we talk about the substance of what we are here to talk about, that is, the flag.

The people of Canada want to know—and this is what they ask me in almost every letter I get—what we are doing about the flag. This is a subject which usually is too hot to handle. Politicians shy away from the subject as a rule. They are not shying away from it tonight. You can see they are not. We intend to attack this problem until we know what we are fighting about. So, with permission of the house I want to tell hon. members what this flag means to me. I cannot argue in a vacuum. I cannot tell others what it means to them. But I have a right to say what it means to me and I know I speak for at least a million Canadians when I do so. I do not wish to parade my war service but after all I cannot deny my origins. I cannot deny that I am of British origin. When I am speaking about a flag would you ask me to say that I am willing to give away a tradition of my race? The British people are a proud race.

Mr. Sharp: That is right we are.

Mr. Bigg: One of the reasons we are a proud race is that we face every difficulty that comes before us in a chamber such as this with free discussion, with kindness and with patience, and we make positive contributions. It is very difficult to make a positive contribution when emotions are aroused and we lose our tempers and call each other names. This institution was not based on that kind of performance and it has stood for 2,000 years.

One of the things this flag has stood for, Mr. Speaker, is this institution. We are allowed to take part in a free discussion in this chamber, and I say to you that if you allow this freedom of discussion to be stopped by closure, by booing and catcalling, or by calling each other names, this institution may well become a great Stonehenge—a circle of silent stones, and freedom will be wept for at that grave.

I have visited Stonehenge on the island of England. Perhaps Stonehenge is a circle of silent stones now because freedom died in Britain 3,000 years ago and was reborn under the Christian cross. I do not know whether people believe anything any more, or whether any of us believe anything.

The origin of the cross in this flag lies in the fact that Joseph of Arimathea took our Lord and Master down off the cross. He knew what a cross was. He saw the Son of

God hanged on a cross. He took that body down and is the man who supposedly brought the first cross to Britain 2,000 years ago. I am not a hairsplitter or a quibbler but let us say he brought the first cross to Britain 2,000 years ago.

I am not a history teacher but a Canadian, born on a homestead out west. In case you think I am a displaced person perhaps I should state that I have a little native blood in my veins. I have this native blood in my veins because John McKay, who came out to Canada with Alexander Mackenzie, married a native out in western Canada. That was seven or eight generations ago so there is no need for you to be superior. Do not bother to look up your own family trees.

My grandfather was a Hudson's Bay factor at Lac la Biche in 1874. I will not go back in my family's history further than that.

An hon. Member: We are just envious.

Mr. Bigg: My grandfather loved these native people and treated them fairly. When the natives burned down the fort they spared him and his family because of his honest and square dealings. This took place in the days of Louis Riel. Louis Riel believed in the British crown. Why should those who scream about Louis Riel being such a patriot now desire to do away with the British flag and the British crown? Why should they want to create another Stonehenge? Do not forget that the British crown and flag stand for the first cross brought to Britain 2,000 years ago.

I will not vote for any flag that denies to Canada the heritage of the Christian cross. The fact that there are three crosses in the union jack and in the corner of the red ensign does not make those flags any less loved. The red ensign was the flag representing a union of the cross of St. Andrew and the cross of St. George in 1801. We also included our Irish friends because we have always admired them. Most of Britain's good soldiers were Irishmen, including Montgomery and Alexander. Many Irishmen saw fit to fight many wars under the British flag.

I am not a waver of the British flag as the last word for democracy or freedom, but I say this, that under the British flag more freedom has been spread across this planet than under any other sign. I challenge you, one and all. Which of you who want to pull down our flag and trample it in the dirt would dare to go across the line and suggest they should take their "glory" down and trample it in the dirt, and expect to live. Are we going to be something less than the land of the north and the land of the free? We are all very quick to jump to our feet, throw out our little chests and show our visitors from the south our fishing holes and our important resources. What is our most important resource? I suggest our most important resource is our love for freedom and for fair play. That is our greatest resource.

Do any of you remember what happened to Uncle Tom, or do you remember Uncle Tom? Uncle Tom knew where to find freedom. He found freedom under the British flag. You want a distinctive flag for Canada. I suggest we have a distinctive flag. I say we now have the most distinguished flag on this planet. I do not put our flag ahead of my country. Our flag is only a rallying point. Our flag was at that place where the Van Doos and the First Field Regiment stood side by side on the battlefield.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Bigg: I should like to continue.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, please.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Some hon. Members: Closure.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member who has the floor will realize that when another hon. member rises on a point of order he should be heard on that point. The Minister of Justice has risen on a point of order.

Mr. Favreau: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As everyone will agree, we would really have closure if I were not allowed to express my point of order.

Mr. Smallwood: Make sure you have something to say this time.

An hon. Member: Shut up and listen.

Mr. Favreau: I do not wish to repeat the argument that was made this afternoon, but I should like to suggest very respectfully that the debate now is directed toward a question of what would constitute a proper questionnaire to be put to the people of Canada if there is to be a plebiscite. We are bound in this regard by the decision rendered this afternoon by Mr. Speaker. That decision was appealed and confirmed on appeal. We are presently limited by the Speaker's decision in which he made the distinction as between that decision and the previous one rendered in respect of the principal amendment, stating that we are not concerned here with an alter-

native and, therefore, not concerned with the merits of an argument as to whether the red ensign is a distinctive Canadian flag. We are concerned with questions to be properly included in a questionnaire to be put to the people. So long as we do not discuss the matter of the drafting of the questionnaire but instead attempt to discuss the merits of the principal question we are out of order, as ruled by Mr. Speaker as recently as this afternoon.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak to the point of order. The Minister of Justice has stated we are concerned with questions to be included in a proposed plebiscite. Surely in discussing those questions to be placed on a plebiscite an hon. member may give reasons why those questions should be included, and that is exactly what the hon. member has been doing.

Mr. Bigg: Mr. Speaker, there is nothing I like better than to be challenged in my own field. I happened to take the trouble to obtain some legal training, before coming to this house, in anticipation of running into this type of argument. In every statute on our books one will find an interpretation clause. I am sorry I must use the facilities provided by an interpretation clause before referring to the meat of my subject. I have yet to get to the meat of my subject.

If I have not done so already, I should like to explain, what a flag means to some people, because some people I know do not know what a flag means. Mr. Speaker, I am using an interpretation clause to speak on the point of order. I am attempting to give a lawyer's answer to a lawyer. If you would like a citizen's answer to a citizen I invite you to stand up and tell me what a flag means to you and why you think the Christian cross should be removed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Has the hon. member concluded his remarks on the point of order?

Mr. Bigg: Yes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I believe the point raised by the Minister of Justice is well taken. On the other hand, I think the argument made by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) has substance also. But we are definitely bound by a decision of the house made this afternoon to the effect that we should discuss this specific matter relating to the plebiscite.

Mr. Bigg: Mr. Speaker, I am trying to be fair and lucid, and I think most hon. members are able to follow my argument. But what is a flag without history? How can we say whether or not we will have a plebiscite if we do not know what a flag is? A flag is a rallying point for all national sentiments. The national sentiments of those of British origin are very strong, but they are not exclusive. Let me take my lawyer's training again and say that Canada is not one nation. Canada is a legal entity consisting of two main races of people joined together with an evolutionary system of government. The events which occurred on the plains of Abraham in 1759 no longer count. It does not matter who won the battle.

Mr. Clancy: It does.

Mr. Bigg: In the treaty of Paris in 1763 Canada was ceded to Britain, which perhaps is an unfortunate truth. That may have been an unfortunate event in history, but I claim that by 1864 we had reached another stage in the evolution of our country. In 1864 the Fathers of Confederation met at Charlottetown, and I gather there will be another meeting there shortly to commemorate that event. I hope that the hundred years since 1864 have not been without their value. I hope that when this meeting takes place we will take another look at this legal entity of ours which we call Canada and which we hope will be a nation, and perhaps at that time we will reaffirm what one might call our marriage vows.

I for one have always been willing to meet Canadians of French origin on an equal footing. In case I am called to order I am talking about our dual heritage behind our flag. I am taking great pains to try and learn la belle langue française and I shall continue to do so until I can converse as fluently in the French language as I can in my own.

I would submit that we are not in fact two different races of people, in the sense of being black or white, or distantly related. I think it can be said that the French and English are very closely related indeed, if not by actual blood certainly by culture. Their respective cultures have intermingled so much that it is hard to tell where British culture ends and the French starts. I am sure that many of us on reading our school history books were moved to tears at the story of Joan of Arc. I would be proud to have the flag of Joan of Arc incorporated in any Canadian flag.

An hon. Member: Who wants it?

Mr. Bigg: I would want it. That is why I have the right to stand up in this house. My family happen to be of Norman-English blood. My name in Norman-English is spelt "Bygge"

and means "barley". After a thousand years we are proud of our dual ancestry in Britain. Here in Canada after 100 years we are proud of our dual ancestry in Canada.

I am not trying to stir up strife here, Mr. Speaker. I am asking for co-operation. I am asking for the same level of brotherhood which is always being talked about and for the right to give my side of the story. One of the reasons I am proud of my British heritage is because I am also proud of our French. I do not think we can build a nation in Canada unless we take this attitude and are willing to forget the plains of Abraham and the last hundred years of bickering. Why not start now on August 17, 1964, and cut that out and get down to brass tacks? But we are not going to get down to brass tacks, any more than we did on the plains of Abraham where we used cannon, unless we sit down and talk things over. The battle of the plains of Abraham was 200 years ago. Have we learned nothing in 200 years? We failed with cannon, so let us get together and compromise.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Bigg: I am talking of the dual cultures.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member may be talking of dual cultures, but I think the dual culture part of his speech should be related to the plebiscite and to what questions are to be put on the plebiscite.

Mr. Bigg: Mr. Speaker, if hon. members do not know what a flag is, how can we decide that matter? I believe that the people of Canada do know their flag, because I have travelled through Ontario this last week and seen thousands of flags flying. Yesterday I went to Belleville and in a store there I saw being sold over the counter the Pearson pennant. There was a great big sign two feet square outside saying: "The flag of Canada".

Mr. Monteith: Shame.

Mr. Bigg: Now, it may well become the flag of Canada. I for one will be the first to serve that flag if and when it is ratified.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Bigg: I said if and when. But I say to hon. members opposite, do they think they have the right to make the decision, if they have not the courage to stand up and say why? I am not afraid to stand up and say why. There are 15,000 people in my district of French ancestry or of French relationship and a great many of them are proud of the present flag, the red ensign. I am willing to take a democratic vote in Canada on any design. I believe in democracy and my ancestors have believed in it for 2,000 years, ever since the dignity of man was once and forever held up before God and man—the Christian ethic. I should like to hear someone stand up and tell me—I would much prefer it was the Prime Minister—why I must take down the present standard as my standard of behaviour.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): Read *Hansard.*

Mr. Bigg: They took Joan of Arc's flag down. They put her lily banner in the dirt. and she was only a woman. But what a glorious woman she was. She put her lily banner out in front and never looked back, and with her very small army swept the ranks clear. She put the rightful heir, I am led to believe, on the throne of France. Then the king of France ratted on her, and you know the rest. Now she is a saint. Which of those opposite in their male pride will stand up and say that they think the lily banner of France or the cross of St. George should be laid in the dirt?

I am not running down, Mr. Speaker, home-made designs. I know where the flag was made. I know who drew it. He has boasted about it openly. He is the man who gave us a new flag. It was given to a man with great courage and determination, a man brave enough to put an economic gun to our heads and say: "Take this flag or you will lose your $18,000 a year". But my dear fellows, do you think there is any amount of money that would make me sell my flag or my country? They hang their heads and say: "Isn't that drivel?" But it is not drivel to me or to the 30,000 men who may never see the flag again. Are they going to rub it off all our national monuments?

An hon. Member: We will rub you off.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Bigg: Stand up and say that. Stand up and say it.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege—

Mr. Bigg: Have I the floor or haven't I?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member has the floor but the hon. member for Cape Breton South is rising on a question of privilege.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member on the other side who made that threatening remark should have the courage to stand up, identify himself and repeat it, or is he ashamed to do so?

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, I did not utter the remark, but one thing that is running out is the opposition's sense of humour.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Athabasca.

Mr. Bigg: Mr. Speaker, I do not think anything we can do can destroy the parliamentary system, no matter how we mistreat it. It has lasted too long. But I do appeal to hon. members to put their petty opinions to one side. If you have not got the courage to stand up and ask for a free vote and if your leader has not got the courage to allow a free vote, then we have no alternative but to put the matter to the people of Canada in a plebiscite. This is the substance of the matter. We are down to it now. Have we not got the courage to stand up on our own feet and say what we think? We have just had a glorious example of the lack of it. I would not like to think that kind of behaviour was typical of any segment of our population. I know that the people in the galleries and the people throughout the country are not ashamed to stand up and say where they stand on the flag and I want to give them that opportunity.

Some might say, when did you dream this up? I have never sidestepped the question of the flag. In *Hansard* for January 21, 1962 you will find a 20 minute speech by me on the subject. I begged hon. members then and I got little response. So I am not being partisan in this matter. I think we have all been delinquent. We all know what our flag has been and we might as well have ratified it 100 years ago. French Canada has always been proud of her allegiance to the British crown, at least in the last 100 years, and if they are not now, then I say stand up and say so. This is a free country. That is one of the advantages of being a Canadian.

Do those people who talk about secession really want to secede? I am sure Newfoundland does not want to secede. All the people there want to do is to retain their British traditions. Joey Smallwood told you that in no uncertain terms and you had to change your original resolution. Many people across the country admired the Prime Minister temporarily when he said: I will come out and cut the Gordian knot; I will give you the opportunity to make a nice clean decision on the flag; I will offer you this flag so that you can clear up the issue once and for all, so that you can stand up and be counted and be Canadian.

That sounded fine, but when Joey did not like it a two-headed resolution was brought forward. Now we are going to have two flags. If you go to Britain and talk to the Queen you wave the union jack but if you are somewhere else you wave something else. Is this the way to be united? I am sure there is not one member in this chamber who does not believe in democracy and if we had a free vote and the vote was 51 to 49 I am sure we would all stand up and sing "O Canada", salute the flag and say God save the Queen. If this is not so I am very much misled. I am in the wrong company if this is not true. This is what I thought when I first came here and this is what Joey Smallwood thought when he led his loyal little island into confederation. He said: We will now become part of the brightest star in the British crown. He meant that. Don't think Joey didn't mean it. He is not going to be nice to you boys if you do away with the flag. You know that, so you have backed down.

Now you are ready to back down, for what? Is it for the $18,000 and the splinter groups because you have not got the courage to stand on your own feet? Oh, they are going to bring in an amendment and you are going to vote for it because that is the only way to save your political future.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Plourde: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

If the Conservatives have nothing but stupid things to tell the house over and over again, it would be better for them to remain seated, because we are ready for the question.

Their filibustering tactics are detrimental to the interests of the Canadian people. I am getting sick and tired of the Conservatives.

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. There is no question of privilege. The hon. member for Athabasca.

Mr. Bigg: We have the first question in the suggested plebiscite, will we retain the red ensign? Of course we should. Second, should we have a modification? I do not like backing down at all, but I certainly put my country ahead of my own personal opinion and pride. I would say that if we must have a modification of the flag I love in order to keep Canada one I will vote for it. Third, should we have the three maple leaves flag? I see little merit in it though I like the maple leaf. We used to sing "The Maple Leaf Forever" and it was a term of derision. A lot of people in Canada did not like it. But what did we of British origin do? We abandoned any

idea of making it our national anthem because it divided us and we have adopted "O Canada", a French Canadian song with very strong religious overtones. We have compromised and accepted that, many of us perhaps with heavy hearts, but those who want to see a greater Canada and who love this country will take "O Canada" and sing it with that much more enthusiasm because it is one of the beloved songs of our French brothers. We have compromised. I do not think there has been one word said in any part of the house against that decision.

I for one would like to see a package deal and have national service also. Some will say: Oh, this is an old soldier speaking and he cannot forget. No, it is hard to forget the friends, the volunteers I served with. It is very hard to forget and I will not forget them. But I am not going to put sloppy sentiment ahead of the unification of my country. So I say that if the majority of members of the house in a free vote will stand up and conscientiously say that they honestly want to do away with everything we have had in the past, that only with this new flag can we march on as a fully united country, that every man jack, be he native North American or French or English, will rally to these colours and if needed will give up his time, his money and loved ones, put them all on the table and say, "I will go", then I will accept that decision. Some enlisted because they were unemployed but I will not say that about my friends. I will not say that about the ones who did not come back. I will not say it about the boys in bomber command. I will say this to defend myself, which I rarely like to do. If I am the only yellow one in the family it is a peculiar thing because in my father's family there were four brothers, one of whom was in the British navy, one in the Strathcona Horse, one in the South African police and my father was in the mounted police. I have three brothers. My oldest brother was in the Royal Canadian Air Force. Let us keep them flying. My second brother was in the Royal Canadian Navy, the senior service, and my youngest brother was in the R.A.F. I myself tried to fly and could not qualify so I had to go into the lowly artillery.

I appeal to the soldiers and non-soldiers. I really believe we do need symbols. We do need a rallying point. There are times when nothing else but the sight of the old flag rallies you out of the dirt, and not the flag on a pole like the hon. member for Edmonton West said. No, you do not go in for flying the flag, but you fly it somewhere. You fly it deep down inside you where it cannot be got at when you are darned good and scared. There are no heroes in battle. You land on your face in the mud but you still get up and go on again simply because you marched into school 15 or 20 years before singing "O Canada" and looking at a little piece of red bunting flying at the masthead.

Do not ask me to turn my back on it, to forget it and never look at it again. If we have to have this new flag I want you to do this much at least. Parade a man from every regiment in Canada that ever served under the red ensign and let them march to the peace tower and lay the red ensign away with glory where it belongs. Do not let it down and say that it means nothing, because it means a great deal to a lot of people.

I do not like to have to talk like this. I do not want to have to go to the widows of this country and say that we have no flag. The people in Holland know that we do. All you have to do is take out one of these little flags about three inches square and show it to the people in Holland. They will crowd around you like a bunch of chickens for a crust of bread; they will be glad to have you back. You should have seen the tears running down their faces when we went into Amsterdam. Where these little flags came from I do not know. The people waved them in Amsterdam. You say, what battles were you in? Everybody cannot fight battles, but we can all be patriots. Is there something smelly about that word now? When nurse Edith Cavell died, she was not ashamed to say "Patriotism is not enough". Do you know what she meant?

An hon. Member: Order.

Mr. Bigg: What would you like to order? If you people really want me to sit down, I will. The single maple leaf design is only a political compromise and everyone in this chamber knows it. There would be nothing wrong with accepting the triple maple leaf if this would unite us. If it is going to unite us, if you are going to serve it, then there is nothing wrong with accepting it.

You laugh at the Legion and say they have no right to this flag. Are we taking it away from them? Were they all drunks? Were they all unemployed? Are they all drunks now? They were drunk with patriotism once. I am not willing to compromise on the single maple leaf design. I am not willing to take the triple maple leaf design on the

basis of my own choice. However, I say again, and I will keep on saying it, that I am willing to bow to a democratic choice. If each and every one of you can stand up on a free vote and vote for this then I challenge you to request your own leader to do so.

I suppose that the four questions listed are good enough for a plebiscite. I honestly believe that if the people of Canada have this choice, then the first question will win on the first ballot. If there is any way of satisfying our Canadians of French origin I am certainly willing to do that. I have nothing but love and admiration for these people. They are our flesh and blood. The fact that they have a rather difficult and beautiful language should make no difference. We follow branches of the same religion, at least. Here again, I think we have had an evolution in religious thinking. If they had had an ecumenical conference 500 years ago, who knows, there might never have been a division in the Christian church.

We have listened to one of our members here speak about nihilism and materialism; taking everything out of the flag and having nothing left. I think there may be something in this modern psychology which is attempting to do away with our standards. If we lose faith in each other we stand to gain nothing. I am one who has always stood for individual enterprise.

An hon. Member: Order.

Mr. Bigg: Is this not in order? It is the essence of our British culture just as I am certain it is of our French culture. The French are making a great contribution to our country. They are alive in the arts. They are intensely proud of their origin. I say if there is any way of giving them any more recognition, if there is any way we can cooperate to the slightest degree to make them forget the errors of the past or even the facts of the past, things we cannot undo, then I am in favour of that because we can certainly march on into the future together.

Let us have this referendum. If these four questions are not satisfactory, then perhaps we could consider others. I have thought about them and I cannot think of anything else which would improve them. We who are here have done a great deal to cloud the issue. We have said things, perhaps, that we should not have said. We have made this issue partisan, whether we want to or not. This applies to both sides. The only fair way is to go to the people and let them make this decision. I do not think it is necessary to have an election. There is a great deal of work we should do. I do not make this statement out of fear I assure you. You can look up the record. I think it would be a waste of time. I am sorry that no longer is the crown allowed to be the independent referee it used to be in the old days. Now the power to call an election rests in the hands of the Prime Minister. We all know this has been the case since 1925. It is up to him. There is no purpose served by looking at the Leader of the Opposition and saying, you fellows can force an election. The Prime Minister holds this stick and everybody in Canada knows it. This stick is being used, and I think it is an unfair one. I do not believe the flag should be a partisan question.

I have been giving you my own views. I have not been directed by any other member in this chamber. Perhaps some of them would have liked it better if I had not said some of the things I have said. However, there are times when if you do not speak, the very rocks cry out. I take full responsibility for everything I have said. I meant every word of it. I assure you that if we can find some flag design which will unite our country, I will be the first to vote for it and I will be the first to serve that flag when it is decided upon.

Mr. S. J. Enns (Portage-Neepawa): Mr. Speaker, it should be obviously a time of excitement when a nation is choosing a new flag. The fact that this is not possible should be abundantly clear to the whole house. The reason I make this statement is something I want to follow up, but I see the clock and it is 10.30.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

HOURS OF SITTING FOR FRIDAY, AUGUST 21

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): May I be allowed to revert to motions with the unanimous consent of the house?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Favreau: The various parties, through their respective house leaders have been advised that the opening session of the national conference on education will take place in this house on Friday, August 21. I, therefore, ask the consent of the house to move:

That when this house does adjourn on August 20, 1964, it shall stand adjourned until 2 p.m. the

following day and that the relevant standing and provisional orders be suspended in relation thereto, so as to allow this session to be held in this house.

Mr. Churchill: May I ask this one question? Translated into layman's language, does that mean we will adjourn at six o'clock on Friday?

Mr. Favreau: Yes.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

It being thirty minutes after ten o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to special order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, August 18, 1964

The house met at 2 p.m.

MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS

Fifth report of standing committee on miscellaneous private bills—Mr. Loiselle.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

CYPRUS—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON PRESENT POSITION

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): I think this question should be directed to the Prime Minister. Has any consideration been given by the government to having a request made for a meeting of NATO foreign ministers, or the NATO council, in order that the deteriorating Cyprus situation, in particular, and the withdrawal of units from NATO, all of which is full of menace to the continuing integrity of the NATO organization, might be considered by that body?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker, consideration was given by the government to a meeting of NATO foreign ministers to discuss and consider this very delicate and indeed dangerous situation. Our fellow members of NATO were approached to find out whether they felt it would be useful to have a meeting at this time; but the consensus within the NATO council was that while circumstances may make a meeting of this kind desirable and even necessary, they did not feel—the majority of them—that it should be held at this particular moment.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I thank the Prime Minister and I should like to ask him as well, arising out of the current situation in Cyprus, whether the Canadian government is supporting the Acheson proposal for the union of Cyprus with Greece.

Mr. Pearson: I am sorry, but I did not hear the last part of the right hon. gentleman's question.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The union of Cyprus with Greece; does the Canadian government support the Acheson proposal?

Mr. Pearson: This is a matter under discussion between the governments directly concerned and the Canadian government is not taking part in these discussions, at least at the present time.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Even though it is not taking part in the discussions, has the government given any indication that it does in fact support this proposal?

Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker. Our position in the United Nations force at this moment and in the present circumstances makes it important that we should maintain a position of neutrality in this matter.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): May I direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Has any progress been made in negotiations with the government of Cyprus regarding the extension of the terms of reference of the United Nations peace keeping force? May I ask the hon. gentleman also whether the fact that Archbishop Makarios is now playing footsie with Mr. Khrushchev is going to make any hope of such an extension less likely of realization.

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I think there are grounds for believing that the powers of the force as provided for in the original agreement with the government of Cyprus will be carried out.

Mr. Douglas: The minister speaks of the original agreement. Is there any hope of an extension of the present agreement to cover such things as the disarmament of guerrillas, in particular?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): The disarming of guerrillas is not necessarily precluded by the present terms of reference. It becomes a question of the capacity of the force in face of the numbers opposed to it. In any event, new powers are now being discussed, as I indicated yesterday.

Mr. Douglas: May I ask the minister if such powers are specifically stipulated in the agreement with the government of Cyprus?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): No, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the Secretary of

State for External Affairs is now in a position to answer the questions I asked him yesterday with regard to the withdrawal of Greek forces from NATO, particularly the extent to which this withdrawal is to take place, the proportion of Greek troops involved, and the implications of this on the general NATO position?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, as my hon. friend reminds the house, this question was asked yesterday. The decision of the Greek government to withdraw elements of its land, air and naval forces from NATO was officially made known to the NATO authorities yesterday afternoon. Members of the house will recall that action of a similar nature, relating to air force units only, however, had been taken earlier by Turkey.

The Canadian government regrets that both these governments should have found it necessary, for national purposes, to remove forces which had been assigned as part of NATO's defensive strength. However, the matter is now being discussed in NATO and I do not feel I can go any further at this time.

Mr. Harkness: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister can tell us whether the Greeks have withdrawn the major portion of their forces from NATO, or only a small portion; and particularly whether the withdrawal of the Greek portion of the eastern Mediterranean headquarters at Izmir means that this will now cease to be an effective NATO eastern Mediterranean headquarters.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): No, Mr. Speaker. In answer to the last question, there is no word of developments of that kind. The full extent of the withdrawal is now a matter of discussion, however, in the NATO council.

Hon. Léon Balcer (Three Rivers): I have a supplementary question for the minister, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister can tell us whether it is the intention of the government to recall to Canada the Canadian air force officers who are serving with the Turkish air force at the present time.

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Perhaps I might answer that question, Mr. Speaker. The house has already been informed that shipments of mutual aid in respect of aircraft parts to both Greece and Turkey have been suspended. Previously, in order to facilitate the supply of spares and the return of equipment to Canada for repair, we had officers in both Greece and Turkey. Some time ago the office in Greece was withdrawn. This was in accordance with previous plans. The office in Turkey was given responsibility for liaison with both the Turkish air force and the royal Hellenic air force. They have been instructed, however, to cease visits pending further developments.

There are three service personnel, one squadron leader and two sergeants, and two contract field service representatives, one Canadair and one Rolls Royce, remaining in Turkey. All these people's tours expire within the next few months and they will not be replaced at that time, unless there is a stabilization of the situation in the meantime. One officer, who had just returned to Canada when his tour expired, was not replaced. That is the situation at the present time.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the minister whether any of the 107 Sabre jets which Canada gave to Turkey were used by that nation in the recent bombing raids on Cyprus?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Perhaps I could deal with this particular question, Mr. Speaker. With regard to the recent press report that Turkey, and perhaps also Greece, used Canadian built aircraft provided to them as mutual aid in Cyprus, the position on F-104's was given in detail by my colleague the Minister of National Defence, as the hon. gentleman will recall, on May 13 this year.

With regard to the F-86 aircraft, Canada undertook in 1954 a program for the provision of F-86 mark II aircraft to Greece and also to Turkey under the general program for the provision of mutual aid to NATO countries. In all some 107 aircraft were provided to each country, with spare engines and spares support. There have been reports in the papers that F-86 aircraft were used by both Greece and Turkey during recent days, but we are not in a position as of this moment to know whether such aircraft had in fact been supplied by Canada several years ago under the NATO arrangements for the mutual assistance program.

However, I should point out to the house that equipment given by Canada as mutual aid is provided on the condition that the recipient nation accepts responsibility for use of the equipment so received to strengthen the capacity of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to deter or resist aggression. The implications of this condition in the present circumstances are being brought again to the attention of the governments involved. As my hon. friend the Minister of National Defence pointed out, at the

time when Canada decided to take part in the United Nations force in Cyprus there was a suspension by Canada of its mutual aid assistance program to Greece and Turkey.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could I ask the minister what steps the Canadian government takes to see that the recipients of military material, such as planes, use that material for the purpose for which it was intended; and in the event that the government finds it is not used for that purpose, is it the government's intention to have the material returned to Canada?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, if it were confirmed that these planes had been used contrary to the requirement of use, the Canadian government would raise the matter at once in the NATO council.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the fact that the UN secretary general, U Thant, announced that he was negotiating an agreement with one country in order to send a reinforcement of 900 men to the UN force in Cyprus, is the Secretary of State for External Affairs in a position to assure us that those negotiations are not being held with Canada and that Canada is not involved in the possible reinforcement of the UN force in Cyprus?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, I call the hon. member's attention to the reply I gave last Friday.

[*Text*]

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I have a related question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs which is as follows. In view of the fact that it was reported at noon today by the Canadian Press that a large number of British troops had been withdrawn from Cyprus, could the Secretary of State for External Affairs tell us whether these were troops under United Nations command or whether they were British troops which were under British command on the island? If they were under United Nations command, was Canada consulted in this move?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, I would prefer to deal with that question either later in the day or tomorrow, because I have a meeting this afternoon and I do not want to say anything before that meeting takes place.

Mr. Nesbitt: A supplementary question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the fact that it was also reported in the same news broadcast that over 50,000 Turkish troops were mobilizing and were on board ships in ports right across from the island of Cyprus, would the Secretary of State for External Affairs at the meetings he is attending whatever its nature may be, make strong representations to any countries which are supplying troops to the UN command not to remove any further troops? Because it was also reported that Canada is now the only country with a substantial number of troops on the island. Could the Secretary of State for External Affairs tells us at this point how many troops are at the moment under UN command in Cyprus?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, there are around 6,000. I am sure no country would remove all its troops without the prior consultation of the participating members and without the authority of the secretary general of the United Nations.

Mr. Balcer: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a supplementary question. Is it the intention of the minister to impress upon the United Kingdom government the necessity or at least the importance of keeping its force on Cyprus at its present strength?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Yes, sir.

[*Later:*]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Guy Marcoux (Quebec-Montmorency): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs?

Is the minister aware of the statement made yesterday in Canada by a Greek Cypriot student? She is reported as saying that the identification of the British and Canadian troops was not adequate, that often Canadian soldiers were taken for English soldiers in Cyprus and that the British troops were not as popular as the Canadian troops?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, I have not seen the statement.

[*Text*]

SOUTHEAST ASIA—INQUIRY AS TO ASSISTANCE TO U.S.

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State, or perhaps it had better be directed to the Prime Minister. In view of the fact that Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge is now in Europe address-

ing members of the NATO council, searching for assistance for United States policies in southeast Asia, is the government of Canada giving consideration to providing assistance to the United States in this region?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): We have already made statements on this matter and I have nothing to add to those statements, except that I believe Mr. Lodge will be visiting Ottawa within the next two weeks.

MALAYSIA—SUGGESTED TRANSFER OF MUTUAL AID FROM INDONESIA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the fact that Indonesia's aggressive attacks against Malaysia are continuing, the latest occurring only yesterday, would the hon. gentleman consider recommending to his colleagues that the hundreds of thousands of dollars now going to Indonesia be diverted to Malaysia to help that country defend itself against Indonesian aggression?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I would want to give consideration to whether that was a wise suggestion.

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): I should like to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether or not any or all of the other nations within the NATO organization have suspended mutual aid to both Turkey and Greece?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I may have misunderstood the hon. gentleman. Did he ask me what the others are doing, or what Canada should be doing?

Mr. Olson: No. My question was this—

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I am referring to the hon. member for Oxford.

Mr. Nesbitt: I was asking the secretary of state if he would request his colleagues in the Canadian government to give consideration to cutting off the supply of aid to Dr. Sukarno, in view of his aggressive attacks on Malaysia, and diverting this assistance, which I believe amounts to some $350,000 or $400,000, to Malaysia.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): The aid given to Indonesia is not military aid. As I said I would wish to give consideration to the suggestion made.

Mr. Churchill: What kind of aid is it?

[Mr. Nesbitt.]

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

HAL BANKS—FAILURE TO APPEAR IN COURT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Labour. In view of the absence of the Minister of Justice perhaps he can enlarge his answer so it might cover the legal aspects of the question, as it relates to Hal Banks. Does the minister have any information for the house today in regard to the whereabouts of Hal Banks and the three other S.I.U. officials who failed to appear yesterday and for whom bench warrants have been issued today? Does the minister have any information about their whereabouts?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): No, Mr. Speaker, I have no information whatsoever in respect of the location of Mr. Banks. I do believe at least one of the other officers who failed to appear yesterday is in Canada. I believe they are all in Canada, but I have no knowledge of the whereabouts of Mr. Banks.

[*Later:*]

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Acting Minister of Justice. It has to do with the elusive Mr. Banks. Has there been any estreatment of his bail bond as yet? Is the acting minister in a position to say what endeavour has been made to locate him? I do not want to suggest that he is on the island of Capri, but that seems to be a place of some attractiveness.

An hon. Member: The minister is coming in now.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I welcome the minister. If Banks would only turn up in the same way everything would be all right. Will the minister say whether there has been any estreatment of the bail? I also asked a question just before the minister came in to this effect. Is he in a position to advise whether there has been any indication as to the present whereabouts of Mr. Banks, particularly since he was said to be sojourning in New England?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): I must be frank and admit that if I was not in the house during the last half hour, I was not with Mr. Banks either. I do not know exactly, therefore, his whereabouts.

Seriously, I have requested that whatever information is available be obtained; and whether precise or not, I am not in a position to furnish it to the house today. I hope to be

able to say something about the matter tomorrow. In so far as the estreatment of the bail is concerned, I understand that this relates to the case with respect to which Mr. Banks was supposed to appear yesterday. I asked my officers this morning to obtain definite particulars from our counsel in this respect, and I will be in a position tomorrow to advise the house.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a supplementary question.

Has the Minister of Justice given instructions for the forfeiture of the $25,000 bond of Mr. Banks?

[*Text*]

Mr. Favreau: I must say that I have not given instructions for the estreatment of the $25,000 bond, for the following reasons. As I said yesterday, there is already a bench warrant issued, so there would not be much point in having the bond estreated. I am considering at the moment whether the cancellation of the bond, at this moment, would assist in obtaining the presence of Mr. Banks on September 14. In any event, I have taken no position on that or given no firm opinion. The main reason, as I have said is that a bench warrant is already available for the arrest of Mr. Banks should he show up.

So far as the bond is concerned in the case in which he was supposed to appear yesterday, I repeat that I have no final information, but my information at the moment is that crown counsel, acting for the attorney general of the province, intends to ask for its cancellation. As I say, we will have further information tomorrow as to the disposition of any motion that may have been made this morning.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Martineau: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Justice.

Was he consulted in the first place about the advisability of granting bail to Mr. Banks?

Mr. Favreau: With regard to the $25,000 bond or bail yes, as evidenced by the fact that after consultation with the then crown attorney, it had been decided, by common consent, that it should be suggested to the chief justice of the court of appeal to refuse any bail—a fact which the judge noted in his judgment—and failing that to set bail at not less than $50,000.

However, the chief justice, guided by his own experience, decided that $25,000 bail would be adequate. He gave his reasons in his judgment.

[*Text*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: Does the minister not now agree with the criticism that was raised by the opposition some weeks ago, that it was a most dangerous course to follow to give Banks bail and not assure in the bail bond that he should remain within the jurisdiction of the court?

Mr. Favreau: I just said, Mr. Speaker, that I have the greatest respect for the honourable chief justice of the court of appeal, who was appointed by the previous government. On the occasion of his appointment I wrote my predecessor Mr. Fulton to congratulate him. I just said that we thought we should object to the bond being granted, but I still say that I respect the decision which was rendered at the time. We still do not know whether Mr. Banks will present himself on September 14.

Mr. Diefenbaker: With regard to the kind of bail bond that is taken, does not the responsibility rest at all times upon crown counsel to see that the judge shall have before him the assurance that the wrongdoer will turn up? I see the minister is receiving assistance from the law student sitting beside him. I am directing the question to the minister. Is it not a fact that at all times the judge accepts what crown counsel suggests, if it is reasonable and right?

Mr. Favreau: Evidently the responsibility for suggesting to the court what attitude ought to be taken with regard to bond rests with crown counsel at the moment when crown counsel may give information to the court. But as of this moment it is the sole responsibility of the court to decide, under the court's authority, what the bond has to be, that is if the court reaches the conclusion that a bond must be set. In this particular case I say that crown counsel has fully discharged his responsibility toward the people of Canada, first in objecting to the bond; second, suggesting the bond ought not to be less than $50,000; third, respecting the court's decision.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Banks seems to enjoy some solicitude.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): In view of the fact that Mr. Banks seems to have appeared on parliament hill on every occasion upon which there were dealings with

the Department of Transport, has thought been given to the possibility of sending him a telegram to appear on parliament hill?

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question which I would like to direct to the Minister of Industry. Are copies of *Hansard* being sent to Mr. Banks so that he may be kept informed of the interest of this house in his whereabouts?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of Mr. Banks' address.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (Queens-Lunenburg): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Justice relative to the disappearance of Mr. Hal Banks. In view of the fact that Mr. Banks is vice president of the S.I.U. of North America and still draws $20,000 a year salary from that organization, has the minister or any of his officials contacted the head office of the S.I.U. to ascertain the address to which they are mailing his cheques?

CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

REQUEST FOR ANNOUNCEMENT OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Prime Minister. With respect to the statement he made yesterday concerning the repatriation of the Canadian constitution, I should like to know whether the government intends to inform parliament of the amendments it proposes to our constitution and the methods it suggests for amending our constitution in future, that is after the B.N.A.A. has been repatriated—

[*Text*]

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker; as soon as there is something to report on this matter naturally we would want to inform parliament.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a supplementary question to the Prime Minister. Could he tell the house whether the federal government has initiated talks with the provinces concerning the repeal of subsection 1, section 91 of the B.N.A.A., especially as far as the unilateral amending of the Canadian constitution by the federal government is concerned?

[*Text*]

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, we have only been considering a procedure for amending the constitution to repatriate it to this country, in the light of the forthcoming meetings.

Mr. Martineau: Mr. Speaker, my question was whether there had been direct conversations with the provincial governments concerning this particular article 91(1).

Mr. Pearson: I would have to look into that, Mr. Speaker. I will inform my hon. friend tomorrow.

CANADIAN FLAG

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON MEETING OF PARTY LEADERS

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Georges Valade (St. Mary): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister. Has he any statement to make concerning his meeting with the leaders of the four parties this morning, as regards the Canadian flag?

[*Text*]

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Not at this time, Mr. Speaker. We had a discussion this morning which was not concluded. We are going to meet again on Thursday, so I prefer not to say anything until after that meeting.

PUBLIC WORKS

OTTAWA—TABLING OF TENDER DOCUMENTS RESPECTING LEASING OF SPACE IN UNFINISHED BUILDINGS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, at the request of the Leader of the Opposition I wish to table the tender documents in respect of a public tender called by the Department of Public Works for the provision of leased accommodation for the Department of Labour and the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources.

FINANCE

FAMILY ALLOWANCES—ADJUSTMENT IN ACCORDANCE WITH COST OF LIVING

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Henri Latulippe (Compton-Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister.

Could the right hon. Prime Minister inform the members of this house of the reasons preventing him from increasing family allowances in keeping with the increase that has taken place in the other sectors of the national economy since 1944?

[*Text*]

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

AGRICULTURE

CHEESE—REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF POLICY

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Clément Vincent (Nicolet-Yamaska): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

Following the representations of the dairy producers federation, can the minister tell us whether he intends to reconsider the cheese policy which he announced on April 29 last, and either restore the 30 cents per hundredweight subsidy on milk or refund the premium of 3.6 cents lost by cheese factories on second grade cheese?

[*Later:*]

Mr. Speaker, before the events referred to a few moments ago by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) materialize, I should have liked to ask the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Hays) a question, but since the Minister of Agriculture cannot be present, would the Minister of Forestry be kind enough to ask him whether he received, yesterday or the day before, a request from the dairy products manufacturers' federation? Also, could not the Minister of Forestry take it upon himself to assist the Minister of Agriculture in settling the urgent problem raised by the Quebec province dairy products manufacturer's federation?

[*Text*]

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

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

QUEBEC—FEED GRAIN SUBSIDIES IN ST. JOHN AREA

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Forestry.

I read order in council 1155 concerning grants for the transport of grain to various parts of the country and I would like to ask the Minister of Forestry if there has been any error or if the wording is correct, because section 2(2) of schedule 4 provides that grants will only be applicable to farmers of the Saguenay area. As the order in council makes no mention of the Lake St. John region, must I gather that no assistance will be given to farmers of the Saguenay-Lake St. John region?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is referring to paragraph B. I have the order in council here and I can assure him that his constituency is covered under paragraph G of schedule A.

Mr. Lessard (Lake St. John): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister tell us if it is pure coincidence that the Îles-de-la-Madeleine and Newfoundland regions will both get higher grants of $15 and $25 a ton respectively? Is it only a coincidence or is it because those two regions are represented by the minister himself and the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill)?

Mr. Sauvé: That has always been the policy of the department as far as that constituency and that province are concerned.

[*Text*]

U.S. POLICY CHANGE RESPECTING MEAT IMPORTS FROM CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. H. Horner (Acadia): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. In his absence perhaps the acting minister could reply. Is the hon. gentleman now able to state the policy of the government with regard to the embargo placed on Canadian meat entering the United States? Some two or three weeks ago I asked a similar question and the parliamentary secretary said he would take it as notice, but we have heard nothing since.

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): Mr. Speaker, the minister left a minute ago. I will bring this question to his attention.

Inquiries of the Ministry

NATIONAL DEFENCE

CANTEEN DISTRIBUTION OF MATCH BOOKS WITH NEW FLAG DESIGN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence. Is the minister aware that military canteens are being supplied with pocket match containers bearing the imprint of the new Liberal proposed three maple leaf flag and, if so, did he authorize their distribution?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, first of all I must admit I am unaware that this is being done, but if it is being done out of mess funds that would be outside the direct jurisdiction of the department and under the jurisdiction of the officers in charge of messes.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Ask the Minister without Portfolio.

BAGOTVILLE, QUE.—EXTENSION OF WATER SERVICE TO NEIGHBOURING COMMUNITIES

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Maurice Côté (Chicoutimi): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Associate Minister of National Defence.

Could he tell the house whether we can hope for an agreement between his department and a group of municipalities of Chicoutimi county concerning a metropolitan water works project that could supply the R.C.A.F. base at Bagotville?

Hon. Lucien Cardin (Associate Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of meeting with a delegation from Chicoutimi county concerning a waterworks project which could at the same time supply the Bagotville R.C.A.F. base.

The department now has that request under consideration and I hope it will be possible to give an answer in the affirmative.

[*Text*]

RETIREMENT OF REAR ADMIRAL OF ATLANTIC FLEET

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Defence and follows up a matter discussed yesterday. In view of the difficulty of going into details on orders of the day, would the minister be ready to discuss with the special committee on defence the principles underlying, or the reasons for, the forced retirement of Admiral Brock?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): No, I do not think so. There are many factors which enter into these judgments which are very carefully thought out in advance of decisions being taken and, as I indicated yesterday, I do not think it would be in the interest of either the services or the individuals concerned that there should be a post mortem in each case, because there will be many such cases running through the whole ranks structure.

STATEMENT ON RECOVERY OF ARMS STOLEN IN MONTREAL

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Last Thursday the hon. member for Medicine Hat asked a question with regard to the recovery of arms stolen from the Fusiliers de Montreal armoury earlier this year. I am now in the position to reply to this question. I am informed that of a total of 110 weapons stolen, 97 have since been recovered. The investigation is being continued with regard to the remaining 13.

IMMIGRATION

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF CHINESE ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Ian Grant Wahn (St. Paul's): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration may I direct this question to his parliamentary secretary. In view of widespread interest, will the parliamentary secretary tell the house whether further consideration will be given to prolonging the Chinese amnesty and adjustment program, and also to revising the regulations with regard to landing requirements for all immigrants?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I shall take the question as notice and bring it to the attention of the minister.

Mr. John N. Turner (St. Lawrence-St. George): Would the parliamentary secretary also transmit to the minister the question whether he would consider in future giving at least three months' notice before lifting the amnesty, so that Chinese people in Canada might be given an opportunity to

apply, and also publishing notices of the policy in the Chinese language newspapers in Canada?

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in view of the interest of the parliamentary secretary in this matter possibly the Prime Minister might answer and relieve him of this fear and this solicitude which is shared by us, and which was brought before the house by the hon. member for Regina City.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would be even happier to relieve the right hon. gentleman of some of his fears.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, from the apparent indication of things it won't be long before he and I will be changing positions.

CANADIAN CENTENNIAL

CONSTRUCTION OF COMMEMORATIVE BUILDINGS IN PROVINCIAL CAPITALS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. K. H. More (Regina City): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Secretary of State following up questions I asked him previously. Has he now received replies from all the provinces regarding the centennial memorial project building grants, and has he reached a final understanding with the premier of the government of Saskatchewan regarding the use of the grant in Saskatchewan?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, the best way of answering that question is for me to read the reply I sent to Mr. Thatcher on August 14, 1964:

I am now in a position to give an answer to your letter of July 7. As you already know, your request has raised an issue which has for us some complications.

On January 23, I wrote to provincial ministers responsible for centennial celebrations, offering, on behalf of the federal government, to participate in the financing "of a single capital project, which would preferably be comparable in spirit and function with the buildings in Charlottetown and Quebec city and be built in the provincial capital."

You are aware that this confederation memorial program provides further assistance to provincial governments, apart from the $1 per capita grant program which was designed to apply to all areas within each province. That is why we thought that the memorial program would lose much of its significance if it were to apply to several cities or areas in a province. I hope, therefore, that your government will find an alternative way of offering special assistance to Moose Jaw.

We have, however, taken into consideration the commitments made by the previous provincial government, the great importance you attach to this matter, the fact that none of my provincial colleagues in the national committee has opposed your proposal, and the similar features of the plans envisaged in Regina and Saskatoon. Because of all these particular circumstances, we are prepared to consider these plans as a twin project for the purpose of the federal grant provided, of course, that our maximum total contribution will not exceed $2,500,000.

Mr. More: As a supplementary question, may I ask the Secretary of State if this proposal requires a matching grant from the province?

Mr. Lamontagne: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. More: As a further supplementary may I ask the Secretary of State if he thinks a suitable building can be erected for $2,250,000.

Mr. Lamontagne: Would the hon. member repeat the question, please?

Mr. More: I ask the Secretary of State if he thinks a suitable building for this project can be erected for $2,250,000, which is the sum now available with the provincial grant of $2 million and the federal grant to Saskatoon and Regina?

Mr. Lamontagne: Mr. Speaker, our contribution under this program provides for a maximum amount of $2½ million, or not more than 50 per cent of the total cost of the project. I am quite sure that funds will be found in Saskatchewan to build these memorials.

Mr. More: I think it is important to clear this up, Mr. Speaker. In other words, 50 per cent of the cost of a project might involve federal and provincial grants and, in addition, the federal grant will not exceed the provincial grant. Is that correct?

Mr. Pearson: Fifty per cent.

Mr. Lamontagne: The only condition we have imposed under this program is that we will not pay more than 50 per cent. The other 50 per cent may be financed by the provincial government, or the city or locality involved, or by both.

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Albert): As a supplementary question can the minister say with respect to these buildings in the different provinces throughout Canada whether the federal government scrutinizes the system of contracting and subcontracting in the construction of said buildings?

Mr. Lamontagne: Yes, Mr. Speaker, because we have a signed agreement with the provinces covering all these aspects.

Mr. Bell: Then is the minister fully satisfied that in the building at Fredericton, New Brunswick, the system of subcontracting meets these federal standards?

Mr. Lamontagne: I am not in a position to answer that question, but I shall have a reply tomorrow.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

COMPLETION OF TRANSLATION OF BEAUCHESNE

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Robert Beaulé (Quebec East): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the right hon. Prime Minister a question?

In view of the numerous deficiencies in Beauchesne's book on procedure, during the debate yesterday and before, could the Prime Minister tell the house what progress is being made in the translation of that book and tell us when hon. members will have such a translation of Beauchesne?

[*Text*]

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I am not, but I will look into the matter and see whether I can make a statement on it tomorrow.

INQUIRY AS TO HOLDING OF BY-ELECTIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): I want to ask the Prime Minister a question. In view of the public interest in this matter, could the right hon. gentleman tell the house whether the government has made a decision as to filling the vacancies in the electoral districts of Westmorland and Waterloo South and, if the dates have been decided on, could he now announce those dates?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): This matter is still under consideration.

Mr. Scott: In view of the fact that in the ridings of Laurier and St. Denis the by-elections were completed within 44 days of the members' resignations, and in view of the fact that the riding of Westmorland has been vacant for 82 days and the riding of Waterloo South for 52 days, could the Prime Minister give an explanation for the haste in the one instance and the delay in the other?

Mr. Pearson: That would require quite a long statement.

[Mr. Lamontagne.]

BROADCASTING

APPROVAL OF TRANSFER OF WINDSOR RADIO STATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): May I direct a question to the Minister of Transport with reference to the transfer of radio station CKWW, Windsor, to WWKC Holdings Limited. Was this transfer approved by the Department of Transport before being referred to the board of broadcast governors?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): That would be quite impossible, I would think, under the law as it stands. As I understand it, the Department of Transport receives these applications and refers them to the board of broadcast governors for its judgment, and there would be no action of any definitive sort taken by the Department of Transport, or by the minister, or by the government—whoever makes the decision in these matters—until the board of broadcast governors had held its hearing.

Mr. Douglas: May I direct a supplementary question to the Secretary of State and ask whether his department is making any representations to the board of broadcast governors with reference to this transfer?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): My department does not make representations before the board of broadcast governors in these cases, but the recommendations received from the board of broadcast governors are always very carefully considered by the government.

CANADIAN FLAG

OFFICIAL ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW DESIGN

The house resumed, from Monday, August 17, consideration of the motion by Mr. Pearson:

> 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 the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Diefenbaker, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. More.

Mr. S. J. Enns (Portage-Neepawa): Mr. Speaker, when I began my remarks last evening I mentioned that the day a nation

unfurl its new flag should be a time of excitement and enthusiasm; it should be a time when the various divisive elements become united and stand behind the new flag, the new symbol which everyone can accept.

That this is not possible at this time should be patently clear to the house. We hear some very sincere, vintage speeches being made by hon. members on this side of the house, but we notice a surprising poverty of speeches from the other side of the house. I am wondering why this is so. Can this be because there is a lack of conviction on the part of hon. members on the other side of the house who are being asked to support a flag for which they cannot quite speak up? Can it be that there is an unwillingness on their part to do so because of the feeling that their constituencies might have them do otherwise? Why is there no enthusiastic response to defend the flag?

I think of some of the very notable speeches that have come from this side of the house, and I noticed hon. members opposite listening with great interest to the very reasonable and reasoned arguments that were undoubtedly put forward. I am just wondering why the indifferent attitude of hon. members opposite is so evident and why they cannot be persuaded by this kind of reasoning. Surely the Prime Minister himself must be quite chagrined over the turn of events since the introduction of the main motion, a motion that he hoped would bring about national unity but which has now brought about the greatest division in our country that we can remember.

With regard to this very point of national unity, Mr. Speaker, I would think all members on all sides of the house are certainly anxious to strive for and do all those things that will contribute to national unity. For this reason I fail to understand why, when a reasonable suggestion is put forward, such as has been made by the Leader of the Opposition, to put this question before the people of Canada in the form of a referendum, the suggestion cannot be accepted. Surely this is a nation-saving move, an excellent and honourable way for the Prime Minister to get out of the dilemma in which he now finds himself.

In this tenth day of debate of this issue there is, I can assure the house, no less enthusiasm for speakers on this side of the house to defend the actions taken by earlier speakers or to defend the measures that will really bring about the national unity that we all expect. I have mentioned the lack of speakers from the other side of the chamber. One hon. member said this reminds him of a lawyer appearing in court with no witnesses. Why is this so? Is he unable to bring witnesses? Are hon. members opposite unable to muster arguments in the defence of their choice of a national flag?

I believe that members on all sides of the house must be receiving the kind of mail that we on this side are receiving. I cannot accept that merely because my neighbour happens to be in another political party the residents of that constituency are not writing the kind of letters that I and other hon. members are receiving. This makes me believe that hon. members who are not willing to tell the house of the kind of letters they are receiving are simply unable to do so because they are not in accord with the main motion put to the house by the Prime Minister.

As my witness I would call an editorial appearing in the *Daily Graphic* of May 21. This newspaper enjoys a wide circulation in my riding. The editorial reads in part as follows:

> The Canadian people have never been directly asked if they want a new flag. Surely this is the first step; it seems to us the question should be asked directly, in a national referendum, and not in the conflict of a partisan election.
>
> If we give birth to a flag out of today's dissension, by a pressed vote in parliament, what will it mean? Further dissension, undoubtedly.
>
> Consider, instead, with what pride and fanfare a flag ... and maybe a better flag ... might have been produced by a dominion-provincial conference that will, in due course, have to consider constitutional changes.
>
> Today is hardly the time, in the face of angry dissension, to force the flag issue on the Canadian people.

I believe many of us have come to feel this way, and that is why there have been repeated requests by speakers to have this matter held over for a few months so that feelings on this issue may be cooled and brought more into line. Coming to the point under discussion—to which I am sure we must limit ourselves—namely the referendum and the plebiscite itself, I would call as another witness an editorial which appeared in the Portage *Leader*, which says in part as follows:

> Limitless debate on Canada's flag is right ...
>
> It would be best, of course, if the Canadian government were to give the people of the nation the privilege of voting in a plebiscite on this question.
>
> It appears unlikely that Prime Minister Pearson is willing to extend to us this democratic luxury, but in the absence of such a plebiscite, it is then most necessary that every member—wherever seated in

the green chamber—should be allowed to express his views with all the eloquence at his command.

This we are doing at the invitation of the Prime Minister. This editorial continues:

In some matters, members of parliament have a duty to follow the program proposed by the party to which they belong and which has given them the privilege of sitting in the governing benches of the House of Commons.

Any man who sought and gained election on the strength of a pledge that he would scrap our national ensign and replace it with some other device must in honour adhere to this commitment.

How many did? . . .

The vote on the flag issue should be completely free. Of course, it will not be. While Liberal members in the government benches have been promised that they will not be punished if they should rebel against the party line, they will be voting under a manifest discipline. Those Liberals who put loyalty to the flag above loyalty to the party may reasonably expect to lose favour in the party caucus.

This, however, is an issue on which individual members will prove their stature by acting independently and relying on the electorate rather than the party organization to pass judgment upon their actions.

With the New Democratic party and the Social Creditistes allied to the Liberals on the flag issue, it is expected that Mr. Pearson's pennant may gain parliamentary approval.

If it does, it will be a sad day for Canada, for many thousands of Canadians will be bitterly offended at the affront to the flag which they have saluted with great respect all their lives.

This is the sort of issue which can only lead to disunity. In our parliamentary democracy, however, the people—not the government—make the final decisions. Whether or not we have a plebiscite, the people will decide on the issue of the flag.

This is the good thing about parliamentary democracy that stems from the United Kingdom—the people can speak at least once in every five years. And they speak with thunderous authority.

I would remind the house that this question has developed at the insistence of the Prime Minister; he is the one who is inviting this discussion, and this is an indication that the Liberal government is not ready to test its popularity with the people of this country. Perhaps it is unwilling to test its stand in a referendum, and maybe that is the reason we are not being given the luxury, if I may call it that, of such a referendum.

With regard to the subamendment moved by the hon. member for Regina City, the first question reads:

1. Are you in favour of the red ensign?

We are asked to consider whether this is a proper question to appear on a plebiscite. I would merely call to mind a sample of some of the the mail which has come to me. First of all I should like to read a brief extract from a letter received from a study group in Winnipeg. One of the signatories to the letter is the mayor of Assiniboia. The letter reads in part:

The loss of the red ensign would cause a split in our nation such as we have never known before. This split added to the Pearson bicultural rift could spell the ruination of our future as a nation.

We believe that if the people of Canada fully understood the traditions represented by the symbols on the red ensign, they would overwhelmingly endorse its retention as our flag.

Were it not for the restrictive ruling made yesterday by the Chair I would have wanted to make additional comments about the meaning of a flag. However, I would refer hon. members to the excellent address of the hon. member for Brandon-Souris, who went to some length to explain the real purpose and meaning of our present flag.

This is a letter which I have received from McCreary, another part of my riding. It reads:

In regard to the national flag for Canada I am in favour of the red ensign. I am strongly in favour of the decision being left up to the people at the next election.

That is endorsing a referendum, and I have had numerous letters supporting the same step. I was also very interested to receive a petition from some collegiate students. About 100 names were placed on this petition from the Carberry collegiate, which puts forward in a very well worded resolution their arguments why they felt the red ensign should be retained as our national flag. Finally, on this first question I should like to mention that I received a letter from Westbourne which really is critical of any proposal for a referendum. However, it goes on to say:

I am not in favour of the tri-leaf flag. I think the red ensign does quite well—

So that even those letters which are critical of our stand—and they are not many in number—are still not in support of the proposed flag, the trifoil maple leaf design. I have mentioned the earlier speeches made in this house, and I have been most impressed by some of the arguments which have been put forward. I am hopeful that more people, as they become aware of the issues at stake, can be persuaded to think again about this very important step which the government is considering.

The second part of the plebiscite, question No. 2, reads:

Are you in favour of the red ensign with changes made thereon to show the main heritages of both founding races?

I have already indicated a strong preference for the red ensign, but I personally am

not inflexible in my stand. I also feel that many people across the country would quite readily accept a modification of the red ensign.

Here we have an odd situation which has developed. We have people who are very much in favour of the ensign and who say "Why all this fuss? Let us make the decision and make it final, and then stop any further debate". Then we have other people who say "Here is a new flag. This is what we want. Let us not continue needless debate; make it final and take a vote". Then again we have others who say "Why is a flag becoming a major issue in the first place, when there are more important things to discuss."

So it will be seen, Mr. Speaker, that we have unanimity across the land at least on one point, and that is impatience at the length of time it has taken to come to agreement on this issue. I suggest to the Prime Minister that if there cannot be agreement, then this is no time to pursue the matter further, and that the judgment of the government must be that the temper of the land will not allow a decision to be taken on the matter. Certainly we do not want to make a decision in haste, like some other decisions taken by the government which have not proven too helpful to the development of our national affairs.

Coming back to the question of accepting modifications to the ensign, I think this is a point which will bring us together. If those of us who favour the ensign are able to say "Yes, we will compromise on a modification", and if those who feel strongly for the maple leaf design can bring themselves to say "We will accept some change or modification to our proposal", then perhaps we can come together with regard to a modification, which is suggested in question 2 of the proposed plebiscite.

I have been reminded of some remarks made by Rev. Gordon Smyth of the Parkdale United church on the question of symbolism. He said:

> It is impossible to cut symbolism out of the affairs of men and nations. The roots go deep. If a man were to resolve never to use a symbol again, he could not shake hands with a friend, put a ring on the finger of his bride, kiss his child or take a sacrament. Human nature requires symbols. The heart craves after some tangible expression of the intangible.

I suggest that the removal of symbols, which would mean removal of some of the traditions which we have come to revere, would be a serious undertaking, and that it ill behooves anyone to do this without proper attention being paid to the matter. I also suggest that such a step should not be taken in any kind of haste. I believe Canadians generally have an abiding faith in divine Providence, and that most Canadians share a trust under the only flag they know. If we are to do away with all links with past traditions, are we thereby indicating that we have become insensitive to the prayers for guidance of God and blessing upon Queen and nation, which mark the start of every day's sitting of this house? The country which does not honour its past has no future.

I would remind hon. members of the emphasis which is placed by this parliament on tradition at the opening of every session. We look at the mace on the table before us and are impressed with the years of tradition which it represents. I am sure that no other ceremony in Canada is as colourful or as dignified as the opening of parliament at the commencement of every session, because that is a ceremony filled with tradition. I suggest to hon. members that the complete removal of those symbols which have become so meaningful on our national flag without full regard to the implications of such a step would be a very dangerous action to take, if it is ever successfully taken. I repeat that the country which does not honour its past has no future.

I would mention at this point the third question on the plebiscite, which really forms the second part of my argument. I interject here to say that I have heard it said that there are too many questions on the proposed plebiscite. It is said that if there are four questions to be answered this will defeat the possibility of any one question being answered in a clear, decisive manner. However, I suggest to the house that really the four questions fall very neatly into two parts. The first two questions deal with the red ensign and modification thereof; the second two questions, questions 3 and 4, deal with the maple leaf design and modification thereof.

Again I point to the wording of the proposed plebiscite, which refers to "among the questions to be placed before the people". It does not say that these are the only questions. Perhaps the questions could even be modified further. I find very little difficulty in supporting entirely the subamendment as it now appears.

Referring to the second half of the subamendment dealing with those questions in

respect of the maple leaf, permit me to name as my further witness a person eminent in public affairs, Dr. Eugene Forsey, who has been often quoted in this house and who reminds us all that we have at this stage accepted the fact that Canada is a bicultural country. If that is so, why then are we so anxious to change and keep out of the flag any implication or indication of this fact of biculturalism? Certainly the design as proposed gives no indication of this fact of biculturalism. As Dr. Forsey has said, every human vestige of our country and everything distinctively Canadian has been carefully excluded from this design by this legislation.

Of course we all realize that Canadians have carried the maple leaf insignia on their uniforms in times of war. However, this fact has been played up out of all proportion. The Royal Canadian Legion is aware of this fact, and what segment of the population is in a better position to appreciate it? What segment of the population deserves more respect? It is true that veterans wore the maple leaf in battle, but I am certain they were not marching under the maple leaf design but rather were marching into battle for ideals associated with the Canadian ensign, which have been lauded by so many capable speakers already.

The authority I have referred to, Dr. Eugene Forsey, and another eminent historian, Dr. Creighton, professor of history at the University of Toronto, wrote an open letter to the Prime Minister dated May 27, 1964, in which they say something about this distinctive new flag which I think should be repeated. That letter reads in part as follows:

> 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 unmistakeably Canadian in character. However, we protest that the maple 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 of strong feeling whatever. We have a despairing feeling that this insipid flag, instead of promoting national unity, will produce only an indifferent response, and in doing so will subtly undermine the Canadian will to survive. We believe profoundly that this negative approach to our national symbols erodes our national spirit.

Later in this same letter these gentlemen state:

> We believe that Canada has a distinguished culture of its own. We believe that this is a positive culture. We believe that the basis of this positive culture is a frank acceptance of both the English Canadian and the French Canadian civilizations. We believe that a distinctive Canadian flag should reflect this positive fact.

[Mr. Enns.]

> We are not in the position of a country with a revolutionary tradition, creating itself anew; we exist because we have inherited the past without a revolutionary upheaval. It is false and dispiriting to adopt a flag which subtly ignores the truth of our own nature. This is not the kind of symbol to rally a bewildered . . . nation.

I think these are very eloquent arguments that we should be careful and slow in the removal of these things and the introduction of new symbols in our flag without paying due regard to the effect on the minds of the people of this country as a result of these significant changes. The adoption of a flag is not the kind of measure that can be amended from year to year. Very often we say that parliament decides an issue and the Canadian people must accept the decision of parliament, but most economic measures can be amended year by year and changed by increasing or decreasing the amount of expenditures, or by adopting new policies as for example in respect of foreign affairs. We know from our experience to date that the adoption of a national symbol on a new flag can and usually will arouse great emotional crises throughout the country. It would certainly be folly for anyone to suggest that parliament can come back in five years and improve on the flag by adding to it, changing the colour, or making some other change that might then be appropriate.

For that reason it is very important that the type of flag to be adopted is one that will really be accepted by all Canadians. I submit we will not know of this acceptance until there has been a national referendum held along the lines suggested in the sub-amendment now under discussion.

National unity and harmony are too important to be driven, introduced or threatened at this delicate stage of our Canadian history. I suggest that every precaution possible should be taken, in respect of any undertaking similar to the adoption of a new flag, to assure ourselves that we are helping to continue and strengthen a united nation willing to stand together regardless of the issues that face the country. I am confident that somehow this can be accomplished, but I believe this will require an honest effort on the part of all members to conduct themselves in such a manner that extreme positions will not be taken, but rather that positions of reasonableness will prevail.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I have hesitated to take part in this debate, not from any lack of conviction but because no one with

respect for our parliamentary institutions would wish to contribute to the filibuster now under way.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, if anyone had any doubt that a filibuster is under way this doubt disappeared on Thursday evening when the hon. member for Regina City moved his subamendment which is now under discussion in the house. The purpose of that subamendment could only be to prolong the debate. Indeed, when your ruling was challenged, Mr. Speaker, the hon. members opposite made it quite clear that they hoped you would rule that they could repeat their speeches over and over again.

Mr. More: Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak to a question of privilege. I think under the rules it is not proper for a member of this house to impute motives to other members.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. More: Certainly the minister has directly imputed a motive to me in respect of my action in this house on Thursday night. I took the action I did then to indicate what a plebiscite should be, and I ask that the minister withdraw the imputation in respect of any other intent.

Mr. Churchill: I should like to speak to the point of order, Mr. Speaker. The imputation of motives was not directed solely to the hon. member for Regina City; the minister included all the members of the Conservative opposition.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: There is general agreement, apparently, amongst the members of the Liberal claque.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: The trained seals, the successors of the 1956 Liberals.

Mr. Speaker: May I suggest that we allow the minister to answer the point raised by the hon. member for Regina City, and perhaps the clouds will disappear very quickly.

Mr. Churchill: May I have the privilege of finishing my sentence?

Mr. Speaker: Well, I thought the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre had finished when he got off the particular subject which had been raised as a point of order and began making general remarks. I thought it was time to intervene.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, there was an interruption from the other side which perhaps might have been called to order and corrected. I wanted to finish my remarks by saying that the minister, in addition to withdrawing the imputation of motives with regard to the hon. member for Regina City, might at the same time withdraw the imputation of motives with regard to the members of Her Majesty's loyal opposition.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, hon. members of the opposition seem to be very sensitive today. If anything I have said offended them in any way, if I imputed any motives to them to which they object, I certainly withdraw. I should like to say this to you, Mr. Speaker, however. Whether or not this was the intent —I shall not really impute motives—this is certainly the result. This subamendment is prolonging the debate, in my view quite unnecessarily. Anything that is being said on the subamendment could have been said on the amendment.

If one examines the proposition put before this house, the four questions that might be asked on a referendum, one is led to the conclusion that the house could not take a decision on this particular subamendment without further subamendments. If I were to agree that there should be a plebiscite, Mr. Speaker, I would not agree with these four questions and I would have to move a series of subamendments. I do not agree, and I am sure that the majority of the members oppose a plebiscite. I challenge the opposition to let the question come to a vote.

Mr. Grafftey: A free vote.

Mr. Sharp: It will be a free vote.

Some hon. Members: Oh, no.

Mr. Martineau: 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?

Mr. Sharp: 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. We believe in this flag individually.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there was a great deal of argument, when former matters were be-

fore the house, that nothing was going on that even faintly resembled a filibuster. There are a few innocents abroad who believed that. Today I do not believe anyone has any illusions about what is going on in the house. Hon. members opposite are determined to prolong this debate as long as possible and prevent parliament from acting.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): Will the minister permit a question? My question is, who has charge of the business of parliament, the government or the opposition?

Mr. Sharp: May I say this to my hon. friend, that if a party is determined to prolong the debate there is very little that can be done by any group, regardless of whether it is in the minority or the majority. I suggest to my hon. friend that the question of who is in control of this house may be answered by saying that the house leader attempts to lead the house, but if my right hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition does not choose to follow there is nothing he can do about it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when we think about filibusters our minds go to other places where filibusters have been attempted. I want to suggest to my friends opposite—

Mr. Peters: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. There was a ruling made yesterday that speeches should be related to the subamendment. I would strongly urge Your Honour to enforce this ruling.

Mr. Sharp: May I just speak to this point of order? I think it ought to be cleared up once and for all right now that I am opposed to the subamendment. I am speaking against it. Are only those in favour of it to be given the privilege of speaking on it?

Mr. Peters: I suggest that the hon. member who has the floor should contain himself. The decision of the Speaker yesterday was very definite, that the debate should be relevant to the subamendment. I suggest that all speakers be held to that ruling.

Mr. Sharp: May I suggest that what I am saying is strictly relevant to the subamendment, which I contend is part of the filibuster.

Mr. Churchill: I rise on a point of order. I think the house would welcome a ruling as to whether a discussion of the nature of a filibuster is related to the subamendment before us.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): I think the ruling made yesterday by the Speaker, and confirmed by the house, was to the effect that the debate at this particular stage should be confined to the subamendment. I would hope the minister would keep his remarks within the bounds of the ruling that the Chair made yesterday.

Mr. Sharp: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I refer, then, immediately to the subamendment. I am discussing the subamendment moved by the hon. member for Regina City which appears on page 6808 of *Hansard*, and which suggests that the amendment before the house be amended by adding thereto certain words containing four questions. I am speaking to the subamendment and I am opposed to it. I am giving reasons why I am opposed to it.

Before the debate on the subamendment goes any further, or before what I contend is a filibuster proceeds any further, may I offer my friends opposite a few words of advice. I am not personally concerned about the prospect of a prolonged debate on this subamendment or a prolonged filibuster. I have been reconciled to it for some time now, so have my colleagues and so, I am convinced, have most of the members of this house. My concern, and it is a concern which I share with all thoughtful Canadians, is as to the effect the prolongation of this debate in an indefinite manner will have—

An hon. Member: Change the business.

Mr. Sharp: I am talking about the subamendment which prolongs the debate indefinitely.

Mr. Martineau: May I ask the hon. member a question?

An hon. Member: Sit down.

Mr. Martineau: In view of his statement regarding the filibuster, so-called, and his concern about the indefinite prolongation of this debate, can he say if he is ready to recommend that the government bring in closure in this debate?

Mr. Sharp: No, Mr. Speaker, as I said I am prepared to stay here indefinitely. My concern with the indefinite prolongation of this debate by devices such as the subamendment which we are now discussing—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. The interruptions are such that I am not able to hear very clearly what is being said.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, my concern with the indefinite prolongation of this debate

which this subamendment would lead to is not so much with its effect upon parliament. I think parliament can survive a filibuster, although it certainly won't enhance its reputation; and the people of Canada won't enjoy the filibuster, but they will survive it too. But what about the party led by my right hon. friend, who unfortunately is not in his seat at the present time? I regret his absence because I do not like referring to the right hon. gentleman when he is not here, and that is the only reason I mentioned it.

How long can this party that he leads remain united if it continues to pursue what I regard as this irersponsible and desperate manoeuvre, trying to prevent parliament from reaching a decision on this vital issue by this device of subamendments and in any other way they choose to carry on the debate? There was a time when I had an admiration, a rather reluctant admiration I must say, for the Leader of the Opposition as he led his party out of the wilderness. He led it to power. He led it to one of the greatest electoral triumphs in the history of this country. In those days he proclaimed his vision of Canada. He spoke of one Canada, united and strong. He led a rejuvenated Conservative party that seemed temporarily at least to have submerged its reactionary tendencies. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite, have they abandoned this prospect of a united Canada?

Mr. Grafftey: No.

Mr. Sharp: Is this subamendment which I am debating a substitute for policy?

Mr. Starr: Yes.

Mr. Sharp: That is what I have always contended, and the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Starr) confirmed that this party opposite has no policy on the flag, when he spoke like that. Are hon. gentlemen opposite, particularly those who speak the same language as I do, prepared to see their party torn asunder and disintegrate?

Mr. Dinsdale: Worry about your own party.

Mr. Sharp: Is their party going to wither away into a regional party of reaction?

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): May I ask the minister since when was he so concerned about the future of the Conservative party?

Mr. Sharp: I shall answer that question directly. I have concern for it, and it is not only my concern. I have here an editorial from the Halifax *Chronicle-Herald* that answers directly the question asked by my hon. friend opposite:

> By pursuing its present tactics to the point of forcing an election—

And until I heard the Leader of the Opposition today welcoming an election, and with all that humility he has asserting that they were going to succeed the present government—indeed, calling for an election—I did not know whether this was true.

> By pursuing its present tactics to the point of forcing an election, the Conservatives, either willingly or otherwise, would find themselves appealing to English speaking Canada only. Such a campaign would mean the defeat of the ten Conservative M.P.'s from Quebec, excepting possibly Léon Balcer.
>
> The party of Macdonald and Cartier no longer would be a national party, flexible enough to accommodate all regions of the country and all segments of the electorate.
>
> It would leave moderate Quebeckers no alternative to the Liberals and it would give—

Mr. Martin (Timmins): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. gentleman or yourself, sir, could inform the house whether the party of Macdonald and Cartier is found in the subamendment?

Mr. Sharp: My trouble is that I do not find the party of Macdonald and Cartier in this house. That is my concern. What I would like to see is some of the spirit of Macdonald and Cartier, not a plebiscite, not a subamendment to prolong this debate. Let me read further from this editorial, because it is relative to this point:

> Conservatism, the peculiarly Canadian brand of it so laboriously nurtured by Sir John A. Macdonald, and rooted in the creation of unity out of diversity, would become—if it has not already become—the prisoner of prairie populism.
>
> It is a bitter memory to recall that the Conservative party between 1958 and 1962 held 50 of Quebec's 75 seats. Today, it has ten and seems determined to lose those. If it does, not merely the Conservatives, but the entire nation will be the loser.

That is my answer. Mr. Speaker, as a Liberal I should not be concerned about the future of the Conservative party, but as a Canadian I am; and when I see the dissension in the ranks of the Conservative party it hurts me as a Canadian, because I want to see that party strong and united, able sometime, perhaps, to take over the government of this country again.

Mr. Coates: I assume, Mr. Speaker, from the latitude you are allowing the Minister of Trade and Commerce in this debate that all further members, so long as this subamendment is being debated, will be allowed the same latitude in covering the field.

Mr. Sharp: I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that you will deal fairly with all sides. I believe I am being relevant. I believe I have a right to say why I am strongly opposed to this subamendment. When I heard myself challenged, along with other members on this side, to get up and speak, what was I supposed to do; support the subamendment? I am strongly opposed to it, and I intend to give my reasons.

The other evening I listened to the Leader of the Opposition speaking on the television program "The Nation's Business." What interested me most about his remarks on that occasion was not his appeal to the people to write in to the government in support of the red ensign which, since my hon. friends would like relevance, is the subject of one of the questions proposed in the subamendment. Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition was anticipating the motion he was going to put before the house when he appealed in advance for that sort of response, but predictably that appeal produced very little result. Certainly none of it came my way, and I consulted among my colleagues and found little response had come their way either.

That did not concern me particularly because that is what I expected, but what did concern me, and concerned me mightily, was the suggestion in the speech of the Leader of the Opposition that the fleur-de-lis should appear on the Canadian flag along with the union jack. Where did this suggestion come from? Did it come from the deskmate of the Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Balcer)? I should like to have an answer to that question. Did it come from any of the members of the Conservative party from the province of Quebec? I am sure if this suggestion had been put to any of those hon. gentlemen they would have spurned it with contempt. To the people of Quebec this suggestion by the Leader of the Opposition—and I have heard it echoed by a number of speakers on the other side, none of them French Canadians—must have appeared as a clumsy and gratuitous piece of appeasement; it must have appeared to my French Canadian friends as a bone thrown out to a troublesome minority to keep them quiet.

An hon. Member: Does the second part of your resolution appeal to them?

Mr. Sharp: Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition did not mean it that way. I give him the benefit of the doubt. But whatever he intended, that is how it appears; just plain, unadorned appeasement by one who had not taken the trouble to understand the true sentiments and true feelings of the French speaking people of this country. I say now, to you, Mr. Speaker, and to hon. gentlemen opposite, let us forget about trying to appease anybody in connection with this flag. Let us all work toward a flag which is truly Canadian and which represents all of us, whatever our origin and language, a flag which symbolizes our unity, not our divisions.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Sharp: In this subamendment—and I will be strictly relevant, as I have been—in the second of the questions proposed for a plebiscite, the hon. gentleman apparently was thinking of a union jack with a fleur-de-lis in the fly.

An hon. Member: What is wrong with that?

Mr. Sharp: What would this proposal mean? To me it would not represent the unity of Canada. It would be a perpetual reminder of our divisions. Yesterday I listened to a number of speakers, taking part in the debate on the subamendment, who boasted of their British origins. I could boast like that, too. I am, I think, of pure Scottish blood, though there is perhaps a little Irish mixed in somewhere.

Mr. Nowlan: Unfortunately, not very much.

Mr. Sharp: Perhaps that is right; I would like to have a little more. I received part of my education in Britain. My father fought in the first world war, and I certainly take second place to no one in my respect for British institutions or my dedication to the British connection. Moreover, I represent an English speaking constituency. I think I know one French speaking Canadian in that constituency, a very eminent lawyer. Other than that, I think they are all English speaking. Does this mean I should insist upon the union jack appearing in a Canadian flag?

An hon. Member: Yes.

Mr. Sharp: If that is the attitude we are never, in this country, going to get a flag which is acceptable. I am very proud of my British heritage, but I tell this house one thing I am even more proud of, and that is of being a Canadian.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Sharp: As a Canadian I call upon all my fellow Canadians in this house to seek a flag which represents Canada at home and abroad. Such a flag should say, to borrow a phrase of the Prime Minister's, "I stand

for Canada". It would be a flag for all of us; for those of my background and experience, for those of Ukrainian origin, for those who came from Germany and Poland, for all the peoples who make up the mosaic of our culture.

During the last few days I have made a point of listening to the speeches made in this debate both on the subamendment and on the amendment which is still before the house and which hon. members opposite do not wish to come to a vote. I must say that all those to whom I listened spoke with great sincerity. They stated with sincerity their convictions about a Canadian flag, and this is as it should be. I have no quarrel with that; I hope I am speaking with some conviction myself now.

But as I listened to those speeches I must confess I was disappointed. Hon. gentlemen opposite spoke of their devotion to the red ensign. They spoke of the Christian symbolism of the crosses of the union jack. I listened very carefully and I was very impressed by some of the speeches, particularly those made by members from western Canada. Perhaps I have a little affinity with them because I spent the first 30 years of my life in that part of the country. But what I missed—and I hope the hon. gentlemen opposite will understand my concern—were evidences of the spirit which I believe must animate Canada, a spirit of tolerance and conciliation. The devotion of these hon. members to the red ensign, I can understand, but what I cannot understand, and what every thoughtful Canadian must deplore, are the derisive references to the proposal put forward by the Prime Minister as a design for Canada's flag.

I will never speak with disrespect or with derision about the Canadian ensign; I can assure hon. members of that. I do not think anyone in this house will do so. Regardless of the outcome of this debate, the red ensign will always have an honoured place in Canadian history. As hon. members opposite are fond of saying, many people fought and bled under that red ensign, so regardless of whether or not in continues as the flag of Canada, it will always be honoured. But to me, and to millions of Canadians who think like me—and there are millions of them, I can assure hon. members opposite—the three red maple leaves are also an honoured symbol of Canada, and my blood boils when members opposite refer to that symbol in disparaging terms. I do not need to remind them how many times we hear them refer with a derisive note in their voices to the "Pearson pennant".

An hon. Member: That is what it is.

Mr. Sharp: There it is again. The national symbol of Canada is being treated with derision.

Mr. MacEwan: It is a Liberal flag.

Mr. Sharp: Throughout the world, wherever Canadians travel and wherever Canadian soldiers are buried, the maple leaf stands for Canada. I feel that hon. gentlemen opposite, when they allow their partisan feelings to overcome their reason, might take care before they cast slurs on what has come to be known as a symbol of Canada throughout the ages, or throughout a hundred years, which amounts to ages in our history.

Listening to this debate on the subamendment—and I think this is relevant because I am referring to remarks made by hon. gentlemen on the other side when speaking on the subamendment—I was shocked as well as disappointed by the recurring theme that the proposed flag, the three maple leaf flag which is also mentioned in the subamendment, constitutes an appeasement of Quebec. This theme recurs throughout. It recurs in the letters I get. I regret to say it has also occurred and recurred in the speeches of my hon. friends opposite. If my hon. friends opposite are determined to alienate not only Quebec but millions of English speaking Canadians like myself, that is the thing to go on saying.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Sharp: There is nothing whatever in the maple leaf design reminiscent of Quebec or of French Canada. The maple leaf is in fact the one generally acknowledged symbol of Canada. We have no other, and the one embodied in this resolution has the sanction of widespread acceptance and recognition. When I hear it suggested, as some hon. gentlemen opposite have suggested, that the maple leaf flag mentioned in the subamendment is appeasement of Quebec, I ask them this: Was the sovereign of the day seeking to appease Quebec when she approved the three maple leaves as the distinctive Canadian symbol on the Canadian coat of arms nearly 100 years ago? Was this appeasement of Quebec? Was King George V seeking to appease Quebec when he approved three red maple leaves as the Canadian symbol? Was the government of Canada seeking to appease Qubec when it designed the second world war discharge button with its three maple leaves? Was the

Canadian Legion seeking to appease Quebec when it adopted the maple leaf on its badge? I could go on, Mr. Speaker. This is what hon. gentlemen opposite are saying, that this is appeasement of Quebec.

An hon. Member: Which ones? Name them.

Mr. Sharp: As an English speaking Canadian representing an English speaking riding—

Mr. Bigg: Mr Speaker, would the minister permit a question? I spoke for 40 minutes last night, and I never made any such statement at any time. You can count me out of that. I love Quebec as much as any other province of Canada. I hope the minister does, too, and will stop this partisan speech.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I listened with the greatest respect to the speech of my hon. friend, as I hope he will to my speech. There was as much politics in his speech as there is in mine. I am as sincere in my remarks on the flag as was my hon. friend. He made no disparaging remarks about Quebec in his speech, and I thank him for it. As an English speaking Canadian representing an English speaking riding, I resent the implication that this flag is appeasement of Quebec. If I believed that, I would vote against the resolution.

To return, Mr. Speaker, to the words of the subamendment and the particular proposal put forward in this house by the hon. member for Regina City (Mr. More), I do not think—I say this with all sincerity, and I am sure that anyone who looks at the proposition would agree—the proposed plebiscite with these four questions will advance the cause of the Canadian flag, nor will it advance Canadian unity. A plebiscite of this kind will do the very opposite. Everyone knows there are differences of opinion about the design of a Canadian flag; you do not have to have a plebiscite to determine that. When I consider the shades of opinion throughout the country on the flag, four questions would only begin to cover the vast panorama of ideas.

An hon. Member: It is at least democracy.

Mr. Sharp: We do not need a plebiscite to prove that we are not all agreed as to what might be a preferable flag. The argument that those who would lose in such a plebiscite would be reconciled by the knowledge that they had been voted down is certainly the most fatuous of all propositions. In my view a plebiscite, regardless of the questions—these four or any others—would only serve to harden attitudes that up to that time had been tentative, flexible, open to persuasion and tolerant.

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 decisions.

Mr. Grafftey: Then give us a free vote. It is as simple as that.

Mr. Sharp: When I look back on the history of this country and at some of the great and momentous decisions that were taken, I do not find very much evidence of plebiscites. The only plebiscites that I have been able to find were not very satisfactory ones. I think we had some sort of a plebiscite on prohibition, which did not prevent anyone drinking. Then we had a plebiscite on national conscription, which I do not think did very much to cement the unity of this country.

I can imagine what Sir John A. Macdonald would have done with the idea of a plebiscite about confederation. You can just imagine the series of questions: Do you favour union of Ontario and Quebec? Do you favour union of Ontario and Quebec and the maritime provinces? Do you think Newfoundland should be in? And so on. One can imagine all the questions. Sir John A. Macdonald was a more sensible man; he knew that these great decisions are settled in parliament—and that is where this one is going to be settled.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Sharp: If I may take another idol of the present Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker), did Sir Robert Borden take a plebiscite before he insisted upon the independence of Canada within the commonwealth?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, since I am brought in, does the hon. gentleman know that the Liberal party advocated a plebiscite in 1916 and 1917?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Sharp: Well, Mr. Speaker, that was a little before my time.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nowlan: You are out of your depth, anyway; it is away over your head.

Mr. Sharp: The Prime Minister of Canada has taken the lead by proposing the resolution for a distinctive national flag in which he has endeavoured to embody Canada's national symbol. He has taken the responsible course of a responsible statesman.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Sharp: 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 another great step forward in our development as a nation.

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, now that the government has taken part in this flag debate and the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp) has said what has hung so heavily on his soul and has bothered his conscience over the last few days, I want to now take part in this debate on the flag. Regardless of what it may be called by any newspaper or any other news media, and even by the Minister of Trade and Commerce or any other member of this house, who have said this is a filibuster, I intend to take my part in this debate.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Starr: Thus, Mr. Speaker, I want to take my rightful opportunity as a member of the House of Commons to state my view and express my opinion on this very important subject. We listened to the Minister of Trade and Commerce start his speech with a lot of drivel and end up with emotion. He wanted to impress on the House of Commons and the country the fact that he held the red ensign dear to his heart, but he felt that it should be discarded and another flag substituted in its place. With regard to the suggestion made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) that the red ensign should include something of French Canada as one of the founding races in this country—the fleur-de-lis—the Minister of Trade and Commerce immediately charged that this was appeasement. I ask, appeasement to whom? Is it not appeasement to take away the union jack from the red ensign? I ask, appeasement to whom? I wish, Mr. Speaker, that the minister had not made his speech, because I had not intended to speak in this vein. I am not of British origin and I am not of French origin; I am proud to be of Ukrainian origin and I am also a good Canadian.

It is furthest from my thoughts and mind to divide the people of this country. I think it is our duty in this House of Commons to bring people together in a democratic fashion in the best way possible. It is our duty to bring them to agreement. But we are not finding agreement in this country today. It makes me as a Canadian other than of French or English origin bleed to find the two founding races fighting between themselves, causing disunity for political and partisan reasons.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Sharp: That is not so in this party.

Mr. Starr: Mr. Speaker, I believe in a democracy for this country. This is what all Canadians who are used to living in a democratic way believe in. They are used to having the opportunities presented by a democratic country. Opportunity is the dearest thing democracy gives to the people—opportunity to work, opportunity to realize ambitions, opportunity to voice opinions. But this is what the present government is trying to take away from the people of this country. This government has set its course and has said that the people of the country shall have what the government gives them. It is all very well to say that if any legislation which is passed is found to be detrimental to certain areas of the country the government which initiated that legislation, if it is still in office, or an ensuing government, can change the legislation so that the people receive equal benefits. But once a flag is approved it cannot be changed. And who takes the responsibility in this case?

Mr. Sharp: Parliament.

Mr. Starr: Do 19 million Canadians take that responsibility? No. When the final vote is counted in this house, about 150 members of parliament, whipped into line in most cases, will say to the Canadian people: "This is the flag the Prime Minister told us to vote for. This is the flag we voted for, and this is the flag you are going to have for all time".

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Perhaps this might be a good time for the Chair to intervene—

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Churchill: It is too late.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I think it is my duty to remind the hon. member who

has the floor that he should as much as possible bear in mind the amendment and the subamendment which are now before the house.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I hear protests, but the part of the hon. member's speech which was heard by the Chair referred to the question of a plebiscite. I realize that the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Starr) has to move to his subject, but I would ask him to keep in mind in due course the decision reached yesterday by the house.

Mr. Starr: Mr. Speaker, I always try to abide by your ruling. I have respect for any occupant of the chair in this House of Commons. But my conception of the situation is that the subamendment proposes that the people of Canada should have the opportunity to express their opinion on four distinct questions. My remarks up to this moment have been directed to that and I do not intend to stray away from it. If you feel I am straying away from the subamendment at any time, please bring the fact to my attention; but up till now I beg to differ with Your Honour, even though I respect your decision. I still think I am keeping within the subamendment now before the house.

I suggest that other vital matters which have come before the people of this country, matters not so much in the federal field of jurisdiction because the opportunity has not presented itself in the federal field, but matters within provincial areas of jurisdiction and municipal areas of jurisdiction, have not been settled by the bodies governing those areas but by referendums which have been submitted to the people. Believe me, Mr. Speaker, if we continue on this path—and I believe this with all my heart—we will cause more disunity in this country than we have ever seen before, and we will never be able to heal it. I appeal to the government. It is not too late now. I speak with all sincerity when I say, give the people of this country the opportunity to say what they want.

The subamendment provides four choices. Those who wish to retain the red ensign will have the opportunity by secret ballot to indicate their feeling. Those who want modification of the red ensign can by secret ballot say so. Those who want the three maple leaves flag can so indicate by secret ballot. Those who want the one maple leaf design can also speak. And we know from experience over the years that the people of this country will abide by the majority decision.

We are divided in this house, Mr. Speaker, and we are divided over this subamendment. There are those in the house who feel that the red ensign should be retained because it has served this country for so many years. Children have been born under it and immigrants have come here and found freedom under it. I speak as one whose parents came to this country at the ages of 17 and 16. They married here without a friend. Why did they come to Canada, Mr. Speaker? They came here to find freedom of opportunity, justice and liberty, things they never enjoyed in the country from whence they came. Because that flag gave them that opportunity, they worked hard. The opportunity was there and they were able to make a living in this country. They were able to set the foundation for people like myself to participate in the active life of this country, and they were, as I am, good Canadians. Surely those who would like to see modifications of the red ensign have a desire to give a prominent place to the two founding races.

I come from people who believe in tradition and who do not throw tradition out the window when it has served its usefulness. I come from people who do not discard tradition in order to appease. I think it is good tradition that will not allow people to throw their parents out the door when they become too old. People have a responsibility to look after those parents. All of these things are part and parcel of human nature and upbringing.

We also have the proposal for the three maple leaf flag by the Prime Minister and the government. Surely those people who want to support it should have the opportunity of doing so by secret ballot, because here in this house we find the government as well as some other hon. members supporting this proposal. We also have a group of members in this house who feel that the one maple leaf flag is the flag that should be adopted for Canada. Mr. Speaker, we are divided in this house on this vital issue. I submit the country is being divided, and is perhaps even now divided. Many people have very strong feelings about this issue and unless we give them an opportunity to express those feelings by secret ballot, and experience the satisfaction that they have had a voice, we will never heal the wounds that will be inflicted upon this nation. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, this

is the only way we can remove the flag issue from partisan politics.

Most of us have our constituents and their votes in mind when we vote on issues in this house. Let us take this issue out of partisan politics. I appeal to the Prime Minister to play no favourite with anyone, and let the people of this country decide this issue. All of us in this house have politics in mind during the debate on any issue, because we are all here as politicians. Most of the members in this house conduct polls in their ridings to find out the feeling of the majority of the people. Is that the procedure we are going to follow in deciding how to vote on this issue? Certainly that is the procedure most members will follow. I am sure every member representing a French Canadian riding will follow that procedure and vote in favour of the three maple leaf design because that is the will of the majority of the people in Quebec. What consideration is being given to the feelings of the people of Ontario? How are we going to heal the wounds that will be inflicted on half the people in a riding because they are divided evenly on this issue? Should one follow the wishes expressed by one half of the people in the hope that the remainder will forget about the situation? Certainly those people will not forget.

Mr. Speaker, I again urge the Prime Minister and the government to take this issue out of the arena of political partisanship in which we have found ourselves embroiled. Perhaps to do so will necessitate the spending of more money. Surely we are spending money in this country for various other reasons probably not as important as this. In my opinion this whole issue is one of the most important to come before this house since I became a member in 1952.

Let us consider for a moment the effect of the adoption of a new flag on the unity of this country. Do the Prime Minister and the government think that the adoption of the three maple leaf flag will bring unity to this country? That thought is far from the truth, Mr. Speaker.

As I said earlier, I am not of British origin, but I have often looked at British people and marvelled at the tolerance they have displayed. I do not know what would happen in another country if a symbol of the people's heritage was removed from the flag. I am not sure that there would not be a revolution. People's hearts must bleed when they witness that happening. Who is going to take down the flag which has stood in this country for so many years as a symbol to the people who came and built this country and provided the opportunity to those of other races to come here and enjoy the liberty provided under this flag? Surely their hearts will bleed as a result of the adoption of the proposal of the government.

In view of human nature one cannot expect to take away something which is dear to the people's hearts, throw it out the window and have unity. Unity will never be created in this country if we follow that course, and I appeal to the Prime Minister and the government to abandon this mad policy. Give the people of this country an opportunity to speak silently one by one. I am sure they will make a choice and they will all agree with the choice of the majority. I am certain these people will not agree with a decision made by 150 or 160 members in this house, which is rammed down their throats. Those members will have to say they combined to adopt this flag for Canada and the people must accept it whether they like it or not. They must say to the people, this is your flag and no one can amend it.

Mr. Speaker, I think we must pursue a solution to this problem with a little more sanity. I think the government must reconsider its position and should not be adamant in its stand. Let us consider how the three maple leaf design was introduced. Let us consider the tortuous path its introduction travelled. The first unveiling of this three maple leaf design was carried out by the Prime Minister before a group of newspapermen in his own home. Even the cabinet was not aware of this design.

An hon. Member: Order.

Mr. Starr: Even the caucus did not know about the design. In fact, no one knew about it other than the Prime Minister, and he wanted to observe the reaction to it and called the members of the press—

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Starr: Do you have a point of order or a question of privilege, not that it really makes much difference?

An hon. Member: This is just an excuse.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, irrespective of the remarks just made, my rising on a point of order to obtain the ruling of Mr. Speaker is not an excuse. A decision was rendered yesterday afternoon, and I think the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Starr) has now

turned exclusively to a discussion of the main resolution before this house. That decision indicated clearly that a debate on a subamendment must be limited to the subject of the subamendment.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, the solicitude of the Minister of Justice does not command very much support. He stood silent when his colleague the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp) was speaking. Surely we have not come to an occasion in this House of Commons when every time the Minister of Justice feels that anything said on this side contravenes the rules, as he would interpret them, he has to be listened to. Why was he so silent? Why did he sit so inert when the Minister of Trade and Commerce was speaking?

Sir, the hon. gentleman who was speaking may not be speaking in a way that appeals to the sentiments of hon. gentlemen opposite, but if ever there was an hon. gentleman speaking with authority of heart and experience, it is the hon. gentleman for Ontario (Mr. Starr).

Mr. Starr: Mr. Speaker, I regret that the Minister of Justice has intervened in what I have said, but certainly I am not going into the history of both parties, as the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp) did. I am staying entirely within a discussion of the subamendment, and have referred to the flags that subamendment has proposed as choices for the people of this country. I referred to the tortuous steps that were taken to introduce the new flag in an attempt to obliterate all tradition of this country. When the Minister of Trade and Commerce describes as appeasement the suggestion made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) to have a fleur-de-lis on the red ensign, in an attempt to give the prominence to the founding races of this country which is their due, that is improper description. I have not endeavoured to go into the whole tortuous speech that he made.

Mr. Diefenbaker: And false, too.

Mr. Starr: He said that this was a gratuitous piece of appeasement in order to satisfy the French founding race of this country. After the unveiling to selected members of the press gallery the Prime Minister, without consulting his cabinet, without consulting the caucus or parliament, unveiled this flag before the Canadian Legion at their convention in Winnipeg. Only then did he go to the cabinet and ask for approval.

[Mr. Favreau.]

These are the steps taken. After that he came to the Liberal caucus and got their approval. Then he came to parliament. Meanwhile, sir, what was happening? Pins were appearing all over this country and being sold over the counter, on which there was the three maple leaf design, before parliament had an opportunity of discussing it. There were bathing suits in this design, too; they looked a lot nicer. The proposed design for a Canadian flag is now being put to commercial use. Is this the way in which a flag design for this country should be treated? We have bumper stickers, flags put on twigs and flown upside down to be used by reporters for the purpose of pictures, as happened last Saturday to the Leader of the Opposition and me. This is being foisted upon the people, and I think it is wrong. I think the people are beginning to resent this procedure.

I should like to ask the Prime Minister and his government to reconsider their position. This emblem that has been proposed by the Prime Minister is being used for every other purpose except a flag. The Minister without Portfolio has ordered 100,000 bumper stickers.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dupuis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

I did not place an order for 100,000 bumper strips, as stated by the hon. member for Ontario. However, I know that so many people are asking for them throughout Canada that 100,000 would be far from enough to meet the demand.

Mr. Lambert: There is no point of order.

[*Text*]

Mr. Starr: I was absolutely right, the Minister without Portfolio has ordered 100,000 bumper stickers. This is the purpose for which this proposed emblem is being used, even before it has been hoisted on a flagpole to be respected by the people of this country. This design is being made up in bathing suits, bumper stickers, and boloney is being sold under this insignia. Is this the sort of emblem of which we, as Canadians, can be proud? All of these stickers are being made, boloney, beer and all the other products are being sold under this insignia. This is what we are being asked to adopt as a flag. Everything else that has stood for our flag in the past is being dumped out of the window.

Mr. Favreau: I rise on a point of order. I suggest that it is up to the hon. member for Ontario to show that the type of discussion he is giving us now has anything to do with

the question of whether or not the questionnaire should read a certain way, as the hon. member for Regina City has suggested in his subamendment.

Mr. Starr: There are four choices listed in this subamendment, and I am discussing each and every one of them. I am discussing how they came about. I am saying that the red ensign has been our flag for years. Sacrifices have been made under it, freedom and opportunity have been found under it. I am discussing also how the three maple leaf flag has been brought about; that is all I am doing. These four questions are in the subamendment.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order—

Some hon. Members: Wasting the time of the house; filibuster.

Mr. Favreau: —I suggest that what the hon. member is doing now is making a speech which has nothing to do with the drafting of the questionnaire. It deals with the merits of the original resolution before the house. The decision rendered yesterday directed this ought not to be done.

Mr. Churchill: May I speak to the point of order? Before you entered the chamber this afternoon, sir, the Minister of Trade and Commerce was speaking. He dealt with the general subject of what he called the filibuster, gave us a lecture on that and made a personal attack on the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Diefenbaker: In his absence.

Mr. Churchill: He discussed the Conservative party, its present position and its future. He then made a reference to the Leader of the Opposition and his address on a television program last week. He drew attention to the proposal of the Leader of the Opposition that some symbol of French Canada might appear on our flag. These were some of the subjects he discussed without interruption by the Speaker. It was a wide open debate. We ought not now to be denied a similar wide open debate just because the Minister of Justice is attempting to intervene.

There was no interruption from this side of the house. I suggest to you that reference should be made to Beauchesne's fourth edition, page 110. At the bottom of the page you will read this:

> 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.

The Minister of Justice is attempting to infringe upon the freedom of speech of the hon. member for Ontario when it was allowed, without interruption, to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I suggest to you, sir, that the member for Ontario should be permitted to speak with the utmost freedom on this subject.

Mr. Starr: Mr. Speaker, on this issue our party does not intend to follow the partisan attitude and the political tones that have been injected into this flag issue by the Prime Minister and the government. I say that, sir, in view of what has been said by the Prime Minister. He has taken away the opportunity of the members of his party to vote according to their conscience. They must follow the line of the government on this question. He has stated his government will stand or fall on this issue, and that makes it a political issue. We do not intend to follow that line in this party. We believe this is a highly emotional issue and that the people of Canada should have an opportunity to voice their opinion by means of a referendum. There should be a vote by secret ballot in this country. I say this procedure will bring satisfaction to the people of Canada because they will have had an opportunity, as they have in the past, to decide the matter by a vote of the majority. It will bring unity to this country. We will have a country of which we can be proud, with a flag that will be chosen by the people themselves and not by politicians in this House of Commons who must knuckle under the whip of the party.

Mr. R. R. Southam (Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to have the privilege to rise in the flag debate at this time and to be the first to congratulate the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Starr) who made such an eloquent speech in defence of democracy. I must reiterate his words in reference to the speech of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp). I was amazed and discouraged to see a minister holding such an honourable position making such a partisan, prejudiced speech as he did in reference to the members of Her Majesty's loyal opposition, and in reference to their right to get up in this house and speak in the interests of Canada's very distinctive national flag.

I want to support unequivocally the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) to the resolution introduced by the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson), and also to support the subamendment

proposed on Thursday last by my colleague, the hon. member for Regina City (Mr. More). In my opening remarks I want to say that the undemocratic principle injected into the flag issue by the Prime Minister, in the manner in which he introduced the matter into the house, means that the Prime Minister has sown a wind and he will reap a whirlwind. I can substantiate that statement by an article which appeared lately in the press, referring to the plebiscite or referendum, an article by that well known and eminent writer, Patrick Nicholson, under date of August 12. He said:

> The campaign strategists of the Liberal party have been halted in their tracks—stunned.
>
> As most, but not all, Canadians know very well, parliament has long been stalled in its work largely because of "the flag issue." As the majority, but by no means all, of Canadians are uneasily conscious, this is dividing the country even more disastrously than the stormiest issue recorded in our history books—

He goes on to state what a recent poll showed:

> It quickly became obvious that "Mike's maple" had attracted overwhelming support among French Canadians, while the lukewarm enthusiasm for it elsewhere was gravely tempered by the resentment, as some M.P.'s have expressed it, that this was "yet another concession to French Canada."
>
> The lopsidedness of cross Canada sentiment on the flag issue has just been revealed by a nation-wide poll, whose sensational results were given front page columns in Ottawa's thoughtful French language newspaper, *Le Droit*
>
> The poll discovered that a majority of Canadians, in every province except Quebec, prefer the Canadian ensign to the maple leaf design. It also ascertained that about one third of all Canadians would prefer some other flag, such as the union jack or another design, or were ignorant or indifferent about the whole issue.

I do not want to be called to order on this, Mr. Speaker, and so I would like to point out that it refers to the subject of the subamendment in that it deals with whether we should have a maple leaf or a compromise on the red ensign. He goes on to say in this article:

> The significance of these figures, in the eyes of all Liberal strategists thinking in terms of an election, is that they clearly show that the flag issue would bring disastrous Liberal losses in nine provinces, and leave that party largely as the political arm of French Canada.

This is a salient point. As the hon. member for Ontario so eloquently put it, we do not want to have an issue which, when developed and brought to a conclusion, will divide our country and bring disunity to this great nation, something that will take several generations to heal. Therefore it is evident to most Canadians and to us here in this house that we should take the advice of the Leader of the Opposition and have a plebiscite on this matter to give Canadians a chance to look at it on a compromise basis, and decide in the quiet of their own hearts what should be a flag for Canada.

[Mr. Southam.]

Many Canadians today are asking a number of questions which I think should be answered by the various members sitting opposite. I was very glad this afternoon to see at last a member of the cabinet get up in his place and speak, after having been silent so long, but let us hear from the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Martin), from the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Hellyer), from the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill), the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys (Mr. Benidickson). Let us hear from the hon. member for St. Paul's (Mr. Wahn), from the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Honey), from the hon. member for Hastings South (Mr. Temple), from the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Hays), from the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Lloyd), and from many others opposite who have sat silent. Let them answer some of these questions.

Why did the Prime Minister decide to bring the flag issue on to the Canadian political scene at this time? It was not in the throne speech.

Why does he not allow a free vote in parliament at this time?

Why does he want to hold the threat of an election over the heads of Canadians?

Why does he want to place this issue ahead of other more important pieces of legislation facing this parliament?

Why does he want to add this most divisive issue to the already over-charged political scene?

Why is he not striving for unity in Canada rather than sowing seeds of disunity?

Why is he taking the advice of the wrong people in these questionable decisions?

Why is he relegating what was once a great Canadian political party into a petty, selfish, partisan group representing only the political arm of French Canada?

Why does the Prime Minister want to take the Christian symbols off our flag?

Why does he jeoparidize the political well-being of so many of his own party members?

Why this all or nothing stand of the Prime Minister?

Why does the Prime Minister want to bury the past?

Why does the Prime Minister not want to set up a committee of both houses of parliament, as Mr. King did in 1945, to come to an agreement on this issue? Why? Why? Why?

These and many more questions are being asked by the people of our great nation.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, and people outside Canada also are asking these questions too, and this is causing me a lot of worry. When the peoples of the outside world look through the window and find us divided in our parliament over this contentious issue they ask the same questions, and the only person who is getting any satisfaction out of it is Mr. Khrushchev himself.

Let us take a look at what some of our people are saying about the plebiscite or referendum, and I think we would do well to take a look at outside opinion as well as expressing our own viewpoints in this house. In deciding to rise in this debate and give my own personal viewpoint I also want to give the viewpoints of the constituency I represent.

Last fall, prior to this debate being introduced, I sent a questionnaire to the people of my riding, a questionnaire which had five questions on it, the first being, "Are you in favour of the Canadian red ensign or a change?" In order to get a cross section of opinion I did not write just to my executive committee or my own personal friends. I directed the questionnaire to the reeves and councillors of the 25 municipal governments that lie within the boundaries of my riding, some 150 people in number, 25 municipalities, each with six councillors and an elected reeve. I felt these people would represent the opinion of the people of that area very well. Among other questions, one was, "Are you in favour of unemployment insurance for farm labourers?" Another was: "Are you in favour of lotteries?" But the first question was on the flag, and without exception the replies I received said they were in favour of the red ensign or a modification of it. To me this indicates that the right hon. Leader of the Opposition is right in asking that this issue be decided by the people of Canada through means of a referendum. I think, also, that my hon. friend from Regina City (Mr. More) was right in putting forward this subamendment specifying certain alternatives so that everybody might have the democratic privilege of making a decision on this issue.

Many hon. members have referred to the position taken by the Royal Canadian Legion, among them the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton (Mr. Flemming) in his eloquent address the other day. I think the voice of the Royal Canadian Legion, of the Canadian corps association, of the Orange Lodge of British America and of other organizations of this character should be given full consideration. I might add that the British Israel world federation has produced a pamphlet about the flag setting out its origin, its symbolism and its significance. I would recommend this publication to the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson) who spent so much time in his amateur endeavours in heraldry before coming up with the maple leaf flag. I suggest that if he has not studied this pamphlet he might do so, because what is set out here is well worth reading. The heraldry and traditions of the red ensign are given, as well as the origins of the union jack, and so on.

I should like now to read into the record some comments regarding a plebiscite by Mr. Heesaker, dominion president of the Canadian corps association. He says:

> 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 through 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.
>
> We feel the supporters of the Canadian red ensign are more democratic in their viewpoint than the supporters of the maple leaf design for they are willing for this question to be submitted in referendum form to the people of Canada and to abide by their decision, where the maple leaf flag supporters are reluctant to trust the approval of their proposed new flag to the people of Canada! 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 ten million dollar 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.

It goes on to say:

> 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 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.

There are others, in addition to the organizations I have mentioned, which support the red ensign and which have made strong pleas for a referendum. Here is a copy of an open letter to the Prime Minister. It states:

Please endorse red ensign which is my flag as third generation Canadian.

Our union jack symbolizes freedom without licence, equity without denial of personal rights to free men under it. Appeasement of minorities unjustly penalizes majority, and fatal to tolerant unity.

Here is a lady writing from Winnipeg, Manitoba. She puts her plea in the form of a little poem, and I think it would be timely to place it on record, too:

The Ensign

This is the flag for which men died
In bloody, and ugly, and nightmare battle,
This is the flag!
This is the flag which death-bound rattle of guns
Could never still,
This is the flag!
And now they fling its tatters to the waves,
And cry with glee, and trample underfoot
Bright honour's face,
O Canada, O Canada .....
I weep for all our race!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member but he did indicate a moment ago that he would be referring to messages and a poem which, he said, had relevance to a referendum and to the red ensign. I heard no reference at all in those citations to anything having to do with a referendum or a plebiscite and in the circumstances it is my duty to remind the hon. member of the decision of the house yesterday.

While I am quite prepared to give the hon. member all possible latitude, I feel his remarks should be confined at this stage to the specific point which is now before the house.

Mr. Southam: Thank you. I can assure Your Honour I do not wish to depart very far from the rules of relevancy. But since other hon. members have been allowed a certain flexibility I thought I was sufficiently in order.

To revert to the subamendment, it is my belief, as I have stated earlier, that this matter should be placed before the people of Canada, now that it has given rise to such widespread controversy. I feel, as the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Starr) said so eloquently, that the people should have an opportunity at some time in the future to go into a booth and mark an "x" opposite the flag of their choice. If this were done, we would never be faced with the accusation that the steps we are now taking are undemocratic and that such an important issue was being decided on a political basis. At this time in our history we should demonstrate to the people of Canada and to the world in general that we are democratic in our principles and that we solve our problems through democratic procedures. We on this side of the house should not be accused of filibustering at this time. We feel very deeply on this issue, which is one which goes to the hearts of our members. It is an emotional issue, not an economic one. If the Prime Minister would take this opportunity, which has been given to him by the Leader of the Opposition, to adopt a plebiscite, using the provisions outlined in the subamendment as a guide, I am sure we could settle this question without further controversy. I am confident this is the way in which the people of Canada feel it should be settled.

In closing my remarks I should like to say that I am definitely in favour of the retention of the red ensign. I say this on my own behalf and on behalf of my constituents, and I believe I am speaking also for most of the members of my party. I believe they would be agreeable to the compromise solution outlined by the hon. member for Regina City, and once more I should like to reiterate what others have said before me, namely that any country which dissociates itself from the past will have a questionable future.

Mr. Matheson: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the hon. member for Moose Mountain (Mr. Southam)?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Plourde: Would the hon. member allow a question?

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Two members have risen at the same time. I believe the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson) is asking permission to put a

question to the hon. member for Moose Mountain, if he wishes to answer.

Mr. Matheson: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has advocated this process of referendum in the selection of a flag. Would he be good enough to indicate to the house what countries have selected flags in this fashion?

Mr. Southam: I would like to answer that question by asking another question. I would like to ask the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson) what country has disposed of its flag by the method now being taken by this government?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Plourde: Is the hon. member trying to imply that he does not want a flag by proposing that the referendum be held at the next general election?

[*Text*]

Mr. Charles J. M. Willoughby (Kamloops): Mr. Speaker, before entering into this debate with regard to the subamendment I wish to also voice my approval of what was said by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Starr). I offer my congratulations to the hon. member, who so ably expressed my personal opinions and I am sure expressed the feeling of everyone in the party to which I have the honour to belong. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, we are now engaged in what is a most unnecessary and a most critical debate. It is unnecessary because the question should never have come before parliament; it is most critical because it is causing serious emotional complications throughout Canada, it threatens to divide our country beyond repair, and it is bringing discredit to the House of Commons at the present time.

We in parliament are spending time on an issue with regard to which the Canadian people wish to express their individual opinions. The answer is obvious in the subamendment, that Canadians must never be forced to accept a flag design contrary to the wishes of the majority; and it is their democratic right to be allowed to express their opinion. I offer no apologies for being somewhat repetitious. Repetition to correct an injustice is always justifiable.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Willoughby: All Canadians ask is for justice, and for this flag resolution to be railroaded through is not justice. We want justice with a purpose and we want justice without partisanship. A lot more important things could be done in the House of Commons at the present time than arguing about this flag issue. In my opinion the flag issue should never have come before the House of Commons. We see, in an editorial which appeared in the last night's *Journal* what people think of this debate. I believe this is a particularly important editorial and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will read it in part:

> Any flag that Mr. Pearson might ram through in these circumstances would serve as a symbol of division rather than unity.

How true that is:

> Canada cannot afford that.
>
> And as to legislation—the cost of Mr. Pearson's clinging to his course is indefinite postponement of the following business—

Then the editorial cites eight important bills that are before the house at the present time and are being sidetracked while we continue in the house, on this divisive flag issue, trying to obtain justice for the people of Canada.

Mr. Moreau: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Willoughby: Certainly.

Mr. Moreau: I was interested in the hon. member's statement that he agreed with everything the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Starr) had said. As I recall it, the hon. member for Ontario stated that this is the most important thing to face parliament since he has been a member. I wonder how the hon. member reconciles that statement with what he is now saying.

Mr. Willoughby: The answer to that question is obvious, Mr. Speaker. This important debate has been created because of the fact that the people of Canada insist on having a voice in what is going on in this house, and this is being denied by the government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Willoughby: I think it is time we in Canada asked ourselves, where are we going? Another question that could be most usefully asked is, what is the purpose of Canada as a nation; what motivates our principles as a nation? Where are we going, Mr. Speaker? Canada has a personality complex, and this demands co-operation and not wrangling over an issue such as the one we have before us at the present time. We must solve this matter and we can only solve it through wisdom. I hope some wisdom will be brought into this issue before we have finished.

Experience is the greatest guide for wisdom, and wisdom is synonymous in many ways

with experience. Where do we find experience in this issue? History relates experience. Can we learn through history; can we learn to avoid mistakes by the study of history? I claim that we can, and we should and we must. Canada insists on going from crisis to crisis. If we are not in an international crisis, if we are not in an international war, we create a crisis among ourselves. It seems to me that the crises we create in our own country, crises of our own making, mean we are happiest when we are in a turmoil.

The flag resolution of the government is causing great and deep bitterness, not only in parliament but particularly throughout this country. It is the greatest crisis since the first world war. This is where we get back into history. I would say it is probably the greatest internal crisis since confederation. I can recall, as I am sure other members of this house can, that one of the greatest crises we had in Canada was in 1911 when the reciprocity treaty was being brought into this house. How did they settle that question? The issue was so serious that it was dividing the east from the west—western Canadians wanted reciprocity; eastern Canadians did not want reciprocity. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, in his wisdom, said, "This is a question for the people". He went to the people. Reciprocity was defeated; but everyone in Canada was satisfied—and they were satisfied because a plebiscite had been held.

Let us come down to 1917. This is another point in history. In 1917 we were at war. Conscription was considered unnecessary. The government of the time did not think they would have a plebiscite for conscription; they thought they would enforce it. This was in spite of the protests of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who said this was an issue that should be sent to the people. Mr. Speaker, all of us in this house know that the fact this issue was not sent to the people was one of the biggest mistakes made in Canada. It created division in our country, division so great that it has taken a whole generation to clear it up.

Now let me come to 1944 when we had a similar situation. Canada was at war. However, precedents offered guidance. The government of the day, under the leadership of Mr. Mackenzie King, realized that the conscription issue was something which would divide our country and asked for a plebiscite on the question. In spite of the urgency of wartime we took time to hold a plebiscite. Naturally some people were not satisfied with the result, but in general there was no resentment and it kept the country from being divided.

Those were times of war, Mr. Speaker. Today there is no war; at least, there is no war as far as this country is concerned. There is no urgency to this matter. We have had the present flag for at least 40 years and it has been our official flag since 1945. Why do we have to rush into this question and decide it now when during the course of our previous history it has been shown on several occasions that on an issue of this type only a plebiscite can clear the matter up? This issue today, if it is not dealt with by means of a plebiscite, promises to create the greatest cleavage Canada has ever seen, and I say that knowing the sentiments of the people throughout the country, having spoken with them from coast to coast. This crisis is the result of an ill-conceived step on the part of the government. The flag issue has become political when it should be outside party politics. The government should never have forced a particular design of flag on the country and said: Either the flag is accepted or we will have an election. This matter is too serious to treat lightly, in a "take it or else" fashion. This is something which must be discussed. It is not a question which is going to affect us only today; it will affect our country for generations to come. We want our children, our grandchildren and our great grandchildren to say that we have a beautiful flag. Therefore we must be careful to give them a flag which will make them proud to be Canadians. This flag issue, if properly handled, can solve the problem of national unity, there is no doubt about that. If it is handled properly our national unity will be stronger than it has ever been in the past. A national referendum, as suggested in the subamendment, will overcome any resentment. The people must decide this issue, Mr. Speaker.

At this time I could go into the history of the red ensign but I realize that I would probably be speaking outside the terms of the subamendment. Suffice it to say that the red ensign has represented the united life of our country. It has represented Canada in peace, in war, in commerce. It is the emblem of our nation and is recognized throughout the world. It also indicates the design of Canadian history. It shows our association with that great organization, the British commonwealth of nations. It has a glorious history. The history of how it came about is, of course, well known to this house; but let

me briefly say this. The three Christian crosses of St. George, St. Patrick and St. Andrew are part of our tradition and history. We just do not eliminate such things easily. We must not allow ourselves to discard all our traditions. The shield is of course traditional. It represents parts of Canada and denotes the great history of our founding races in generations past, and I hope for generations to come.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, why is it necessary under these circumstances to eliminate the union jack from our flag, whatever may be the design decided upon? That question has never been answered. Why is it necessary to have a second flag and call it the union jack? Has any other country in the world two flags? I do not know of one. I do not see why we should have two flags. Is one flag to be flown in one part of Canada and a second to be flown in the second part of the country? Would that be in the best interests of a united Canada? Would it not differentiate between parts of Canada and create a more serious division? I say, let us deal with this subject by creating unity, not division, in our country.

Some people complain about our present ensign because its design is similar to the British merchant marine flag. But what more honourable organization could it resemble? The British merchant marine has been the organization which has kept alive the British commonwealth. It has done more for the progress of the world than any other organization. Why should we not be proud to belong to, and be associated in our emblems with, that great commonwealth of nations?

On the other hand, a design has been proposed which this house is asked to accept, they say without argument. This design represents the merchant marine of another nation, a nation not particularly friendly to this country. Why should we accept their design and discard one with such tradition and connections with the commonwealth of British peoples? Many flags of different countries resemble each other. Sometimes when travelling around Europe one must almost take out the geography book to see which flag he is looking at. There may be a little variation here and there, with the same colours being changed around in different ways. But there is nothing wrong in having a flag which resembles another flag. These are all petty criticisms and are ineffective.

The red ensign has been accepted as Canada's flag. It is known throughout the world as Canada's flag. People throughout the world do not know what we are talking about when we say we want a new flag. How long would it take Canada to produce another flag which would be recognized throughout the world as such, as the Canadian red ensign is now so recognized? The question is, Mr. Speaker, where are we going from here? What do we mean by a distinctive flag? In my opinion a distinctive flag is one which we can recognize as Canadian, which will be recognized throughout the world as Canadian, one which will be approved by Canadians, is acceptable to Canadians, and will unite Canadians. That is what the subamendment wants to bring about, and it is exactly what we are after. The people wish to have a voice in the choice of a flag. The people want to indicate which flag should be adopted. A referendum will not only give us an indication of their choice but create unity, which I believe is very important.

It is not a dereliction of the duty of the members of this House of Commons to suggest that this issue should be referred to the people. I think this suggestion indicates we have confidence in the people of our country to choose that with which they will be satisfied. A decision to adopt a flag without a referendum I believe is an insult to the intelligence of the people of this country who wish to express their opinion.

Mr. Favreau: Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Willoughby: Certainly.

Mr. Favreau: Does the hon. member not think or believe that the right hon. Leader of the Opposition was correct when he stated that under the British system of principles a plebiscite was a negation of the existence of parliament?

Mr. Willoughby: I am sorry, I did not understand the last part of the question.

Mr. Favreau: Does the member feel the right hon. Leader of the Opposition was correct when he argued that under the British system a reference to a plebiscite was the very negation of the existence of parliament?

Mr. Willoughby: Mr. Speaker, I am not certain what the hon. minister is referring to, but I should like to state that the history of our country would indicate, as evidenced by the several examples I cited, that a referendum is the answer to this kind of issue.

An hon. Member: You do not agree with your leader.

Mr. Willoughby: I do not question my leader's statement at all, but I do suggest the issue he may have been discussing was probably something entirely different from and unrelated to this type of issue.

An hon. Member: He was referring to conscription.

Mr. Willoughby: I am not sure what the issue is you are referring to and therefore cannot discuss it more thoroughly.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, I believe the holding of a referendum would constitute a compliment to the people of Canada. The government has indicated that it obtained a mandate as a result of the last election and now has authority to bring in a new flag. In my opinion that suggestion is entirely wrong and I emphatically disagree with it. The members of the government party must remember that they formed a minority government and were elected by a minority vote in this country. They must also remember that very few voters knew there was a flag plank in their platform. In my opinion 99 per cent of the voting public did not realize there was a flag plank in the Liberal party's platform. The majority of people are amazed to now learn of the existence of that plank. I am sure had they known there was a flag issue, as some of them must have known, they were not aware of the proposed design. It is my belief there is not one man in this House of Commons today who had any idea about the proposed flag design. I do not agree with the suggestion that because the government obtained what it has referred to as a mandate from the people of this country, most of whom had not the slightest idea there was to be a new flag, nor of course of any proposed design, it should be allowed to force a flag upon the country. I think the suggestion that the government has obtained a mandate in respect of the flag issue is absolutely without foundation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this flag issue and the new design proposed by the government could not have been placed before this parliament at a worse time. We have a splinter parliament and we are creating a splinter nation. We need a unified nation. We should not carry this debate to a point of creating an irreparable division of the country.

If there is a desire on the part of the people of this country to have a new flag perhaps we should go to the Indian citizens and ask them their preference. Those citizens have lived under our flag since we came to this country and took it from them. I have not heard one Indian express a desire for a new flag.

There are millions of Europeans in this country. We have listened to the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Starr). He is of European origin and has voiced the opinion of millions of citizens of other racial origins who have adopted Canada and its emblems, and fought for Canada under the red ensign. These people have not expressed complaints but are proud to be Canadians. I suggest it is extremely questionable that the majority of the people in Canada today wish to replace our present red ensign.

I am sure the people of Canada do not resent the maple leaf as one of our national emblems but rather are very proud of it. The people of Canada do resent being forced to accept something without being allowed to express an opinion. They resent arrogance of any kind but particularly when it is displayed in respect of a most serious issue of this kind.

Mr. Speaker, I am here in this chamber to represent my constituents. Some members of this house have suggested they are not here to represent their constituents but to express their own personal opinions. I repeat that I speak and work for my constituents and can say that the majority insist there be no change. I have received hundreds of letters asking me to oppose any change in the present flag.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the hon. member would permit me to ask a question. He has said he is here to represent his constituents. Does he not think that under our parliamentary system he is properly here to represent all of Canada and not just his constituents?

Mr. Willoughby: Mr. Speaker, in answer to that question I should point out that it is absolutely obvious that my constituency is part of this country of Canada. My constituents are proud to live in a part of Canada and their voices must be heard in this country.

I have received a few letters representing the other side of the argument, and I have had the privilege on several occasions to talk with the people who wish to have a new flag. I have asked these individuals whether they favour the adoption of this proposed design but have yet to hear one answer in the affirmative. Most of them were surprised when I told them the proposed design was the one they must accept without the benefit of choice. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that a stroll down the main street of Kamloops is similar

to a trip through a hornets' nest. Everyone asks me what we are doing about the flag issue and suggests that we should retain the red ensign.

Many think that the letters we have received are the result of an organized propaganda campaign. I represent ten Canadian Legion establishments in my constituency and I know how the members feel about this issue. These people have a right to voice their opinions in this country. They have fought for this country and their suggestions should be given some consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that press polls are not always accurate, but they do indicate that the people of Canada are two to one in favour of the retention of the red ensign. I challenge every member from British Columbia—I am glad to see there are at least two here—to ask their constituents to see what they should do on this flag issue. I ask these same men to ask their leader for a free voice on this vote. I ask them to vote according to their conscience and according to the wishes of their constituents. If they do this, I have no doubt what the result will be on this particular issue. I know we will have a plebiscite.

I do not believe that the holding of a plebiscite means it is necessary to have an election. I believe that the holding of a plebiscite could await the next general election. There is no hurry about this. We have had this flag for many years. The plebiscite could await the next general election and in this way it would not cost us anything at all, just a ballot. Then a flag would be chosen which would be acceptable to all the people.

I am not trained in heraldry. I do not know anything about flag design. I have no training in art, but I appreciate a good picture when I see it. I have some feeling when I look at a flag. I want to look at a flag of which I can be proud. I want to be able to say, "I am a Canadian; that is our flag; is it not beautiful?" There must be a certain amount of colour balance in this thing; I think that is the way you describe it. It must not be insipid. It must not look like a piece of wallpaper. It must have something of which you can really be proud. It must have some history. It must be something to which we can look forward with enthusiasm.

My constituents are protesting. There is something lacking in this particular suggestion for a new flag. They want to retain the red ensign. I do not believe we are going to create more division in our country if another design, including some symbols of our historic background, is available. If democracy is to be made to work, we must respect the wishes of the people. People must be allowed to express their opinions. These people who are so anxious to preserve our present flag should not be restricted. Minorities should be allowed to express their opinions the same as majorities. A plebiscite will appease their antagonism. It would prevent national disunity. A plebiscite, as suggested in the subamendment, will leave no doubt as to what we should do.

As I say, this has become an extremely emotional issue, and this is the most dangerous thing that can happen to our confederation. As I have said, there is no hurry for a decision on this matter. A referendum can be held at any time. This is not an election issue and never should have been considered as an election issue. There should never have been any mention of an election in connection with this issue. It should have been dealt with in a reasonable way and the people should have been allowed to choose what they wish. It should have been outside party politics. This matter has become a purely partisan one in this house and we should not allow it to further divide our country, or we will be in for serious trouble.

A vote for a referendum, as I have suggested, is a vote for freedom of choice. It is a vote for unity within confederation. It is a vote for democratic principles and it is not necessarily a vote against the proposed flag. Is the government so confident of its design, is it so confident it is right that it is afraid to let the people vote on the issue? If the government feels the public are in favour of this new flag, what could they be afraid of? What would a plebiscite change? If they are right and the people are in favour of this, as they say, what are they afraid of? I appeal to the members of this house to let us have a national flag and not a party flag.

Mr. Boulanger: May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Willoughby: I shall be finished shortly, and then you can ask your question.

In closing, I should like to say this: I think that this plebiscite, as recommended in the subamendment, is the best thing for Canada at the present time. I say, let us unify ourselves as Canadians. Let us be a parliament with a purpose. Let us declare our wishes as Canadians, and let us accept the flag as

Canadians. Let us unify our country. Let us march forward under a flag of which we can be proud. Let us get back within the realm of sanity. Let us have leadership and not chaos. Let us support the subamendment in order to preserve the unity of our country and march forward under a flag of which the vast majority of Canadians can say, "I chose that flag."

Mr. Boulanger: May I ask the hon. member a question? Does he know of a country which was given a flag through a plebiscite or referendum, whatever you call it?

Mr. Willoughby: This question was answered a few minutes ago. If the hon. member will tell me of a country that has changed its flag in the manner in which we are attempting to do here, then I will answer the question.

Mr. Barry Mather (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time simply to say that if my friends on the right will ever permit me to do so I will vote for their amendment, and for a plebiscite on the flag. I have been in favour of a plebiscite from the start of this flag debate since I believe it is a very fair and reasonable way of settling the issue. I have been waiting now for three weeks in order to vote for the Conservative amendment. I will vote for it just as soon as they allow me to do so.

In a few more days I have to leave to go to my constituency on important constituency business. I am afraid that the vote will be taken before I can return. I should like to get it on the record, if I may, that if the Conservatives would allow me to vote for their amendment, I would do so now. If I had a vote I would vote in favour of the amendment.

Some hon. Members: Question; let us vote.

Mr. H. M. Horner (Jasper-Edson): Mr. Speaker, on an emotional subject such as the one we have been discussing it is the duty of a member of parliament to register his position. A number of things have been mentioned on the flag question and I make no apologies for repetition.

The subject is one which should not have been introduced for debate in this house but which should have been settled by a plebiscite. The question of whether or not we should vote on a Liberal party flag is one that should not be brought before the house. In western Canada the Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau) replied, "Oh, we had an election and the people voted for us. We had a flag plank in our platform." The only time the Liberal candidate who ran against me mentioned the flag was when he hesitantly agreed with the Legion in his home town that the red ensign was the best flag for Canada. That was the last we heard of the flag issue from him.

We should be attending to some other business in this house, matters that should be brought in and discussed fully, not things that will be hauled away from the house before being decided. There are health and welfare matters that should be discussed. There are agricultural matters that should be discussed—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): My hon. friends yell order but I would refer them to these words of the subamendment, "and that in such a plebiscite among the questions to be placed before the people should be the following", and I would point out that certain questions are listed and there are others that might be listed. One of the other things we could be talking about is agriculture, even though a recent issue of a western farm paper said there had not been much time spent on agriculture, mainly because the previous minister of agriculture had done so much that there was little left to do right away. These are some of the things we should be discussing rather than spending our time dividing the country on a very emotional issue.

If we are to have a flag agreeable to a majority of the people, how do we achieve it? You certainly do not achieve it the way the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) has attempted to do so. You do not antagonize the people of Canada, and then force a flag on them. You do not divide the country and then force a flag on it. This is not the way to get a worth-while flag for the country. You do not take a flag and thrust it down the throats of the Canadian people.

When the Prime Minister first brought forward his flag proposal he had far more support for the maple leaves than he has now. The Liberals are losing support because of their arrogance and contempt for the people of Canada. How much better it would be to have a referendum and settle this question properly. Among the questions which the subamendment proposes is that of the red ensign and the modifications that might be made to it. Personally I am in favour of the red ensign with modifications, to show the heritage of our history. I am and will be

utterly and forever opposed to the three maple leaf foliage which, as the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Starr) pointed out, is no more than a carton trademark, something I personally would hesitate to fly at any time.

What are we going to have if we adopt this flag? We are going to have everybody in Canada flying their own flag. People will say, "Mr. Pearson can have his flag, and so can I." That is their attitude towards this subject, which has been bungled, and bungled badly by the government. I believe I speak for a majority of my constituents when I say we should have the red ensign with modifications to show our dual heritage. Such a flag would show something of the freedoms we have in Canada, freedoms we would like to preserve.

One of these freedoms is freedom of the press, which to all intents and purposes we have lost at the moment. We have newspapers like the Edmonton *Journal* coming out with large editorials dealing with the red ensign and the plebiscite—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order please. I have the impression that the hon. member is straying away from the subject before the house.

Mr. Bigg: He is right on the dot.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order please. I feel he is straying away from the subject matter now before the house and, as he knows, there was a decision of the house rendered yesterday. I feel it is the duty of all hon. members to try to abide by the decision of the house, which was to the effect that hon. members taking part in the debate at this stage—

An hon. Member: What about the Minister of Trade and Commerce?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: —including the Minister of Trade and Commerce, should limit themselves to the specific point at issue.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): On that point, Mr. Speaker, I am trying to establish some of the reasons why I think the second question in the subamendment is the one I favour, and why I think it is an ideal solution as a plebiscite question. I see nothing out of the way in stating why I think the red ensign with modifications is a good idea to have as a question in a plebiscite.

I was mentioning that we were losing some of the freedoms we fought for over the years, and one of those freedoms which we have pretty nearly lost is freedom of the press. If Your Honour will allow me I would like to point out two or three instances in this regard. The most blatant one is the recent dismissal from *Maclean's* of six editors because they would not follow the Liberal line, and there was not one pressman with enough gumption to stand up and defend his fellow journalists who were thrown out of their profession because they would not follow a flag with three maple leaves. Is this the kind of freedom we are going to have under these three maple leaves, which I would like to label as the pettiness, pomposity and petulance of the Prime Minister? The three maple leaves are going to take away our freedom. This is not the kind of flag I want to live under, nor the kind of flag my constituents want to live under.

I would like to mention that the managed press in Canada is kowtowing to the Liberal line. The Edmonton *Journal* had a long editorial in favour of the red ensign and a plebiscite, but it got the word shortly thereafter and it has been particularly quiet ever since. It published the results of its own referendum and in northern Alberta, an area which is basically Anglo-Saxon but which has a mixture of all nationalities and has a substantial number of our French Canadian friends, who are some of our best citizens, this area was 65 per cent in favour of the red ensign.

We need the union jack on our flag to preserve this very vital freedom, this freedom of the press which we are losing, if we have not already lost it to big business which controls the publishing industry. These people are trying to mould public opinion in favour of the foliage flag, in favour of pettiness, pomposity and petulance.

Mr. Moreau: Would the hon. member permit a question? I was wondering if he was not aware that three maple leaves was the emblem of Canada selected under a Conservative administration?

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): The three maple leaves were designed by a former king of England and I am surprised my Liberal friends would pick them up as a slogan for Canada. We in western Canada, if we do see maple leaves, certainly do not see three of them on one stem. I do not think it is a botanical possibility in any case. As I say, personally I have no use whatever for this foliage flag and I will never fly it in any place over which I have jurisdiction, wherever I may be. As I have said, this foliage flag means nothing. I can only say it is a product of petulance, pettiness and pomposity on the part of the Prime Min-

ister. It probably reflects more than anything else the attitude of this government to date. We have seen budgets come and go. We have seen 60 days of decision come and go. We are now in the midst of a flag debate, which will continue because it is of vital importance to the majority of the people of Canada.

This is not something which hon. members opposite can decide, because they believe they are almighty. They are not. They will have to answer to the people eventually. If they persist in trying to force this foliage flag through, and if they succeed, it will be known as a Liberal party flag. It will be a political flag and nothing more.

Miss Jewett: Passed by parliament.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): Passed by parliament by trained seals following a leader. Have a free vote if you want to talk that way. Have a free vote, and I would like to see how some of the hon. members over there would vote, including the hon. lady.

An hon. Member: What would happen on your side?

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): Don't worry about our side. This three leaf flag will become a political flag—a flag which will go out on every piece of Liberal propaganda in the next election.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): Of course it will, particularly in certain areas, because the Liberals believe in a policy of divide and conquer. This is a dictum of the Liberal party and it dates from the days of Mackenzie King: You cannot win the country politically if there is unity; you must have the west fighting the east and then you pick up the pieces and become the big cheese. This was Mackenzie King's dictum, way back; the only way to win political power was to divide and conquer, and we in the west suffered from that policy for many years.

I say to the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Dupuis) that if he and some of his hon. friends from Quebec were less interested in the question of provincial autonomy and more interested in Canada as a whole we would have more success in building up a greater country. He might also be helping the people of his province a great deal more than he has done in the past if he would think in broader terms and contemplate a wider horizon. We in western Canada have always been accused of being radicals, even on occasion of being separatists. But we believe in Canada and we are willing to make sacrifices in order to remain part of Canada. I want to see Canada grow. I do not think it can grow under this three maple leaf device. We believe it is much better to have the red ensign which means something to our people, and I am sure even those members in the back benches of the Liberal party must have been thrilled when the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Starr), of neither Anglo-Saxon nor French origin, got up and made the speech he did this afternoon. It was an example of what Canada can and should be under a flag such as the red ensign, perhaps with modifications to show our dual heritage. In this way we could go ahead in unity. The only manner in which this could possibly be done now is by means of a plebiscite.

We did not force this flag issue on the House of Commons. It was brought on by the Prime Minister saying, in his petulance, that he must fulfil at some time at least one of the promises made during the election. So he pushed this issue before the house in an effort to force this flag down our throats, trying to force upon us an artistic monstrosity which does not mean anything and which the majority of Canadians do not want. It is not good enough for the hon. member to say "just vote on it".

An hon. Member: On the plebiscite.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): There are others on this side who want to speak. I was talking earlier about freedom of speech. This is something which may be unheard of in Liberal ranks. But we believe we should learn from history and we would like to have the red ensign continue as our flag. We believe in the freedom of speech and in the freedom of the press and we would like these things to continue. We have had an example in this very debate of what might happen if we did not enjoy freedom of speech. We would have a foliage flag forced down our throats without regard to the opinions of the people of Canada, which would be a most divisive thing and would spoil the heritage on which this nation is built. We need this plebiscite. I think all hon. members, particularly those in the back row over there, should sit down and re-examine their positions; indulge in a little self-hypnosis and come out in favour of the subamendment.

May I call it six o'clock?

At six o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): Mr. Speaker, at six o'clock I had said that if we go ahead and pass this foliage flag of three maple leaves, which I designated as representing the pettiness, the pomposity and the petulance of the Prime Minister, we would cause nothing but disunity in Canada. I would like to spend just a few minutes saying how a plebiscite of the nature outlined in the sub-amendment could foster unity in Canada and make it a better, greater and more prosperous nation. One of the most serious things that is besetting confederation at the moment is this unsettling idea of the disunity that has been fostered, particularly in the province of Quebec but also in my own province in western Canada. While not so much has been heard about it, there is in each of the areas of Canada, I am sure, that local pride, that local necessity to promote their own area which fosters regionalism and makes separatism feasible to the people in these areas. This is, after all, Canada's greatest problem at the moment.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that the Prime Minister has done a disservice to Canada by bringing forth the flag issue at this particular time. There is no doubt about it, nobody asked for a new flag particularly. Why should we change our flag; this is the question. It is not a question of giving us a flag all of a sudden; we have had a flag for 100 years. Why should we have a new one right now, when we have all sorts of problems that are related to confederation, that are related to our being a vast country different in geographical areas, different in areas of ethnic origin, different in what people are doing, and different in economic potential. In the face of these problems, why should we suddenly try to give them one little symbol that is supposedly going to make them all happy? But, Mr. Speaker, it is not going to do that. Ordinary common sense tells us that this is going to be a divisive issue; that this is going to foster disunity, not unity. The only way we are going to get that on to the right track, the only way we can try to bring Canada to that kind of unity we would all like to see, whereby all peoples of all ethnic origins can live, work, prosper and develop together, is by having a majority vote on this very emotional question.

It is not good enough for a few cabinet ministers, like the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp) this afternoon, to rise and rant and rave about filibuster, and so on. This issue is far more important than that. I would have thought the Minister of Trade and Commerce would have had more knowledge of the people he is governing than he displayed this afternoon. We must have, if we are going to achieve unity, that area of co-operation that is necessary to do this. Whether you want to call it co-operative federalism, or not, does not matter; but we have to be one country.

I am sure the Minister of Industry (Mr. Drury) appreciates that you cannot go around stealing industries from one area and giving them incentives to settle in another, providing jobs in one area at the expense of another. This is the sort of thing that will also foster disunity, and it is already taking place to a certain degree. We need something that is going to bring us unity. We are not going to get it under this foliage flag. We are going to get it only if we have a plebiscite.

I think the idea of having four questions is a good one, because this will give people in all parts of Canada a chance to express their opinions and they want to express their opinions. The Liberal party did not fight the last election in most areas of Canada, on the question of the flag at all. As I said earlier my Liberal opponent mentioned it only once. He said he was in favour of the red ensign and then backed off this question for the rest of the campaign. This was pretty general in the rest of Canada. So to say now they have a mandate to bring in a new flag is just nonsense, because they do not have a mandate to bring in this kind of flag at all.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we need a plebiscite as a unifying force in this country, as a democratic way of settling a difference. Then the majority decision will be accepted by the people of this country. Along this line we need, in order to promote unity in Canada, the communications media orientated to Canada as a whole. We have had the C.B.C. and other communications media, notably the press, orientated mostly to promoting themselves and not at all to promoting Canada. They have been destructive instead of constructive. They have not promoted the idea that we should have one Canada and a single symbol for one Canada. To my mind, Mr. Speaker, a single symbol that will make Canada united is one that has an historic background; one that will give our dual heritage full play; one that is acceptable to the people who came here from other nations partly because the union jack was on the flag we are flying and its freedom was all they

wanted. This is the only reason many people came to Canada in the first place; I have been told this many times. People of our various ethnic groups want their chance to say now what kind of flag we are going to have.

There are the four questions that could be posed to them if a plebiscite were held. There is the question: Are you in favour of the red ensign? Are you in favour of the red ensign modified—as I am—to show our dual heritage? Are you in favour of the three maple leaves? If we can trust the newspaper polls—and I never trust anything that is printed in the newspapers any more, after having come to parliament—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): —the majority of people in Canada in nine provinces do not want this foliage flag. That is, if you can trust anything that is printed in the newspapers, as I say. I do not; I am just putting that forward.

The other question is with regard to the single maple leaf. The only disadvantage I see to a single maple leaf is that it does not denote anything. I think the three maple leaves denote, as I have said, several characteristics of this government and of the Prime Minister, but the single maple leaf would not denote anything. It is not a national botanical specimen, and we in western Canada would rather have the beaver or even the buffalo. We think these are national emblems. Why do we not have a rose?

Mr. Guay: Or Diefenbaker.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): We could do all right with that, too. Still the question remains that all of us have to think on a proper basis along more than strictly provincial lines. This is the serious challenge thrown out to all members of parliament. We must quit being regional in the sense that we must have a particular flower or leaf from our area to be used as a symbol. The easiest and most historic thing which will unify Canada is for us to have a red ensign modified to show our dual heritage.

I say let the people of Canada decide. Let the people vote on a plebiscite composed of these four questions. Surely the only other answer is for the government to allow a free vote amongst its backbenchers without any brainwashing. That is the only alternative to a plebiscite. If the Prime Minister will lose some of his pomposity and petulance, then we can get on with the business of Canada and settle the question of a symbol very easily. Once we are prosperous and working together this can be done. To continue in this manner is to continue to divide the country, and confederation will be meaningless in the near future if the government persists in its pattern to date.

Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Pictou): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the constituents I represent in the historic county of Pictou I wish to take part in this debate, which itself is an historic one. I subscribe to the terms of the subamendment moved by the hon. member for Regina City (Mr. More), and I shall be referring to it in my remarks more fully.

This afternoon the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp) brought forward in his speech a few matters which he said pertained to the subamendment; and in view of the fact that he was permitted to carry on and bring forward various matters I think at this time I should be able to comment briefly on the points he raised. The minister said that the official opposition were carrying out a filibuster in this debate. As pointed out by my hon. friend the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton (Mr. Flemming) on another occasion, a filibuster means to impede the progress of legislation. In this case it means to impede the progress of the House of Commons and of parliament itself. That is not the interpretation which I place upon my speaking in this debate, Mr. Speaker, nor is it the interpretation of the official opposition or of many people in this country.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) is on record as pointing out that the members of this house should speak in this debate and have the right to have their say. If hon. members opposite do not wish to do this, that is their business. But if we on this side do wish to do this, then that is democracy at its highest.

Several months ago one of the members sitting on the other side—I will not point him out—said to me when sitting down at the table one day: "What is the point of going on with the debate on the flag? You are going to lose the vote anyway. You might as well give up the ghost." Yesterday in this house, someone on the other side—it is recorded in *Hansard* as "An hon. member"—said "We will rub you off". This was said after the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Bigg) said names would be rubbed off monuments. If we, the official opposition, and the people of this country were to give up the ghost and cease to fight, then certainly nothing would be accomplished in the way it was accomplished during the period since confed-

eration in making this country of ours the great country it is. If the allies in the last war had given up when the Germans told them that they would defeat them, so what was the point of keeping on, where would we be today? They even sent a spy over to England to talk the U.K. and our allies into surrendering. I believe it is worth fighting a battle when principles are at stake in which you believe; and we certainly have principles on our side in this case.

The minister also said that the control of the business of the House of Commons is in the hands of the leaders who were meeting today. I took some notes of what he said, but as they are not verbatim I can be corrected. I might point out it was a different matter in 1962, when the government of that day was charged by the opposition with being in charge of the business of the house, rather than the various leaders of the parties. It is a different matter, now that hon. members opposite are on the government side. The official opposition were also accused of irresponsible manoeuvring. It seems to me that in this regard the irresponsibility should be placed at the doorstep of the Prime Minister and of the government for bringing forward this flag resolution and pressing it upon the people of Canada. Let us put irresponsibility where it belongs and look at this question in an objective manner.

Confederation in the spirit of Macdonald and Cartier was also mentioned. I think the hon. member for Timmins (Mr. Martin) got up and asked, where was the spirit of Macdonald and Cartier. Of course, the Minister of Trade and Commerce wondered about that, but said it is not present in this modern age. I suggest that in this debate the members of the government have no free vote. The minister said that parliament should decide the issue of the flag. I suggest that parliament is the proper body to look into this question and decide the issue if hon. members on both sides of the house are given a free vote and are able to vote as their conscience dictates. In the days of Macdonald and Cartier, when men from all over the country were brought together to form and to weld the nation which we have today, there was certainly no doubt as to a free vote. Those Fathers of Confederation became members of this house and of this parliament of Canada and they were free to do so. They were not pitched into it by any party. They showed their own independence, and we need more of that in this parliament today.

The minister said, among other things, let us not appease anybody. I am not going to go beyond the terms of the subamendment, but in speaking of appeasement let us not forget that there is another resolution to follow, that concerned with the adoption of the union jack. As has been said on a previous occasion, there are two flags—one for show by the government and one for Joe, the premier of Newfoundland.

The minister also said he has been disappointed by the speeches of opposition members. He said there was sincere evidence of spirit but none of tolerance and conciliation.

Mr. Byrne: And he will be disappointed with yours, too.

Mr. MacEwan: The hon. member's greatest contribution to the house is to sit there and mumble. Sometimes he appears on *Hansard* and sometimes he does not; but in either case he makes no real contribution. I hope that he will speak later on. I always like to hear him speak and to read his speeches, because they can be used on other occasions.

With regard to the question of a free vote I thought I might look into the original stand taken by the Prime Minister and dwell on that for a few moments. First there was to be a free vote given to the members of the House of Commons. Other members have made this suggestion and I think it is worth repeating at this time.

There was a suggestion that any vote on the flag issue would be considered as a confidence vote and any defeat in respect of the Prime Minister's motion would be considered to be a defeat of the government. Following that suggestion, of course, the Prime Minister challenged the opposition to an election. This then became a political football.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp) this afternoon read part of an editorial which appeared in the Halifax *Chronicle-Herald*. This evening I should like to read from the May 21, 1964 edition of that newspaper. I do not intend to read this item completely, Mr. Speaker, but I feel portions of it should be repeated during this debate. The portion I wish to quote commences as follows:

> The so-called "free" vote on the flag issue is so much double talk, a mere sham.

The article then continues:

> It matters little that Mr. Pearson says that any member of the Liberal party voting against the design submitted by the government would not be read out of the party. To our mind, such assurance is meaningless, and is not characteristic of Mr. Pearson.

Another portion of the article states:

> We do claim, however, that the Liberal members would not line up unanimously behind the government's choice of flag—as it appears they are going to do—if party loyalty and the government's future did not hang in the balance. It is impossible to believe, for example, that all the Liberal members from the Atlantic provinces—where sentiment in favour of the red ensign seems overwhelming—would vote contrary to the wishes of their constituents.

The article then indicates that the flag issue is different from other issues brought forward by the government. This issue has been brought forward as a political football. It involves a flag proposed by the Prime Minister, with the help and assistance of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson), and will not give Canadians the opportunity of expressing their views. The Minister of Trade and Commerce suggested that parliament should decide this issue. I would be in support of that statement if a free vote was held.

In reference to item 3 of the subamendment relating to the three maple leaf design, as other hon. members have pointed out, this does not represent a distinctive Canadian flag. Maple trees do grow in various parts of the United States and other countries and are certainly not distinctive to Canada. Mr. Speaker, I received an interesting letter in this regard, as did the hon. member for Wellington South (Mr. Hales), who quoted a portion of it, which appears in *Hansard* of July 3, 1964 at page 5019. I should like to repeat that quotation as follows:

> If Canada should have a new flag ... it should at least have a definite Canadian identification and not maple leaves.

Mrs. Young of Avondale Station, one of my constituents sent me several samples of our maple leaves. Following your ruling last night, Mr. Speaker, in respect of the various flags produced by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) I decided not to bring the samples with me. I should like to read a portion of Mrs. Young's letter as follows:

> Enclosed please find a few samples of our maple trees. So that you may have the evidence to show the Prime Minister that the red maple of Canada is not the one he plans to paint red on his flag. The Canadian red maple is *rubrum*, and the one shown on the flag designs we've seen, look more like the "Norway maple" which is an introduced tree, or the "sugar maple" which is Canadian and American but not red in colour. It turns yellow in autumn.
>
> We think the Prime Minister and others should be better acquainted with our beautiful red maple whose leaves are distinctive but not like the Norway maple.

The suggestion is that the proposed design with the three maple leaves is not representative of a maple leaf distinctive to Canada. Undoubtedly the hon. member for Leeds dealt fully with this matter, and he will correct me if I am wrong when I say that the evidence indicates that the proposed maple leaf on the flag design is not distinctive to Canada.

I should like to read from an article written by Mr. Roland Sherwood, which appeared in the Pictou *Advocate* of June 4, 1964 with reference to the three maple leaves. I do not intend to read the entire article but only the pertinent portion. He says:

> This new flag design, with the maple leaves, throws the whole set-up out of kilter.

He is referring to the red ensign and "O Canada". He then goes on to say:

> The design looks to me as something good for some group or organization, but not as a national symbol. However, to keep everything in focus, I have a suggestion for Mr. Pearson. If he is determined, and I respect his determination, to have the three maple leaves on a white background, with the two blue bars on the ends, then I suggest that he scrap "O Canada" in favour of "The Maple Leaf Forever" as the national anthem. At least this would be consistent. And one other thing. Since the proposed new flag has a large white field, it will be difficult to keep clean, once it hits the flag pole and starts to "brave the battle and the breeze". So, if the maple leaf design becomes the national flag, I suggested that Mr. Pearson make arrangements to have a package of "Breeze" given with every flag purchased. And let this be our rallying cry:
>
> The maple leaf our emblem dear
> Upon our flag we sees.
> With all our might
> We'll keep it white
> By using new blue Breeze.

I have made reference to that article, Mr. Speaker, to indicate some of the feeling toward the suggestion that this design is distinctively Canadian. Many of us have witnessed small flags on car radio aerials which are copies of the red ensign and the maple leaf design, and we have seen what a few weeks have done to them.

In reference to item 1 of the subamendment, Mr. Speaker, which deals with the Canadian red ensign, I received a very interesting letter from a retired army colonel. In this letter he refers to a visit to a tobacco shop operated by a Mr. John Dallas of New Glasgow. I might say that John Dallas is a well know merchant of Grecian origin who has lived in this town for many years. The letter in part states:

> I was in his shop on Wednesday morning for my paper. He had a paper in his hand at the time. I

hardly got into the shop when he demanded to know, pointing to the red headlines on the flag issue, what do you think of that? Then he went on to say, there were two cuts on the front page, pointing to the Prime Minister's flag, "that is not my flag, this one is," meaning the red ensign, "it is the one I want, I will never put that so and so thing up," again pointing to the maple leaf design.

Mr. Speaker, that represents the feeling of only one citizen in this area who came to Canada many years ago and who operates a small shop in this community. That gentleman has been treated well by the town, country, province and indeed Canada. He expressed his feeling about this proposed design, and the red ensign. I fully endorse his views.

Shortly after receiving that letter I read an edition of the New Glasgow *Evening News* dated July 22, 1964 which contained an article in reference to this same Mr. John Dallas. That article reads as follows:

The philosophy of "don't throw away—save everything," has paid off for 81-year-old tobacco shop owner John Dallas.

Apparently this gentleman saved old cigarette packages which displayed various flags in existence as far back as 1914-15. The article then continues as follows:

Dead in the centre of the display is the flag of Canada, as yet—the red ensign.

As Mr. Dallas said, "That is the flag I want. I will never put that so and so thing up. The red ensign is my flag." And I, too, join with him and say the red ensign is my flag.

Many speeches have been made about letters received by members. I must state that I have received letters from members of Legion branches, branches of the I.O.D.E., the Silver Cross women and, indeed, from some younger people of my constituency, who endorse the red ensign.

As I pointed out, I hope that this problem will be solved soon. I hope the Prime Minister will withdraw the resolution so that the people of Canada may follow the procedure laid down by the subamendment and make their wishes known. As I told some of my colleagues, last night I was awakened at 1.30 by a telephone call from one of my constituents who was most irate about this matter. I assured him we were going into the matter fully. He was very disturbed. I hung up the phone, and at a quarter to two I received another call from him so I hope in heaven's name the Prime Minister does withdraw this resolution so that we can all have a little peace and quiet in this country. I slept on this matter, and this speech is the result.

In so far as the matter of the referendum is concerned, it can be pointed out—

Mr. Favreau: What time did your caller call back that same night?

Mr. MacEwan: About 1.45. He still could not get to sleep. He was calling from Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, and he was very put out, as the Minister of Justice can well understand, not with Charlottetown but with the matter of the flag.

In so far as the matter of the referendum is concerned, perhaps I can just quote briefly from a newspaper article. The referendum, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) last night and the hon. member for Jasper-Edson (Mr. Horner) this afternoon, encompasses four different points. They are these: 1. Are you in favour of the red ensign? 2. Are you in favour of the red ensign with changes thereon to show the main heritage of the founding races? 3. Are you in favour of the three maple leaf design? 4. Are you in favour of the one maple leaf design? I think this subamendment should carry.

In so far as the referendum is concerned, as I have said perhaps I could quote briefly from the *Globe and Mail* for August 13, 1964.

An hon. Member: Oh, oh.

Mr. MacEwan: I hear a little noise down in the corner there. The monkeys are at it again. I wish somebody would put them back in their cages and give them some peanuts to keep them quiet.

This article is by Bruce West, and reads in part as follows:

I am sure that many of us who now oppose the scrapping of our present proud flag would be willing to shut up and bow to the will of the majority if a referendum indicated that a new flag were desired by this country.

It might be painful, but not nearly so painful as the prospect of having this flag foisted upon us by a government which really gives its members no other choice but that of voting for the adoption of a new standard.

As I've often said here before—

An hon. Member: Dispense.

Mr. MacEwan: This is very enjoyable; just listen.

—it seems to me that there is hardly any other question which deserves a free vote of the people more than that of what kind of flag they must live under.

The pertinent part follows:

Surely the democracy of which we have always been so proud hasn't fallen so low that such a

choice can't be made in a free and honourable manner. Once the referendum has been set up it would then be expected of all politicians that they would refrain from making any mention of the flag issue until after the people had expressed their will.

Any politician who attempted to inject the question into any of his harangues would then be clearly labelled for what he was—a tinhorn opportunist who was attempting to make capital out of a matter which should be considered above politics.

In this way we could probably preserve far more unity than under the present conditions, in which the flag issue can and does become a political football.

Then, there is this final paragraph:

Let the country speak on this matter. The answer will come from the soul, where it should come from when dealing with the question surrounded by such a great deal of honest sentiment. Once the country has spoken in this healthy manner, dissension on this subject will cease, no matter which way the vote may go.

As was pointed out in the issue of *Labor* of July 4, 1964, in a letter to the editor:

Prime Minister Lester Pearson has stirred up a hornets nest by wanting to destroy our lovely red ensign and put one of his own in its place, and what a tame thing his flag is. We already have maple leaves on the ensign. Our whole setup—Britain and the commonwealth—came from God's promise to Abraham in Genesis 33-11: "A nation and a company of nations shall be of thee."

Finally, as I have already stated, I am in favour of the red ensign and the sub-amendment which gives the people of Canada the opportunity to speak on this matter. The parliament of Canada cannot decide this issue since a free vote has not been accorded to all parliamentarians. I do not believe the present resolution before us will create the necessary unity in Canada. I have enjoyed the company of many of our friends from Quebec on many occasions. I have gone to army camps with them. I have been associated with many of them here in our House of Commons and I have enjoyed the House of Commons with them. I have enjoyed social occasions with them when we sang that old French Canadian song—not Alouette, that came later—The Regiment. I enjoyed that very much. I think there must be ways of further unifying this country other than the presentation of this resolution by the Prime Minister. Let him take cognizance of this. Let the government take cognizance of it. Let us go ahead so that in 1967 when we celebrate our 100th birthday we can show the necessary unity and we can fly a flag of which all Canadians can be justly proud.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Guy Marcoux (Quebec-Montmorency): Mr. Speaker, my purpose in rising is to—

[Mr. MacEwan.]

Mr. Boulanger: Shorten the debate.

Mr. Marcoux: Perhaps, if that is possible, but especially to say something new in a debate which has been repetitious for some time now. It is also because I have young children and cannot afford to come here and listen for days on end to the speeches which the Conservatives seem likely to continue for the next several days.

Mr. Boulanger: Shame.

Mr. Marcoux: They are aware of the fact that the duty of the head of the family who has been elected a member of parliament is to sit in the house during several months and also be with his family when he can take a few days off. It could happen that I might not be in the house when votes are taken on minor questions, but I want my constituents and all the members of the house to know that I am in favour of a distinctive national flag and that I support the motion proposed by the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson). In addition, if it was necessary to select a flag with a single maple leaf, green instead of red, with darker blue stripes, horizontal rather than vertical, I wish to say that I would still favour any such flag, as long as we finally select a distinctive national flag and bring this debate to a conclusion.

I understand some Conservative members are pleased to see more visitors in the public galleries during the summer than at any other time of the parliamentary year, but I feel rather ashamed that after 97 years of confederation and three years away from the centennial, we are still without a distinctive national flag. It seems to me that we should put an end to our discussions as soon as possible in order to be able to proudly hoist a fully Canadian flag.

As others pointed out earlier, we have nothing against the red ensign, or the French flag or still against the union jack, but we feel it is time, as I said in my speech of June 1, which is reported on page 3808 of *Hansard*, Canadians were proud enough of themselves, of their past, but also of their present achievements, to adopt their very own emblem.

Far be it from me to accuse those who take part in this debate with being dishonest and simply wanting to force their views on us. The matter is too serious and national unity is too important for me to accuse some members, regardless of their parties, with being dishonest or attempting to divide the country, because I am convinced that both sides are in favour of unity within the country. However, they do not all use the same

means. Some resort to stronger action and others to gentler methods. I feel the motion put forward by the government is better suited to promote Canadian unity than the amendment proposed by the Conservative party.

Now, to come back to the subamendment, I think it is of no importance whatsoever whether the referendum includes one, four, ten or a hundred questions. A referendum is essentially an ultimate method of reaching a decision, one which can only be appropriate when there are no other means of settling a problem, especially when the decision put to the house would run counter to a commitment already made during an election campaign in respect of a well-defined policy.

We know that, in 1942, for instance, a referendum took place to release the government from one of its formal promises. Let us say it was a neat way to impose conscription on a group which wanted no part of it. That referendum was justified because the promise had been made, fallaciously or not, and the government wanted to be released from it.

If we were to pursue the argument of the Conservative party to absurdity, it would mean that no decision could be taken by parliament without a plebiscite being held.

Today, I heard the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Starr) say that the government should be more respectful of democratic opinion. That is exactly why we were elected and it is because we live in a democratic country that we must take in the house a stand which meets the wishes of our constituents. Whether we spend a month, five months or a year discussing this matter, we will still be under the obligation to vote in the house, according to our conscience, it is true, but also according to the wishes of the majority of our constituents.

If the amendment proposed by the Conservatives had to do with the flag's shade of red or blue or the number of leaves, we could say that we have here an amendment on which to make a decision. But what is before us is a request to hold a referendum and the subamendment sets out in detail reasons for it which we could discuss forever. If we want democracy to prevail here in the House of Commons, the matter should be put to a vote. Let hon. members give their opinion in the house, let the electors know what it is, there is no objection to that, but let it be done after the vote, in the fall or later.

I am convinced that the house would give unanimous consent to let hon. members who have not had the opportunity to speak before adjournment to do so when the session resumes its normal course in the fall, provided that the vote is taken beforehand.

I say this because we know it is a most controversial matter and as there are 19 million people in the country, we will never reach a true solution. The only solution is to vote on the issue here in the house, because it will have to come to that sooner or later, even if the debate goes on for one or two years. In my opinion, that is what we should do, because after listening to all the arguments, I did not learn anything new about the referendum these past few days. Hon. members are only repeating the same arguments in a different way or quoting different newspaper editorials or taking ever so much time to explain why a certain stand will be taken. Now, filibustering is not serving the cause of the Conservatives or that of any other party. Every parliament is generally against resorting to a filibuster, even if it is a democratic or parliamentary procedure. It is a procedure which reminds me of the drowning person who will grab at anything, a dead leaf, a piece of wood, although knowing it is to no avail. But if the one who comes to his rescue realizes that the drowning person is trying to pull him under, he only has to hit him just hard enough to calm him down and bring him safely ashore.

I think hon. members have taken their stand and they now should vote accordingly. I am therefore pleading with the Conservatives to stop their filibuster—or whatever they call this—stop prolonging this debate which, in any case, will end up by a vote being taken in a very democratic way.

We might in the same manner, have opposed the 11 per cent sales tax. We made representations and, finally, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) agreed to a compromise. He maintained the tax, but it started at 4 per cent and gradually escalated to 11 per cent. I realize that such a measure was unpopular; I know that other members could have extended the debate indefinitely until the minister should decide to withdraw it. But since the minister refused to withdraw the measure, the Conservatives decided after all to end the debate and to allow the question to be put, and this 11 per cent tax was passed.

I am sure that if the government were asked to use a little darker blue and to have smaller leaves, they would be prepared to

agree, because those are minor details, but to ask that a motion which has already been submitted to the house be completely changed, I think this is absolutely impossible, especially since the adoption of a flag was a promise made during the last electoral campaign by the party in office. Even we, of the Social Credit, had submitted a project which is different although it was a reasonable and clearly distinctive flag design.

We also know that the party in power finally accepted, after several about-turns, to bring nuclear arms into the country. Some members objected strenuously, but finally, the measure was passed and now certain formations of the Canadian army are equipped with nuclear armaments. Some were against it, and are still against it and always will be. But the measure was passed although for a time, the opposition played its role which was to prevent the government from getting nuclear arms, until it had exhausted all the reasonable and legitimate procedures.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member, but it seems to me that after observing the rules of the house when he was talking about a plebiscite, he wandered away a great deal from the subject in the last few minutes.

Mr. Marcoux: Mr. Speaker, I was not dealing directly with the plebiscite, but with the consequences of the normal development of events which take place in this house, in a democratic way, because of the attitude of the members who were elected by the people.

I do not want to go farther, Mr. Speaker. I would like to quote several letters from voters who took the trouble to write to me—organizations like the St. Jean Baptiste society, the Jaycee's of Quebec city, the students of Laval University—and ask me to fight tooth and nail in favour of the flag proposed by the government.

I do not want to delay any longer the debates of the house, but I say that several persons and organizations wrote and asked me to support the measure introduced by the government, which is consonant with my personal opinion, so that it is twice as easy.

In conclusion, I will relate a fact—I hope that you will allow me to do so, Mr. Speaker —which happened last year during the international scout jamboree held in Greece; if my memory is good, it was near Athens, but I am not sure. The Canadian scouts were represented by various units coming from different parts of the country. There was namely a unit from the province of Quebec, and the government of that province had given its scouts the fleur-de-lis flag in order to show that the were from the province of Quebec.

All Canadian scouts were quartered together. Suddenly, an English scout decided to organize a display of flags; a British scout decided to have a display of all the flags. He went around all the units asking them to come for a parade with their own distinctive national flag. When he came to the Canadian unit, he said to the leader of the Quebec company: Come in with your flag: Canada must parade with its flag. The scout replied: But this is not Canada's flag, it is the flag of the province of Quebec. The other asked: Where is the Canadian flag? The scout answered: It is the other over there. The scout leader retorted: But it is not that one; this one is everybody's. We want a distinctive flag.

He then asked the Quebec company to take part in the display with the Quebec flag.

That means that even the British people, who have undoubtedly great respect for the Queen and the traditions, realize, when they see the flag which is presently considered as Canada's flag, that it is not a distinctive flag, and they insist on Canadians having a flag which would distinguish them from the British group.

Mr. Speaker, I will not dwell any longer on that matter. I merely wanted to change the atmosphere a little to show that, in spite of all, we want to co-operate with the government, not because we like the flag as such, but because it is a distinctive flag.

To conclude, I submit that the official opposition should not force the government to avail itself of standing order 33 which is the closure rule, nor of standing order 52, which is the rule concerning the previous question.

With all the consideration I have for the Conservative members who oppose the flag and with all the consideration I have for those who have taken part in the debate on the students loans legislation in a rather lengthy fashion, I think that we must finally come to a decision and that the government would not be blamed, in these circumstances, if they introduce a motion to apply the rule of closure. I am sure that if any member of the house could do it, this motion would be introduced, perhaps right now.

I therefore, suggest to the government that, if the opposition continues its filibuster, its extension of the debate, it should take its responsibilities and move to apply either section 51 of standing orders which deals with

the previous question, or section 33 which deals with closure of debates.

Mr. Vincent: Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency, if he allows me to do so.

I should like to know whether the hon. member can answer this question: Does the fact that a member of the house, even though he is a Conservative, uses a privilege reserved to any member of the House of Commons, that is the privilege to speak, as the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency has just done, mean that he is filibustering? As a matter of fact, I have not yet spoken and I intend to do so before the end of the debates.

Mr. Marcoux: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to answer the hon. member's question. Nobody is deprived of the right to speak, but this is simply a normal resolution brought forward in the usual fashion and which is discussed usually in a reasonable number of days and finally put to the vote.

Then, under those circumstances, it happens that a number of members, from each party, are designated to speak—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. It seems to me that the subject matter of the discussion between the hon. member for Nicolet-Yamaska (Mr. Vincent) and the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency is somewhat different from the subject now before the house.

Mr. Valade: Would the hon. member allow me to ask him a question about the referendum?

Mr. Marcoux: Yes, provided the house allows me to answer it.

Mr. Valade: Would the hon. member answer the following question?

On March 17, 1962, when the hon. member still belonged to the Social Credit party, his former leader, the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) stated that if his party assumed office, he would hold a referendum on the flag issue within six months following his coming to office.

Was the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency in favour of that commitment? If not, why did he not denounce it at that time?

Mr. Marcoux: To my knowledge, the leader of the Social Credit party at the time had not made such a statement.

[*Text*]

Mr. F. J. W. Fane (Vegreville): I think at the outset I should read, or place before the house, exactly what it is I propose to talk about tonight. My speech will of course be circumscribed by Your Honour's ruling of yesterday, but I should like to put the amendment on record again. It reads as follows:

> That all the words after "that" in line one be deleted and the following substituted:
>
> "As the proposal to change Canada's national flag will affect the unity and destiny of Canada now and for years to come, the government be authorized to take such steps as may be necessary to conduct a plebiscite prior to any further action being taken by the House of Commons, in order that all Canadians may be given their rightful opportunity to declare their choice concerning a national flag."

This was later the subject of a further amendment by my hon. friend from Regina City (Mr. More) who moved:

> That the amendment be amended by adding thereto the words:
>
> "and that in such a plebiscite among the questions to be placed before the people should be the following:
>
> 1. Are you in favour of the Canadian red ensign?
> 2. Are you in favour of the Canadian red ensign with changes made thereon to show the main heritages of both founding races?
> 3. Are you in favour of the three maple leaves design?
> 4. Are you in favour of a one maple leaf design?

This is the ambit of the discussion at the present time.

I wish to say right now, Mr. Speaker, where I stand on this question. First, I am in favour of the subamendment providing for a plebiscite, with the four questions set out to allow people to express exactly what they want to vote for. I am also in favour of the continuance of the Canadian red ensign as Canada's national flag. I want to tell you right now, Mr. Speaker, exactly why I am in favour of our red ensign continuing as Canada's national flag. In the first place, it has been Canada's flag for many years. It is a flag that has been carried and honoured all over the world. It is a distinctive flag, because no other nation in the world has a flag that looks like the red ensign. It has been said that New Zealand's flag, Australia's flag and the flags of several other countries are the same; but they are not—they have blue ensigns. There is not another national flag in the world that looks like the Canadian red ensign.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, I represent a constituency that is made up of 70 per cent central Europeans. We have there about 40 different national origins. Thirty thousand of the people whom I represent are of Ukrainian, Polish, Czechoslovakian, Austrian and Rumanian origin, including also the other

central European countries. I represent about 6,100 people of Anglo-Saxon origin, about 1,300 people of French origin, nearly 3,000 people of German origin, and the rest are made up of other national origins of 40 different countries.

In the last election campaign I held about 45 election meetings. At every meeting where the flag became an issue or was talked about at all I was asked where I stood on the flag question. I said, "Naturally, being a veteran, belonging to the Royal Canadian Legion, and being a Canadian, I stand for the Canadian red ensign as Canada's flag". Whenever the flag was mentioned and I made that statement I received the applause of everybody at the meeting, of whatever national origin they happened to be. I was told by Americans that this was the only stand to take. Thousands of Ukrainian people have told me they came to this country from their homeland because they did not have freedom there. They came to this country and found freedom under the union jack. They have told me that any flag which did not bear the union jack on it somewhere was no good for them.

I have, as a matter of fact, some 1,300 native Canadian Indians in my constituency. These people look on the union jack—the red ensign now—as the Queen, the person with whom their treaties were made, the great white mother. They want to see a flag with a union jack on it; it has to be the Canadian red ensign or some modification thereof. They prefer it as it is but, like the rest of us who are reasonable people, will certainly make a concession to the rest of the people if others want a maple leaf or a fleur-de-lis or something else on the flag. But the first choice is the Canadian red ensign, as is.

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Mr. Fane: Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to mention Quebec at all, but I just want to say right now that I thank the good God that the whole of Quebec is not represented by people like these who are yapping all the time. Whenever a person gets up to speak in English, these people are yapping. They talk about our dividing the country, but when we have something to say and get up to say it, they interfere all the time. It is they who are dividing this country, and not us.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Fane: Yes; you can yell "Order" till you are black in the face.

[Mr. Fane.]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Beaulé: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I would ask the hon. member to withdraw what he said.

[*Text*]

Mr. Fane: It does not matter—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Beaulé: Mr. Speaker, I rose on a point of order. I asked the hon. member to withdraw what he said.

An hon. Member: He does not understand.

[*Text*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. Is the hon. gentleman rising on a question of privilege or a point of order?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Beaulé: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member made insinuations about us and I ask him to withdraw them.

[*Text*]

Mr. Fane: Mr. Speaker, do I have to retract the truth?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. I think when the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Fane) began his remarks he was completely within the ambit of the motion before us. I would suggest that he continue in that vein.

Mr. Fane: Mr. Speaker, I never intended to get off the track at all. As you know, when I am told what the limitations are, I usually stick to them; but when remarks are passed such as those that have been passed, I naturally have to reply. There is another thing about the Canadian red ensign. I have travelled a great deal around the country. I was recently in the United States. I travelled to—

Mr. Byrne: Texas.

Mr. Fane: No, I didn't go to Texas. I didn't go to Kootenay East either. Perhaps some time the hon. member for Kootenay East (Mr. Byrne) will be big enough to stand on his feet and make his own speech.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Crouse: He sits there and "byrnes".

Mr. Fane: I was a member of a committee of this house that went to Colorado Springs, the headquarters of the air force section of NORAD. It was a very great pleasure to see the Canadian red ensign flying beside old glory on a flagstaff of equal size. It was certainly very wonderful to see our flag there.

The same situation prevailed in Norfolk, Virginia, and in Bermuda. I was recently at a Rotary convention in the city of Toronto. There were around 16,000 people there; they were mostly from the United States. When they saw from the badge I was wearing that I was a Canadian they said, "You are a Canadian. What do you think about this flag issue?"

Fortunately I did not have to go into too much detail, but I told them that there was no issue, that it should not be an issue because it was entirely phony. I said the majority of the people of Canada wanted to continue with the red ensign, but this government had decided that the flag should be changed. These people said to me: "Why in the name of heaven would anybody want to change that beautiful flag which you now have?" That is the way the Americans feel about the Canadian red ensign. Naturally I did not talk to all 16,000 who were there, but I did personally talk to about 200 people from the United States, which I think is a pretty good cross section. Other people were there from all parts of the world and I talked to many of them, and they felt the same way about the matter.

As I said a minute ago, the flag issue seems to be very unnecessary at this time because it was not an election issue. Certainly it appeared in the platform of the Liberal party that within two years of election a Liberal government would submit to parliament a design for a flag which could not be mistaken for the emblem of any other country. If they had done that there might be something to say for it, but they did not. The flag proposed by the government, with the exception of the maple leaves, is almost exactly the same as the flag of the republic of Guatemala. I might also point out, quoting my hon. friend from Battle River-Camrose (Mr. Smallwood), that the proposed flag is not too much different from the merchant marine flag of the Soviet union. It has the same colours; it has red in the middle and a white background. Therefore, how can anyone think that the flag presented by the Prime Minister is distinctive, that there is no other flag like it? That proposition is fallacious. Are we to give up the flag which has had its beginnings as the flag of the British merchant navy for a flag not too different in looks from the Soviet merchant navy flag? I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what are we coming to? What is the outlook of a Prime Minister who would bring into this house a flag like that, and try to ram it down the throats of parliament and impose it on the people of Canada? That is exactly what is happening here, Mr. Speaker.

That is why this party is so opposed to this flag. It was not a definite election promise. Only a few people referred to it. In my constituency it was not a general issue in the last election, and the people were not told what kind of flag they would be asked to accept. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that 90 per cent of the people in my constituency will not accept this proposed flag. If we held a plebiscite I would venture to say that 90 per cent of my people would vote entirely for the red ensign.

During my visits back home I meet a great many people, and since the question of the flag has become an issue only three people have said to me that we should accept the flag proposed by the Prime Minister. One of these people was a man who originated in Quebec, one was a man who originated in Poland and the other was a man from Scotland. They told me they would accept this proposed flag, and they are the only three constituents out of 45,000 who have openly supported this flag. The rest of the people have said to me: "Go ahead and get the Canadian red ensign continued as our flag. If you cannot do anything else about it, then if possible get a plebiscite and let us vote, because so far we have not had a chance to say whether we want a different flag from the one we now have. The way we feel is that no flag without the union jack on it is any good for us".

These people are also wondering, as I am, what force impelled the Prime Minister to bring this flag issue to the fore at this time when it was unnecessary to do so. The Prime Minister has lots of other election promises which remain unfulfilled and are more important to the economy of the country than changing our national flag. Was somebody blackmailing him? Why did he pass it on to parliament? That is what the people want to know. They say: "Why fight an election on the flag issue? We will be forced to vote for the candidate who supports the flag we want, whether we like him or not". That is another reason the flag should not be made an election issue. These people are also wondering why the Prime Minister did not first unveil his flag in the House of Commons, in parliament. That is why we are here. If we are to pass judgment on this flag and to decide under which flag we should live, we should have been the first to hear about it and to see it. We were told this

afternoon about all the devious ways in which it was unveiled before being presented to the house.

I was at the annual convention of the Royal Canadian Legion in Winnipeg and I heard the Prime Minister put forth his ideas about what should be our national flag. He did not get very much support. It was unfortunate, but the reason he did not get a good hearing was that the initial opening ceremony at conventions of the Royal Canadian Legion is a sacred one. It is a ceremony of dedication to those Canadians who did not come back from the wars. These people feel that the Prime Minister has desecrated their sacred service.

Mr. Speaker, I have told you why I support the red ensign and why I do not support the flag proposed by this government. I have indicated that I would settle for a modification of the red ensign if the adoption of such a modification would unite Canada. I do not believe a flag containing three maple leaves or, for that matter, containing one maple leaf would be adequate and assist in uniting this country.

If we desire to have a flag containing national symbols, why do we not include a symbol representative of those citizens who lived in this country before the white people came? Surely we should have something representative of those Canadians we see fit to call North American Indians.

There have been suggestions made in respect of members serving in the armed forces in Canada under the symbol of a maple leaf. Of the 34 years I was in the service I wore the maple leaf on my uniform for only two years. For the remaining period of time my badge depicted either a beaver or a horse. I think too much consideration has been given to the use of the maple leaf by the armed services.

I suggest the government should give consideration to the amendment proposed by the opposition and hold a plebiscite on this national flag issue. I think by following that course the government will obtain the opinion of the people of Canada and avoid any future argument. Certainly some segments of the population will be in favour of the new flag while others will be in favour of the retention of the Canadian red ensign as it now appears or as modified. I think the only way out of this impasse is a plebiscite which would allow the people of Canada to come to a decision in respect of a Canadian national flag. The people of Canada have not had an opportunity of voting on this flag issue; whether we should have a national flag, or whether we should change our present flag. I do not suggest that we hold an election—and I do not make that statement because I am afraid to face my electors.

I am quite sure the other members of my party are not afraid of the results of an election, but I am sure that if an election is held the flag issue will be obscured and the end result will not be clear. For that reason I say we must have a plebiscite containing those questions suggested by the subamendment.

Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested by some members on the government side that the member for Regina City (Mr. More) should not have moved the subamendment to the amendment moved by the right hon. Leader of the Opposition. I am sure that had the government offered a plebiscite it would contain the question: Do you prefer the flag proposed by this government or would you rather have one covered with pink polliwogs on a rainbow rampant? There would have been no choice offered. The population would be in the same position the backbenchers on the government side find themselves in at this time. The Prime Minister has said that he would consider an adverse vote on this flag issue as reason for an election and the defeat of his government. That is why his members support his proposal. While I do not shed any tears for them because they are all free, white and 21 and have made this decision with their eyes open, I would hate to be in their shoes at the time of the next election, having backed the proposal for a new flag which displaced the Canadian red ensign.

I have only referred to the Canadian Legion as being in support of the retention of the Canadian red ensign as the national flag, but there are innumerable associations also in favour of that retention. I have also referred to the many letters I have received from my constituents who are in favour of the retention of the red ensign. I have not received one letter from one constituent expressing support for the government proposed national flag.

I have received letters from other parts of Canada. In fact, I have a pile one and a half feet high on my file tables. I am very pleased to have received those letters and have attempted to reply to them all, but this is an onerous task. Some of those letters have been in favour of the new proposed flag.

I wish the Prime Minister was now in his seat because I should like to suggest to him that he should recall the final four lines of

the poem "In Flanders Fields" written by the late Colonel John McCrae. I do not think it is necessary for me to quote it but I will do so for the benefit of those who are not familiar with the words.

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.

I would ask the Prime Minister how in the name of heaven on November 11, Remembrance day, he is going to be able to say along with the rest of the veterans: "In the morning and at the going down of the sun we will remember them".

Thank you.

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I hear some hon. members across the way crying "carried". I hear some hon. members on my left saying "let us vote". I do not believe that these members who say these things deep down in their hearts, believe that those who feel they have a duty to express their thoughts on this subject should not do so.

In rising to speak in this debate, Mr. Speaker, I realize it is most difficult to make an original contribution on a subject that has already absorbed the attention of the house and has resulted in some of the finest contributions to debate since I became a member of this house in 1957. I should like to refer specifically to the speech made today by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Starr), and in the earlier debate to the speeches delivered by the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton (Mr. Flemming) and the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale). I rise, Mr. Speaker, because this is a subject which touches the hearts and minds of many Canadians and crosses party lines, or indeed should cross party lines. Last Sunday afternoon I attended an outdoor church service. As I was leaving the grounds where this service was held I saw a very good friend of mine. I say that he is a good friend, but on election day he does his best for the Liberal party in an effort to defeat me. I jokingly said to him, "I am leaving for Ottawa in a couple of hours, is there a message you would like me to take to Mr. Pearson?" He said, "Yes, there is. You tell that man to put his flag in mothballs and put it away." You can see, therefore, that a subject like this does cross party lines. This man, while a good friend, is not a supporter of mine, and I doubt if he ever will be because if one knows the traditions in some areas he realizes that people do not change their political affiliations.

We have before us a subamendment which provides the means whereby Canadians can make a selection from what appears to be the more acceptable flag designs submitted. If I were to vote in such a plebiscite with four choices, I would choose the Canadian red ensign. However, I am democratic enough that I am willing to put my personal choice to the test. The question in my mind, and in the minds of many Canadians, is why the government is unwilling to put its personal choice to the test.

An hon. Member: It is.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): But not in the form of a plebiscite. Let us not become confused about the meaning of importance and urgency. While I consider no subject of greater importance to the Canadian nation than the selection of a flag I, at the same time, associate no great urgency with its selection. The greatest danger facing this house at the moment is what the end result of thoughtless haste might be. The government would be well advised to remove this subject from debate in this chamber and provide a cooling off period, while carrying on with the more urgent matters facing this house and the country.

A few days ago I had the very great pleasure of taking part in the annual Gaelic mod at St. Ann's in my constituency at which time, as usual, the Scots met together to demonstrate to the world that they have kept faith with their historic past. Now, is this not the crux of this debate? Is not the objective of the official opposition to try to convince the government that the flag approved by the members of this house should be one which keeps faith with our historic past?

Canada is a nation composed of many cultures, many traditions, all of which have contributed to the strength, the diversity and the unity that make our country unique. In order to be vibrant, to be forward looking, to be progressive, a country must foster a national pride and love of country; must cherish its traditions and base its progress on what has proven of value in the past. So it is with Canada. The many races that are today an inherent part of Canada have enriched our culture and developed our economy. We have only to look around us here to see the proof of that statement.

I am reminded of the annual Dominion day celebrations here in Ottawa when the lawn in front of the parliament buildings echoes to

the songs and dances of many nationalities, originally brought from distant lands but which now form an integral part of the colourful mosaic that is the Canadian way of life. These are the traditional things which are prized by groups individually and by nations collectively. These are the inherent strains of our Canadians nation which we must strive to preserve and protect. These are the elements, Mr. Speaker, which make Canada distinctive, for without these distinctive elements Canada would soon lose something of its appeal, its very reason for being. Each and every one of us has a responsibility to preserve what has proven of value in the past, for we of this generation are the channel through which our traditions and cultures will be passed to the rising generation. Canadians of Scottish origin, particularly Cape Breton Scots, have diligently discharged their responsibilities in this regard.

As a Scot representing the constituency of Cape Breton North and Victoria, I would be remiss in what I consider my responsibilities if I did not participate in the debate on a subject of this importance, and speak out against any government, no matter of what political party, which by its actions would eliminate all traces of our historic past in proposing a flag design such as is embodied in the resolution before us. Think for a moment of our history. The earliest settlers of Cape Breton came from France and our island became the jewel in the French crown, the Gibraltar of the north. Indeed, at the height of its fame as a French colony, Cape Breton was known as Isle Royale, the royal island. Years later there was an influx of Scottish settlers, some 30,000 strong, and they utilized their traits of perseverance, integrity and love of country to build upon the foundations of the earlier French settlements. These two strains, the French peasant and the highland crofter, are still strong in Cape Breton. Together, they have made our island a place of unique interest to the many visitors who come to our shores. They have done this by preserving their traditions and promoting their culture as a part of their everyday life.

Then, think for a moment of the history of Canada. The pattern of development in Cape Breton can well be applied to the country as a whole. You will recall that it was the French who first established settlements along the shores of the St. Lawrence and who later made their way by canoe and foot into the unknown interior, opening up the great fur trade upon which the early economy of the country was based. We do well to remember their struggles, their trials and their tribulations in this field under almost impossible conditions.

But it awaited the contribution of the Scottish highlanders to transform the fur trade into an industrial development of fire, imagination and boldness which took traders and explorers all the way from our eastern shores to the gulf of Mexico and to the Pacific and Arctic oceans. The Scottish characteristics of daring and tenacity complemented the know how and perseverance of the French voyageur and the result was, in large measure, a great new country.

The early French and Scottish settlers showed their willingness and their adaptability to work together for the common good. Of all the contributions made towards the successful building of this nation, none have been greater than the efforts of these two races. And to their credit, down through the years they have striven to preserve their own cultures and their own traditions. Our annual Gaelic mods to which I referred earlier, are a good example of the success of the Scots in this regard.

In these days, when strife and conflict characterize many actions and reactions in Canada, let us not forget the enrichment to our society by the many other groups who have come to these shores seeking a new home. Each group has made its contribution and the country is the greater for it; the loss of even one would leave Canada a poorer nation. In my constituency, where we once had only the French and Scots, we today find people representative of every ethnic group in this nation. These people have indicated an appreciation of the contribution made by the French and Scots to the development of our area and, at the same time, the French and Scots have derived great benefit and diversity through the infusion of these groups, that has added lustre to the development of our area and its culture and traditions. They have together, I feel, developed reverence for the Canadian red ensign and what it stands for.

Unfortunately, there is a tendency by some in this country today to discount and discredit the traditions, symbols and cultures which constitute the Canadian mosaic. We must not let ourselves be swayed by this lack of awareness of the things that have made Canada great and which will keep her great. We must not be lulled into allowing our interest to weaken or our fervour to abate in our devotion to the things we hold dear.

I am not, nor have I ever been, a flag waver. I must confess I did not discuss the flag question during the last election campaign or any other campaign, but then neither did my Liberal opponent, nor anyone else on either side, so far as I am aware. I do not feel the voters of my constituency or, indeed, of this nation, expressed their opinion on this flag question during the last campaign. I am in favour of keeping the Canadian red ensign as our national flag because it keeps faith with our historic past. At the same time, and because this was not discussed during the last election campaign, I am unwilling to allow the government to make a decision for me or for my constituents on a new flag design, until I know their feelings on our present distinctive flag.

Some speakers have mentioned letters they received, and representations which were made to them. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I have received many communications but only one of them was in favour of the proposed new flag. If I were to go by the mail I have received I would of course vote for the Canadian red ensign, but through the process of a plebiscite the people of my constituency would have an opportunity to say what they favour, as would people elsewhere throughout the country; and if the majority were in favour of the proposed new flag then I would be the first to honour forever whatever new flag the majority favoured.

How can any one man, or small committee of individuals, select a flag for 19 million people without first endeavouring to ascertain from them whether they desire any alteration or change in our present flag? The plebiscite now requested by the official opposition and the choices suggested in the subamendment are in my mind the more democratic approach for selecting a flag, and I approve of this approach and will vote for it when that moment arises.

Why should there be any objection to this subamendment or, indeed, to the amendment in relation to a plebiscite? We are not a people who have been held in political or economic bondage within the British commonwealth and, as a result, had any sign or symbol which reminds us of colonial rule. We are a nation which developed through political evolution. We are a living example to the world that it is possible for a colonial possession to become an independent nation. Not for us was there a war to achieve independence; not for us was there violence or the threat of violence. Since we did cut our colonial ties in an orderly manner, there was no oppressor, no feeling of casting off the bonds of an evil oppressor, no feeling that we must wipe away any sign or symbol from our national life which would remind us of a time when we were not free. Quite the contrary, I think it can be freely said that Canadians have a feeling of respect and of good will towards the homelands of their ancestors. I do not believe they wish to tear out of their flag, which has evolved with our growth to nationhood, all references to their past.

We are not a people who are ashamed of our beginnings. I do not think we are a people who want to put some kind of a blackout over our past, as if we did not know our ancestry or that we were ashamed of it. And I do not believe Canadians are the kind of people so haunted by feelings of inferiority that they must proclaim they belong to a free and independent state.

Let us have a plebiscite on this question. Let us get the views of the Canadian people in a free, democratic manner. Let the people of Canada decide whether they feel a new flag is in the interest of national unity; let them decide whether a new flag would give them a sense of pride in their country.

Personally, I believe Canadians now have a sense of pride in their country and have confidence in its future. If they do not, then I do not think all the flags in the world would give them a proper sense of pride and of confidence. Any sense of pride and confidence a flag could possibly give would then be a false and phoney pride and unworthy of our Canadian people. Mr. Speaker, there is but one sure, certain way to obtain the views of Canadians on this question: A plebiscite is the answer.

A flag which is going to fly over us and which will command our loyalty, devotion and sacrifice—yes, our lives, if need be—should be a flag that is born in the hearts of its citizens and reflects the best and truest in all of us, and that speaks for the people, because the people spoke for it. And then it would not be Pearson's personal preference, a political platform promise, or a pennant pushed through parliament by a prejudiced party.

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I would first like to take the opportunity of assuring you, sir, that my remarks this evening on this subject will be on point, constructive, not provocative or repetitive and, I hope, persuasive. The first question I think we should consider on the subamendment is the basic one of whether a plebiscite

is justified. This is a question which has been asked a great many times in this house during the present debate. I have assured you, Mr. Speaker, that I do not intend to be repetitive, and since I did discuss this matter at some length in the course of my remarks on the amendment on July 2 last, I do not intend to repeat what I said on that occasion. However, I think a brief summation might be in order.

I think it is clear to all students of government, and of parliamentary government in particular, that while in most circumstances members of parliament are sent here to decide public issues—I would say this is true in at least 99 per cent of all instances—there are always exceptions in human institutions and there are certain times when a plebiscite or referendum is clearly justified. These are instances where members of parliament do not have at their disposal any special knowledge or information which their constituents lack. This, of course, is the case when moral or emotional issues are involved —issues such as capital punishment, for example, the use or non-use of alcohol, or a decision about a national flag as in the present instance. In none of these cases do members of this house have any greater knowledge of the subject concerned than do their constituents. Consequently, they cannot, in a sense, act as representatives at all, and such matters are fit ones for a plebiscite.

This afternoon, when the hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Willoughby) was speaking, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau) asked him if he disagreed with the leader of the official opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) who, at one time, it was alleged had objected to a referendum being placed before the Canadian people. I am surprised that the Minister of Justice, who is such an eminent member of the Canadian bar, would not have shown more discernment in a matter such as this. The subject he referred to was, I take it, the referendum on conscription held during the second world war. It is clear that in a case such as that, members of parliament have a great deal more information at their disposal, both confidential and otherwise, than do their constituents and for this reason a referendum would be unsatisfactory. In fact I think it proved to be so.

It has been said during this debate that the discussion has gone on too long. The word "filibuster" has been used repeatedly.

An hon. Member: Oh, no.

Mr. Nesbitt: In the first place, the word "filibuster" is a word which Canadians have borrowed from the United States. It is quite unsuitable to apply to our parliamentary government and it has a connotation, from things we read in the United States press and things which actually go on in the United States congress, which has no application to the affairs of this country in the sense in which it is used. In any event, a filibuster is justified in certain circumstances, whether in the United States or in Canada. It is most certainly justified when a minority government attempts to force down the throat of parliament what is apparently—and I will come to this in a moment—a proposal which commands the support of only a minority of Canadians. I can think of no instance when a filibuster would be more justified, if such were the case.

During this long debate—and it will probably continue for a while—the public discussion which has gone on both in this house and outside on this important subject has been I think very valuable. This is something which has in my opinion been overlooked by many who have taken part in the discussion. We have seen a great number of criticisms in public media of information and elsewhere saying: Get the flag issue decided; get it out of the way; sweep it under the rug; it is costing too much money; it is taking the place of things of more value, pension schemes and the like. I do not know what we are coming to in this country when we place a dollars and cents value on every subject which comes up. I am shocked at the extent of criticism of this kind. It proves we have no moral values any longer in this country; everything is calculated in dollars and cents and if you cannot place a dollar value on something it is not worth discussing. Well, in my opinion there are many things of great value to which a dollar label cannot be attached. The symbols of our country and of what we stand for and the principles we choose to follow are among such things. Some of the shallow criticism we find in the press from pseudo-intellectuals who edit our press—and I think of the Ottawa *Citizen* in this connection, among others—should be reconsidered.

In this regard there are three important and constructive things which have come out of our discussion. First, it has been shown that a large percentage of the people of Canada are very interested in the subject of a Canadian flag regardless of their views as to what its design should be, or should not be. The people are interested in whatever is to symbolize our country, and in what we

stand for. This is good. It is a matter of great importance and value. Everyone will agree, I think, that any flag design must command at least a majority of public support. The discussion has clearly shown, I think, as a result of the work of the press, Gallup polls, and the like, that apparently no present flag which is much in the public eye has more than, at the best, the support of 40 per cent of the people of this country. I refer to an article which appeared recently on the front page of *Le Droit*, and a column by Mr. Patrick Nicholson. The figures he gave, and I have not heard them refuted, showed that of all the provinces of Canada the province of Quebec offered most support for any design, but even this amounted to not more than 40 per cent, in all Canada. The red ensign had a majority of support—a small one, perhaps—in the other nine provinces, and it came second in Canada with a substantial 30-odd per cent. Apparently neither of these flags have a majority of public support behind them.

The discussion has led to a better understanding of the points of view of members of this house as well as of the points of view of others throughout the country. I know it has helped me a great deal. I do not agree with all that other speakers have said during this debate, but at least I have a better understanding of their views now than I did before the debate started. So I think these are three constructive things which have resulted from this debate.

There is one most unfortunate thing which has resulted from this debate and it is something most of us deplore. As a result of these discussions, both in this house and in the country, a great deal of bitterness has been engendered. The debate has been divisive in many ways and that is a most unfortunate thing. But, after all, it is the government which is responsible for having initiated this debate at this time and it is the government which must take full responsibility for the unfortunate aspect I have mentioned.

Since it appears that only a minority of the people of Canada support any flag design, we in this house should all know the real facts of the matter before parliament makes a decision and the only way in which this can be done is by means of a plebiscite. A referendum is too binding on any government; the holding of a plebiscite is the way to go about it. Then we would have the real facts instead of the educated guesses of public opinion pollsters. If we had a plebiscite, parliament could properly decide its course of action. After such a plebiscite, the Prime Minister himself might be a little less unrelenting and adamant with regard to the position he has taken.

I realize there are difficulties attached to drawing up the proper question to be placed before the electorate in a matter of this kind. But the four questions that appear in the subamendment are perhaps the only possible or logical ones that could be presented to the public in this regard.

The first question in the subamendment concerns the red ensign. This is of course one of the very logical flags to place as a choice before the electorate. This is the flag we have had for quite a number of years. We have had it officially as the flag of Canada since 1946, which is something a large number of the public do not seem to realize at all. Is it a distinctive flag? I think it is, in a great many ways, and a great many other people do also. This flag is very highly regarded and very much wanted in many parts of Canada. I agree that certain regions wish it more than others, and some regions do not wish it at all, apparently. I conducted a little plebiscite of my own in my region, and 75 per cent to 80 per cent of the people, at a minimum, would like to see the red ensign retained. But I also found in my own area that people are not that rigid. They would prefer the red ensign to be retained, but I found that people in our part of the country are flexible and reasonable and I think would meet the viewpoint of other people in this country if that should prove necessary.

Also, Mr. Speaker, people in other parts of the country have very deep feelings—this also applies to my own area—on the subject of the red ensign. It is something under which they have been raised; it is something that symbolizes to them our institutions of parliamentary government, freedom of speech, the courts. You cannot just disregard people's views in this matter, because they are very sincerely held views. Then, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Starr) this afternoon, who came to Canada at a very young age and is of Ukrainian origin and this applies to other members of so-called ethnic groups, which is a term I do not really care for very much, Mr. Speaker —these people are very fond of the red ensign because they made Canada the country of their own choice; they came here because, as was so eloquently pointed out this afternoon by the hon. member for On-

tario, of the institutions for which the red ensign stands. For this reason, because the red ensign is so strongly viewed as a symbol of Canada in the hearts of so many people —well over 30 per cent—this is clearly one choice that should appear on a plebiscite.

The second question concerns a modified form of the red ensign. This has come about as a result of public discussion of this matter, which I mentioned a few moments ago. This has been a very valuable result of the considerable discussion on this matter. I know this modified version of the red ensign is a matter of personal preference. I would prefer to see something of this nature myself. This would be my first choice, although if a vote did come in this house I feel obliged to support the red ensign because that is the wish of my constituents; and to be logical in my discussion that must be my stand. But as a purely personal choice I would like to see some modified version of the red ensign to bring together as other hon. members have mentioned the symbols of the two principal cultural groups in this country. I believe these things are necessary in order for a flag to be meaningful. A flag that is invented out of thin air so to speak, or as a result of some pedantic thinking, some sort of deep delving into abstruse subjects in producing designs is sometimes not the best method. It may have real meaning in the heraldic sense, but from a practical, common sense point of view it may have very little meaning.

The next question on the subamendment is of course concerned with the maple leaves flag which has been suggested by the Prime Minister and his party. I think most of us are aware that probably the very, very large majority of people in the province of Quebec prefer this flag. Most of us understand, as a result of public discussion of this matter over some period of time, why the people of Quebec prefer to see a flag design which does not incorporate the union jack. I do not agree with them but I can understand their point of view. I sympathize with them without agreeing, because I can understand their point of view. They feel the union jack is a symbol of something rather unpleasant in the past. I also know that the suggestion that there be the fleur-de-lis on a modified red ensign is something that is objected to and I can understand why it is objected to. It is because to some people it represents, to put it in the vernacular, the letting down by the Bourbon kings in 1759. I can understand why neither of these symbols would be particularly agreeable to the people of Quebec, and I think most of us can understand this as a result of public discussion both here and elsewhere. There is, of course, certain support in other parts of Canada for the flag presented by the Prime Minister. It has not as much support as has the red ensign, but it has substantial support. I think we must all recognize that fact. For this reason, most certainly the flag presented by the Prime Minister and his party should be on any plebiscite to be held.

The fourth item is the question of a single maple leaf flag, which is really a modified version of the Prime Minister's suggestion. That design has appeared before this house, in the press and elsewhere as a result of lengthy public discussion. Since there is apparently some considerable following for this design—how much, we do not know, but I believe most of us have received representations and letters to this effect—this likewise is a design that should appear on the plebiscite.

When the real results of public opinion are known as a result of a plebiscite—and this is the only way in which it can be known—we will be in a much better position to decide upon a flag design. There is no other way of determining public opinion in this regard, apart from educated guessing by pollsters, which does not mean very much; very many people tell pollsters they have no opinion because they feel they are not expressing the opinion that is expected of them. A good example of this occurred recently in connection with the California primaries in the United States election. There were supposed to be so many undecided people, but they clearly were not at all undecided; they supported Senator Goldwater. They thought this was perhaps not the popular thing to say at the time, but that is what they were going to do.

I believe that on an emotional issue such as the flag many people will not say what they want to do; they want to keep their opinions to themselves; they do not want to get into quarrels with their neighbours and so many other people. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I believe the results of a plebiscite might be very surprising. Anything else would be merely guessing, and the only way to ascertain the wishes of the people is by holding a plebiscite. If a plebiscite is held, we will have some real results in this house upon which to base our opinions and our final decision. Then I think perhaps even the

Prime Minister might revise his opinions on what he should do.

If the plebiscite showed that a large majority, or even a substantial majority of the people of Canada supported any design, no matter what it was, I believe any member of this house would be very glad to support that flag design and accept it as the Canadian flag. This would then be an end of the matter. But if no majority should appear, not even a simple majority, for any one flag as a result of such a plebiscite, another course of action would have to be taken.

Mr. Matheson: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Nesbitt: Certainly.

Mr. Matheson: I certainly respect the fairness of the hon. member's presentation. Does the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) consider that the method used in 1921 by Mr. Meighen to adopt arms, and the method used by Mr. King in 1945 to adopt a flag, namely order in council, was inappropriate or undemocratic; and would that method be appropriate today?

Mr. Nesbitt: The method used on occasions in the past may well have been appropriate for those conditions, but at the present time I do not feel those conditions would be at all appropriate. Here there is public controversy over the matter whereas on the other occasions there was not. One must adjust to the times.

Mr. Boulanger: No, there is not.

Mr. Nesbitt: The hon. member for Mercier (Mr. Boulanger) may feel there is no public controversy, but he must be living in a rather rarefied ivory tower, to say the least. If it was found from such a plebiscite that there was not even a simple majority for any flag—and I really cannot understand why government members seem so sure about this, yet are alarmed at the thought of a plebiscite—then I would suggest that a parliamentary committee, consisting, say, of ten members drawn from all parties on an appropriate basis, be set up to try and decide on a flag design. Although I realize there are some who would not agree, I feel that a time limit should be set of three to four months. Then that parliamentary committee, knowing the real feelings of the people as a result of the plebiscite, could get together with such a time limit and work out some compromise design which might be mutually unsatisfactory to everyone, as it is said, but might be reasonably satisfactory to most people in Canada.

Mr. Patterson: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Nesbitt: Certainly.

Mr. Patterson: The hon. member has referred to the possibility of there not being a majority.

Mr. Nesbitt: No, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I do not agree with my hon. friend from Fraser Valley (Mr. Patterson). I do not normally disagree with him but on this occasion I do. I feel that a transferable vote in a matter such as the flag would result in almost no opinion at all or a hodge-podge of opinions. I feel that this would not produce a satisfactory result.

I say that for this reason, and this is my next point. If you have a parliamentary committee to try and arrive at a compromise design, I am sure that this could be done. There have been a number of discussions amongst hon. members, and I am sure a number of hon. members present are aware of them. Several flag designs have been privately and informally discussed. These flag designs might well meet the points of view of quite a number of members on both sides of this house, and might be even more appropriate than some of the designs suggested so far. I will not go into the details of these designs, but many hon. members know to what I am referring. If a parliamentary committee were set up, and if none of the present flag designs could command a majority of public support, the flag designs which are being discussed could present a compromise point of view, would receive a chance for consideration and might meet some mutual point of view.

If such a committee were set up, I suggest of ten members, on which every party had appropriate representation, it would also have to be made clear that the decision of such a committee would not need to be unanimous. Clearly you might run into some maverick or ornery character, to use the vernacular, who would not agree. But if 80 per cent of three quarters of the committee agreed on a design, the design could then be presented to the house for consideration.

Mr. Brewin: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Nesbitt: Certainly.

Mr. Brewin: I am very interested in the suggestions he is making, but what would he suggest the committee do if, for example, as

a result of the plebiscite you get 35 per cent of the people for the red ensign, 10 per cent in favour of the red ensign with some modification to indicate the heritages of both founding races, 25 per cent in favour of three maple leaves and 30 per cent in favour of a single maple leaf? It seems to me that we would be in a situation of utter confusion and it would make it very difficult for parliament to act.

Mr. Nesbitt: I can see very little point in this, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin), for whose opinions I have a high degree of respect, did not hear what I said. I said that if none of the designs proved to command even a simple majority of the people of the country, there are a number of other designs which are being promoted here and elsewhere which could be considered. I know a number of people who prefer the red ensign but would accept another design, to which I will not refer at the moment.

Mr. Knowles: Would the hon. member permit another question.

Mr. Nesbitt: Yes.

Mr. Knowles: In that case, if the committee came up with some design other than the four proposed designs, would not that design have to be presented to the country in yet another plebiscite? Would not the same principle which calls for a plebiscite now have to be employed again?

Mr. Nesbitt: Well, that might well be the case.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Brewin: A plebiscite to the death.

Mr. Nesbitt: This is one of the problems we have here, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Knowles: We want to live to see the issue resolved.

Mr. Nesbitt: I imagine that this is why it is difficult to meet points of view. There may be faults in suggestions which are made, although I do not see any faults in this suggestion; but when suggestions are made in this house hon. members have set views and are not prepared to listen to new ideas. I think that is the case with most of the government members.

Mr. Moreau: Would the hon. member permit still another question?

Mr. Nesbitt: Yes.

[Mr. Brewin.]

Mr. Moreau: It seems that we are never going to get a vote on the plebiscite question, but I was wondering whether the next suggestion from the opposition might be that we have a plebiscite on whether we should have a plebiscite.

Mr. Nesbitt: Mr. Speaker, I think everyone is charmed with the wit of the hon. member for York-Scarborough (Mr. Moreau) and would probably be half right.

Mr. Scott: Would the hon. member permit another question?

Mr. Nesbitt: No, well, yes, I would be delighted.

Mr. Scott: I was wondering whether the problem could not be solved by having a plebiscite in which we list the 2,900 designs we have received, and have a transferable, preferential ballot, and then we could give the statistics people ten years off to tabulate the results.

Mr. Matheson: Might I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Nesbitt: Certainly.

Mr. Matheson: My hon. friend is making a very serious speech and I think a helpful one. However, I am sure the hon. member recognizes that the recommendation of the Prime Minister in his resolution is an endeavour to honour what has been an emblem which goes back nearly 100 years. Is it possible that he or any of his associates or colleagues in his part of the house have any ideas how this emblem, which was formally adopted in 1921 under the Meighen government in the reign of King George V, could be preserved in a fashion more acceptable than the resolution presently presented?

Mr. Churchill: It is on the coat of arms.

Mr. Nesbitt: In reply to my hon. friend's question, it could be preserved in the Canadian coat of arms. In reply to the question of the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Scott), facetiousness is all good fun and we all enjoy it, and he and the hon. member for York-Scarborough are some sort of twins in this regard, although they are not of the same party. However, in order to finish my remarks I will have to ask hon. members, if they have any more questions, helpful or otherwise—

Mr. Knowles: —to submit them to a plebiscite.

Mr. Nesbitt: —to keep them till the end. Regardless of the rather interesting and amus-

ing little interlude we have had through the efforts of the members of the Liberal and New Democratic parties I still believe a parliamentary committee of ten members could arrive at a design acceptable to the house. If the hon. members for York-Scarborough (Mr. Moreau), Danforth (Mr. Scott) and Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), who showed a remarkable sense of humour which I did not think he possessed, would agree, perhaps we could commence with a plebiscite.

Mr. Knowles: Perhaps it was the hon. member who excited it.

Mr. Nesbitt: I am very glad to have excited something in the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, if I may say that.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Robichaud: Be careful.

Mr. Nesbitt: In any event, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to take up more than my allotted time as I know there are other members on the government side who wish to speak. I would be very pleased to hear them make some suggestions. I am sure all members would be glad to receive them. I do not believe we have heard from any member of the government party other than the Prime Minister.

Mr. Robichaud: Where were you this afternoon?

Mr. Nesbitt: We did hear something from the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp), but I do not think he was very helpful.

Mr. Robichaud: You were asleep.

Mr. Nesbitt: I am sorry to have created any difficulty, Your Honour, having promised earlier that I would not make a speech of a provocative nature. However, you will realize that under certain circumstances one must change his intentions.

It has been said that a plebiscite would cost approximately $6 million. That may be the case but there is no reason why such a plebiscite could not be held during the next federal election. No one, except members on the government side, seem to think there is any urgency in this flag matter. I am sure that as long as we have a flag by 1967, which is our 100th birthday, that is all that is necessary. If the government does feel there is a reason for having a flag before 1967, in order perhaps to fulfil the Prime Minister's election campaign promise of two years ago, there is no reason why such a plebiscite could not be held this fall in September or October. Regardless of the $6 million cost, if a referendum assisted in the creation of national unity and obviated the necessity for further divisive debate it would be worth it.

Perhaps we could form a parliamentary committee of the type I have suggested, to arrive at some decision in regard to a national flag within a two year period of time allowing the Prime Minister to fulfil his promise, making everyone happy. I think it is important that this divisive debate taking place both in this house and in the country as a whole be concluded. I expect one of my friends on the government side to say that all we have to do to effect this result is discontinue our remarks, and the debate will conclude. I think that is a correct statement but there is one thing wrong with it. We now have a minority government attempting to force a minority view down the throats of the population of Canada.

Mr. Macaluso: How could we do that?

Mr. Nesbitt: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Hamilton West, in one of his customary bright interjections has said: "How could we do that?" If my hon. friend from Hamilton West is so sure of his position why does he object to a plebiscite?

Mr. Macaluso: Let us vote on it. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member for Oxford how he thinks a minority government could force anything down the throats of the majority of members?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Nesbitt: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to make remarks in reference to other parties in the house, but it is suggested that the smaller parties will support the minority government.

The design being proposed by the government is not a design proposed by other parties. Since the Prime Minister has made it very clear in this house that unless his design is supported there will be an election, and since most members of this house, as well as the majority of this country's population, do not want an election at this time, I think the government can expect to receive support from other parties.

Mr. Douglas: Oh, come, come.

Mr. Hahn: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Nesbitt: No, not at the moment.

Mr. Speaker, I hear the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas) say, "come, come, come". I do not think my friend wants an election at the present time. I do not think

that the majority of the members of this house want an election at this time.

Mr. Robichaud: What have you to say about that which your leader said this afternoon?

Mr. Nesbitt: I do not know how the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Robichaud) would know what was said this afternoon. I did not see him in the house during most of this afternoon.

Mr. Robichaud: I was here all afternoon, sir.

Mr. Nesbitt: I do not know where.

Mr. Matheson: Would a free vote help?

Mr. Nesbitt: I suggest that the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson) put that suggestion to his leader.

Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned it is the view of the majority of the members of this house that we now face a difficult impasse. This impasse was created by the government.

Mr. Boulanger: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nesbitt: This impasse was created by the hon. member for Mercier (Mr. Boulanger) and by his government.

Regardless of that fact, Mr. Speaker, I have made some attempt this evening to be constructive, although that is very difficult to do at certain times. I suggest the only way out of this very difficult impasse, which exists not only in this house but in this country itself, is to hold a plebiscite. If the results of that plebiscite indicate that a substantial majority is in favour of the proposed flag design then it should be adopted. If a majority indicates a preference for another flag, that flag should be adopted. If only something less than a majority indicates a preference toward any particular design then the matter should be referred to a parliamentary committee. I think that is the only way of solving this impasse which has become extremely difficult not only for this house but for the country as a whole. This continued debate is divisive and costly. I do not think any group here will be able to force a view on another. There must be a little give and take on all sides, and I hope all members in this house will realize that fact. I am sorry that some hon. members opposite apparently do not agree.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the flag presently proposed by the government is unfortunately regarded as a partisan flag in a great many places in this country. I agree that perhaps the country as a whole does not take that view. We cannot adopt a flag to represent national unity, our ideals and ambitions for the future, that is in any way regarded as a partisan flag. For that reason I hope that the hon. members of this house will make an attempt to co-operate and perhaps make concessions so that we can make some arrangements for the adoption or retention of a Canadian national flag. I do not suggest that what I have proposed is perfect.

In a rather witty and humorous way a number of members have pointed out some theoretical objections to my proposal, and although I do not feel they are practical, I will admit that there are difficulties. I am not narrow minded in respect of this matter and will be glad to listen to any other suggestions hon. members wish to make, particularly those hon. members on the government side. Someone must make some suggestions if we are to conclude this debate. Members of parties other than the government party have made suggestions. Those suggestions may not be entirely suitable, but as long as the suggestions are being made I think we are progressing.

Mr. Speaker, I see that it is now 10.30 so I will resume my seat.

It being thirty minutes after ten o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to special order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, August 19, 1964

The house met at 2 p.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. HARKNESS—PRESS RELEASE RESPECTING FIRST ALBERTA MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary North): I rise on a question of privilege. It has to do with the perpetration of a distortion of history, or an attempt to rewrite part of the early history of the province from which I come, namely Alberta. I have in my hand a press release put out by the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources which states:

> Two plaques honouring Frank Oliver, founder and publisher of the Edmonton *Bulletin* and first member of the House of Commons for Alberta, will be unveiled in a joint ceremony by resources minister Arthur Laing and Edmonton mayor William Hawrelak on Monday, August 17.

Further on the press release states:

> Oliver founded the Edmonton *Bulletin* in 1880 and was publisher of the newspaper until 1923. He was the first elected member for Alberta in the House of Commons—

These statements that Hon. Frank Oliver was the first member of the House of Commons from Alberta are completely incorrect. The Parliamentary Guide, which contains a history of the constituencies of Alberta, states, under the information for my own constituency of Calgary North:

> In 1887, when the old Northwest Territories were first given representation in parliament, the whole of the old territory of Alberta was created an electoral division with one member. In 1903, the territory was divided into four constituencies, and by the Act of 1906-07, the representation was increased to seven.
>
> The record of the original district of Alberta was as follows:
>
> 1887—W. W. Davis, Conservative
> 1891—W. W. Davis, Conservative
> 1896—Frank Oliver, Liberal
> 1900—Frank Oliver, Liberal

Then it goes on to state:

> Under the act of 1902, Alberta was divided into four constituencies, Alberta, Calgary, Strathcona and Edmonton, the electoral records of which, up to 1908, were as follows—

And the members elected in the first election in 1904 were: Alberta, John Herron; Calgary, M. S. McCarthy; Strathcona, Peter Talbot; and Edmonton, Frank Oliver.

I fail to understand how the department of northern affairs came to put out a press release of this kind. The inaccuracy is repeated in various other ways. For instance, only last night there was an editorial in the Ottawa *Journal* stating that Frank Oliver was the first elected member from Alberta, and so on.

I have, of course, no desire in the world to take anything away from the position Hon. Frank Oliver holds in the history of Alberta, and I fully agree with this plaque having been put up to his memory. The fault, however, was not that of the historic sites and monuments board. I have received a copy of the inscription on the plaque that was erected, and there is nothing incorrect on it and no statement that he was the first elected member for Alberta.

Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I think the only thing the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources can do is issue another press release correcting the first one and apologizing for it. He should also give due credit to W. W. Davis, who was the first member elected for Alberta. I also suggest that a plaque should be erected to W. W. Davis.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Harkness: Finally, Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources should write a letter of apology to Mr. Rider Davis, the son of W. W. Davis and a barrister in Fort MacLeod at the present time.

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): Mr. Speaker, I think we are agreed that these were very great men. I would say particularly that Hon. Frank Oliver was a very great man. The people of Edmonton think so, as I gather from the number who turned out the other day. We want the statements that we make to be accurate, just as accurate as the plaques that we put on these buildings. I will certainly look into this matter, and I thank my hon. friend for drawing this reputed inaccuracy to my attention.

However, I think Alberta entered confederation in 1905, and the statement we made was

that Mr. Oliver was the first elected member from Alberta. He had represented, as had Mr. Davis, the Northwest Territories, which at that time included the great Canadian plains as well as everything north of them. In those days that man must have had the largest constituency in the world.

Mr. Harkness: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources did not catch the significance of all I stated. Alberta sent a member to parliament for a long time before it became a province. For ten years W. W. Davis was that member. He was succeeded by Frank Oliver. When the province was divided into four constituencies and sent four members to parliament at the time of becoming a province, the constituency of Alberta itself was represented by John Herron.

PROCEDURE

Tenth report of special committee on procedure and organization—Mr. Speaker.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

*INCOME TAX ON HOSPITAL INSURANCE PREMIUMS

Question No. 1,226—**Mr. Fairweather:**

Is it proposed to make employer paid hospital insurance premiums subject to income tax and, if so (a) which provinces will be affected by this change in policy (b) what considerations support a policy which would permit different federal income tax provisions for different provinces?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue): No. However, in the case of provincial hospital insurance plans which require that premiums be paid by the persons covered, if such premiums are paid by the employers for their employees, then these payments are taxable benefits to the employees. (a) Not applicable since there is no change in policy. (b) There is no difference between provinces as to the application of federal income tax provisions.

COST OF FILM "MR. PEARSON"

Question No. 1,369—**Mr. Alkenbrack:**

1. What was the total cost to the taxpayers of the film "Mr. Pearson"?
2. Did the C.B.C. pay Mr. Richard Ballentine for his professional services in connection with the making of this film and, if so, how much was he paid?

[Mr. Laing.]

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows:

1. Total payments were approximately $35,200.

2. No. Payment was made to Intervideo Productions Limited of which firm Mr. Ballentine is president. Because this was a business arrangement in a field in which there is competition, it is not customary to require the corporation to disclose the amount paid for such services.

CROSSING OF NORTHUMBERLAND STRAIT

Question No. 1,395—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. Has a report been received by the Minister of Public Works from Northumberland consultants in reference to the construction of a transportation link across the Northumberland strait and, if so, when was such report received?
2. Does this report offer grounds for an earlier estimated time for the actual commencement of construction of the crossing?
3. Has a request been received from the premier of Prince Edward Island for a copy of the said report?
4. Has a copy been made available to Premier Shaw?
5. What dominion government departments are studying the report?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): 1. Yes. A progress report was received on May 29, 1964 and an amendment thereto on June 24, 1964.

2. No.

3. Yes.

4. The report was commissioned by the Department of Public Works and is under study by that department with the departments of finance and transport who will report to the minister. No release will be made of the report until the studies are completed and reviewed by the minister and his colleagues.

5. Answered by 4.

*DAUPHIN, MAN.—TOWN DIRECTORY

Question No. 1,551—**Mr. Forbes:**

1. Did any department or agency of the federal government engage Henderson Directories Limited of Winnipeg to compile the addresses and occupations of householders in the town of Dauphin, Manitoba and, if so, at what cost?
2. Do all postal areas having letter carrier service engage private firms to compile a postal directory?
3. Is the Post Office Department provided with a copy of the directory free of charge?
4. Are the addresses in the directory examined by post office officials to determine if they are correct?
5. Are the directories available to the public free of charge and, if not, what is the price of each copy and where may it be obtained?

Mr. J. B. Stewart (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): 1. No.

2, 3, 4 and 5. No. The Post Office Department does, however, compile householder directories for those areas where a commercial directory is not available. The directories are set up by electoral districts and are available through postmasters at $2 per copy. A commercial directory is available for the town of Dauphin, Manitoba.

"DO NOT SHIP" LIST—APPLICATION FOR REINSTATEMENT

Question No. 1,560—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. How many people who were on the "do not ship" list have applied to Commander Robertson of the maritime appeals board, for reinstatement in the S.I.U. by (a) letter (b) personal visit (c) telephone (d) telegram?
2. Of those who applied, how many have had their appeal heard?
3. What, precisely, step by step, has the procedure been in hearing these cases?
4. Of those who have appealed, how many have been reinstated and, what are the names of those reinstated?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): 1, 2, 3, 4. The board of trustees of the maritime transportation unions have provided the following information:

The maritime appeals board is a quasi-judicial body which obtains its jurisdiction from the S.I.U. of Canada. It is thus an internal organ of the S.I.U. Within the limits imposed by the nature of its operations the following statistical information can be disclosed. Since the maritime appeals board was established, 38 former members have applied to have their cases heard:

A. Nine have been reinstated, namely: Bigelow, Stanley; Chutskoff, Peter; Crimmins, T., reinstated upon payment of dues; Dalton, Patrick; Dronfield, William; Gregory, W.; Grubb, C., reinstated upon payment of dues; Hannan, C. L.; Williams, John N.

B. Ten have been ruled eligible for reinstatement as probationary members upon application to the S.I.U. of Canada, namely: Bragg, William; Chambers, Ronald Arthur; Kendall, Louis; Langlais, Guy; Leclerc, Leo Joseph; Madeo, Eugene; Pothier, Antonio; Spears, Clyde; St. Laurent, Jean Paul; Wiseman, John.

C. Ten are now before the appeals board, namely: Gardecke, Victor; Hall, William Brearley; McIntaggart, Michael; Morin, Edward; Neville, Richard; Osborne, William; Dower, Vincent; Plant, Real; Ranta, Henry; Savard, Jacques.

D. Six are now before the appeals board awaiting proof of membership in the S.I.U., namely: Anderson, Max; Bath, David; Cameron, Gordon R.; Clement, Armand; McNeil, John James; Swam, Donald.

E. Two not concerned with membership in S.I.U.—disagreement with union over arbitration of pay dispute, namely: Johnson, Warren F.; Johnson, Agnes.

F. One appeal denied, namely: Wood, John J.

*MAIL THEFTS

Question No. 1,593—**Mr. Pigeon:**

1. Since April 22, 1963, how many mail bags were stolen in Canada?
2. What is the total amount of money thus stolen?
3. What is the total value of the stolen parcels?
4. What is the total number of the letters stolen?
5. What action does the government intend to take in order to stop robberies of this type?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): 1. Two hundred and ninety from April 22, 1963 until July 23, 1964.

2. The amount of money stolen as a result of the theft of mail bags is $715,640.20.

3 and 4. The post office does not maintain a record of the value of parcels accepted for mailing or the number of ordinary letters enclosed in mail bags.

5. Postal robberies are not different from other robberies and the police forces which have the jurisdiction, take such action as they deem most appropriate in each case with the view to eliminating criminal activity of this type. Postal investigating officers extend to the police the fullest co-operation and assistance in cases involving the Post Office Department. The post office has been providing additional security where improvements of this type are practical.

R.C.M.P. POLICE DOGS

Question No. 1,603—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Does the R.C.M.P. use police dogs in its work?
2. How many police dogs does the R.C.M.P. own?
3. Where were these dogs trained; by whom were they trained?
4. Where are these dogs kept permanently?
5. What uses are made of these dogs?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): 1. Yes.

2. 21.

3. The majority of these police dogs were trained at the R.C.M. Police training kennels located at the Twin Maples farm, Ramsayville, Ontario. Some dogs received their training at the R.C.M. Police training kennels, Sydney, Nova Scotia, before these facilities were moved to Ramsayville, Ontario in 1961. These dogs are trained by qualified members of the

R.C.M. Police who are attached to the staff of our training kennels.

4. On completion of training, the police dogs are transferred to various points throughout Canada and kept under the personal care of their masters. At present police dogs are located at the following locations: Corner Brook, Nfld., St. John's, Nfld., Sydney, N.S., Truro, N.S., Moncton, N.B., Ramsayville, Ont., Brandon, Man., Dauphin, Man., Stonewall, Man., Prince Albert, Sask., Saskatoon, Sask., Yorkton, Sask., Red Deer, Alta., Peace River, Alta., St. Albert, Alta., High River, Alta., Kamloops, B.C., Cloverdale, B.C., Nelson, B.C., Nanaimo, B.C.

5. They are employed to a great extent in searching for lost and missing persons, particularly children; lost and missing property and objects which may have been used in the commission of an offence. They are also used as an investigational aid in the tracking of suspected criminals; in excise and liquor searches, and on rare occasions in defence of members of the force subjected to armed attack. They are particularly useful in searching for dangerous criminals in wooded or enclosed areas during the night where human senses are unable to detect the presence of other persons.

S.I.U. "DO NOT SHIP" LIST—REINSTATEMENT APPLICATIONS

Question No. 1,604—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Were the following people on the "do not ship" list of the S.I.U. of Canada: John Wood, Edward Morin, William Hall, Maurice Marrinan, Red Boulton, Omer Boudreau, Pat McManus, David Swam, Carmel Deguire, Ken Lewis, J. Romack, Mel Grandy, Mike Sheehan?

2. How many of these people have applied to the maritime trustees for reinstatement in the S.I.U. and for permission to work again on Canadian ships?

3. Have these applications been studied by the maritime trustees or by any other agency established by the trustees or by the S.I.U. of Canada?

4. Have any of the applications of these people for reinstatement been approved and, if so, by whom?

5. If the applications have been rejected, for what reasons have they been rejected?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. The board of trustees of the maritime transportation unions have provided the following information:

(a) John Wood: The case appealed to the maritime appeals board, from expulsion from the S.I.U. of Canada by union trial. Appeal denied. Not on the D.N.S. list within the knowledge of the S.I.U. of Canada.

[Mr. Favreau.]

(b) Edward Morin: The case appealed to the maritime appeals board from suspension from the S.I.U. of Canada by union trial. The case is presently before the maritime appeals board. Not on the D.N.S. list within the knowledge of the S.I.U. of Canada.

(c) Maurice Marrinan: Reinstatement in S.I.U. ordered by the Quebec superior court. Reinstatement offered by S.I.U. of Canada. Not on the D.N.S. list within the knowledge of the S.I.U. of Canada.

(d) Red Boulton: No record in board of trustees' files. Not on the D.N.S. list within the knowledge of the S.I.U. of Canada.

(e) Omer Boudreau: Advised to apply to the maritime appeals board for reinstatement. No application received. Not on the D.N.S. list within the knowledge of the S.I.U. of Canada.

(f) Pat McManus: Advised to apply to maritime appeals board for reinstatement. Letter returned, "address unknown". Appears in schedule 44 of the Norris report as having been placed on the D.N.S. list.

(g) David Swam: No record with the board of trustees or the S.I.U. of Canada.

(h) Carmel Deguire: No record with board of trustees. Not on the D.N.S. list within the knowledge of the S.I.U. of Canada.

(hh) William Hall: Appears in schedule 44 of the Norris report as having been placed on the D.N.S. list. Appeal pending.

(i) Ken Lewis: Application form for appeal to maritime appeals board mailed on June 4, 1964. No reply. Never on D.N.S. list within the knowledge of the S.I.U. of Canada.

(j) J. Romack: Advised by letter to appeal to maritime appeals board. No reply. Placed on D.N.S. list according to schedule 44 of the Norris report.

(k) Mel Grandy: No record with board of trustees. Not on the D.N.S. list within the knowledge of the S.I.U. of Canada.

(l) Mike Sheehan: Advised to appeal to the maritime appeals board. No reply.

As far as is known to the trustees the union possesses no record of a D.N.S. list and schedule 44 of the Norris report constitutes the only available record of such a list. No member of the S.I.U. of Canada has been barred from sailing since the imposition of trusteeship by the operation of a D.N.S. list or any equivalent.

With the absence of complete files on the D.N.S. list as it previously existed, it is impossible for the trustees or the union to state positively whether a man was on the D.N.S. list at any time. All steps are being taken, however, to obtain accurate information

on persons who may have suffered as a result of the existence of this list and to effect a restitution of membership rights.

The maritime appeals board is a quasi-judicial body established by the S.I.U. of Canada. Disclosure of its reasons for accepting and rejecting appeals could prejudice its function and it is felt that details of its inner workings should not be disclosed.

IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM, WATER STREET, YARMOUTH, N.S.

Question No. 1,622—**Mr. Crouse:**

Is the government giving consideration to carrying out an improvement program in the area known as the Bluenose public wharf district, Water street, Yarmouth, Nova Scotia which includes a town dump, a junk yard, and a collection of old boats, and, if so, when will this program be commenced?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State of Canada): In November, 1963, the province of Nova Scotia forwarded to Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation a request from the town of Yarmouth to investigate a proposal for the acquisition and clearance under section 23, N.H.A. of two areas. One of these areas is a site of approximately ¾ acres at Water and Forest streets in the Bluenose public wharf district. Since then, discussions have been held with municipal officials concerning this proposal in relation to the need for redevelopment in other areas of the town. These discussions are continuing and it is expected that sufficient information will soon be available upon which a program of improvements could be considered by the municipality.

MASTER OF FISHERIES PATROL CRAFT "SCATARI LIGHT"

Question No. 1,624—**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria):**

1. Who was the master of the fisheries patrol craft *Scatari Light* prior to April 16, 1964?
2. How long had the individual been master of the craft?
3. What are his qualifications?
4. Why was he transferred; was his transfer a promotion and, if not, for what reason?
5. Is the former master of the *Scatari Light* a veteran of world war II?
6. Is the present master of the *Scatari Light* a veteran?

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries):

1. Martin Patrick Picco.

2. From May 11, 1959 to February 21, 1964.

3. One year high school; navigation school, Toronto and Halifax. In March 1963 was issued certificate of competency as master, home trade steamship, 350 tons and home trade tugboat.

4. (a) Redisposition of vessel crew personnel; (b) no; (c) answered by (a).

5. No.

6. No.

TIMMINS, ONT.—BENEFITS FROM MINERAL DISCOVERIES

Question No. 1,630—**Mr. Peters:**

What surveys have been conducted by either the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys or the Department of Industry to ascertain what role can be played by the federal government to ensure the maximum benefit to northern Ontario from the recent finds of copper and zinc in the Timmins area?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): No surveys of this type have been made by the Department of Industry. However, the department is following closely developments in the Timmins area and is prepared to provide assistance to interested companies to help them arrive at a decision regarding the establishment of smelting facilities. Such assistance could include the granting of special tax concessions available to new manufacturing and processing enterprises which locate in designated areas of which the Timmins national employment service office area is one.

The Department of Mines and Technical Surveys carries out continuous mineral economic appraisals of the Canadian mineral industry, although it is not the role of the department to do assessments that are the normal responsibility of a company.

At this stage in the development of the northern Ontario copper-zinc developments at Timmins, some general assessments of employment have been made but no detailed surveys have been done relative to benefits that may accrue to that area.

NEW INDUSTRIES ESTABLISHED IN QUEBEC

Question No. 1,634—**Mr. Laprise:**

1. Under provisions of the Income Tax Act granting income tax deductions in certain districts, how many industries were established in the province of Quebec, and in what localities?
2. What sums did each such industry invest?
3. What is the number of employees working for each of such industries?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): 1. The government is aware of 23 industries in the province of Quebec which have signified their intention to take advantage of the designated areas' tax incentives under section 71A of the Income Tax Act. These industries are planning a combined capital investment of over $63 million and will employ approxi-

mately 1,400 people. They are to be located in eight of the 13 N.E.S. office areas which have been designated in Quebec. Those firms with the shortest lead times to set-up are now reaching the production phase. The government is aware of eight of these which are now in commercial production. They are located in the designated N.E.S. office areas of Louiseville, Matane, St. Jean, Shawinigan and Val d'Or.

2. The eight firms have estimated the following capital investments: $136,000, $121,000, $105,000, $90,000, $60,000, $42,000, $55,000, and $90,000, respectively.

3. The eight firms have estimated that they will be employing the following numbers of workers: 5, 60, 13, 39, 25, 8, 6 and 2, respectively.

SUFFIELD COMMUNITY PASTURE

Question No. 1,638—**Mr. Horner (Acadia):**

1. What was the cost of operation of the Suffield community pasture for the years 1961, 1962, and 1963?

2. What were the total grazing fees collected for the years 1961, 1962, and 1963?

3. Does the army find it much easier to control livestock on the bombing area since the establishment of the community pasture?

4. Has the army command at Suffield issued any complaints with regard to part of their land being used as a community pasture and, if so, of what nature?

5. Has the 1 cent per head per day which is collected for municipal purposes been distributed to all municipalities close to the pasture and from which cattle are drawn, in view of the fact that no land was taken from local improvement district No. 24 and, if not, for what reasons?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): 1. 1961, $27,124.41; 1962, $28,480.24; 1963, $34,457.41.

2. 1961, $42,285.72; 1962, $35,178.22; 1963, $47,442.75.

3. Stock in the community pasture are fenced in and controlled by P.F.R.A. staff. Establishment of this pasture has not altered the problem of control of stray cattle in the operating range. Impounding measures continue to be necessary on the same scale as in the past.

4. The defence research board has not complained as the community pasture on the S.E.S. range was establishing in 1961 to assist farmers in carrying cattle under the severe drought conditions of that year on a temporary basis only. The full range facility is required for the proper execution of the D.R.B. program at S.E.S.

5. The answer to part 4 of question No. 1,541 indicated the levy of 1 cent per head per day had been received by local improvement district No. 24. This information was based on tentative list of recipients to whom funds would be forwarded. Subsequent information has indicated the funds were paid to the Alberta department of municipal affairs for distribution to those local government agencies which provide local services in the areas adjacent to the Suffield pasture. The areas from which the cattle are received are not necessarily the areas to which the funds are to be distributed as the funds are for the purpose of assisting local governments which provide services adjacent to the pasture.

CANADIAN DELEGATION TO ICAO

Question No. 1,643—**Mr. Côté (Chicoutimi):**

1. What are the names of the president, vice president and members of the Canadian delegation to the international civil aviation organization?

2. Are each of these persons bilingual?

3. What is the salary of each?

4. Are their offices located in the international civil aviation organization building in Montreal?

5. How many Canadian officials are attached to the international civil aviation organization?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1, 2 and 3. Canada is one of the 27 members of the ICAO council and, as such, maintains a permanent delegation in Montreal. There are two Canadian government officials on the delegation: Mr. R. Duder, permanent representative of Canada at the ICAO who is bilingual and who gets $15,100 a year, and Mr. T. H. Prescott, elected member of ICAO's air navigation commission who is unilingual and who gets a salary of $10,400.

4. The offices of the Canadian delegation are located in the International Aviation building which is also ICAO's headquarters in Montreal.

5. 234 Canadian citizens work at the secretariat of ICAO.

[*Text*]

S.I.U. STAFF CHANGES

Question No. 1,647—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. How many new employees have been taken on the staff of the S.I.U., since the appointment of the maritime trustees, in the positions of vice president, secretary treasurer, port agent, despatcher, or full time organizer?

2. How many of the people occupying any of the positions listed above have resigned or have been removed since the maritime trustees were appointed, and (a) on what date did each terminate his service (b) for what reasons?

3. (a) Who are the vice presidents of the S.I.U. of Canada and what vice presidencies do they hold (b) who are the port agents at Vancouver, Fort William, Thorold, Toronto, Montreal, Quebec city, and Halifax (c) who are the full time patrolmen of

the S.I.U. at each of these ports (d) who are the dispatchers of the S.I.U. at Montreal (e) who are the paid organizers—full time and part time—of the S.I.U. in each of the above ports (f) who is the secretary treasurer of the S.I.U. of Canada?

4. (a) Do any of the persons taken on staff of the S.I.U. since the maritime trustees were appointed have criminal records and, if so, what is the name and record of each (b) have any of the new staff people hired since the maritime trustees were appointed ever been charged in court with committing any indictable offence and, if so, what was the charge?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): 1, 2, 3. Some of the positions listed are normally elected offices while others are staff positions to which employees are hired depending on the seasonal requirements of the industry. Information concerning staff employees is regarded as a matter of internal operation of the union, which unions are not normally required to divulge. The trustees feel such information is privileged and it would be a breach of their duty to make it public. The following elected officers are serving in positions as indicated:

Leonard J. McLaughlin, executive vice president, Montreal; Donald Swait, secretary treasurer, Montreal; Roderick Heinecky, vice president, west coast, Vancouver; Raymond Doucet, vice president, east coast, Quebec city; William Glasgow, port agent, Toronto; Stanley Devine, port agent, Halifax and Saint John; John Royce, elected patrolman, appointed agent, Fort William; Rene Turcotte, elected patrolman, appointed vice president in charge of organization, Montreal.

4. The release of such information even if it were available, would not, in the opinion of the trustees, be in the public interest.

CHARGES ON GOVERNMENT WHARVES

Question No. 1,648—**Mr. Groos:**

1. How many government wharves are there in each province?

2. What is the scale of charges authorized to be levied on users of these wharves?

3. Are the charges identical in each province and, if not, what are the differences?

4. How much money has been collected in each province from users of these government wharves in the years 1962 and 1963?

5. Have any changes in policy been made since 1960 with respect to charges to be levied for use of government wharves and, if so, what were the changes?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Answer in so far as the Department of Public Works is concerned:

1. Province	Number of wharves
Newfoundland	415
Nova Scotia	379
Prince Edward Island	106
New Brunswick	217
Quebec	408
Ontario	636
Manitoba	47
Saskatchewan	18
Alberta	35
British Columbia	385
Total	2,646

These wharves have been constructed by the Department of Public Works and transferred to the Department of Transport for administration and control, and include all federal wharves that are open to the public.

Answer in so far as the Department of Transport is concerned:

The following answers refer, only to wharves administered by the Department of Transport under the Government Harbours and Piers Act:

2. The schedule of charges is to be found in the government wharves regulations as established by authority of order in council P.C. 1964-104, January 23, 1964, and effective March 1, 1964.

3. Yes.

4. Gross collections:

Province	1962/63	1963/64
Newfoundland	57,154.70	74,232.99
Prince Edward Island	74,576.01	69,620.22
Nova Scotia	115,840.67	149,281.45
New Brunswick	39,732.24	45,587.51
Quebec	401,358.79	388,317.92
Ontario	250,107.16	399,446.44
Manitoba	1,985.70	1,763.37
Saskatchewan	1,565.43	1,559.92
Alberta	1,453.25	1,202.00
British Columbia	85,134.72	82,378.95
Northwest Territories	4,095.55	4,818.15
	1,033,004.22	1,218,208.92

5. There has been a standard schedule of charges for the use of government wharves for many years. There has, therefore, been no change in policy in recent years but there has been increased effort to collect more realistic charges in the light of (a) increased construction and maintenance costs, and (b) to reduce to a minimum unfair government competition with private industry.

Questions

POLITICAL ACTIVITIES OF CIVIL SERVANTS

Question No. 1,649—**Mr. Cyr:**

Is a federal civil servant whose services come under the civil service commission allowed to take an active part in (a) federal politics on behalf of a member or a party during a non-electoral period (b) federal politics on behalf of a candidate or a party during an electoral campaign (c) provincial politics in favour of a member or a party during a non-electoral period (d) provincial politics in favour of a candidate or a party during an electoral campaign?

Mr. D. S. Macdonald (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): It would not be appropriate to give an answer to this question, as it would be in the nature of a legal opinion. The matter is dealt with by section 61 of the Civil Service Act.

*C.B.C. COVERAGE OF GOLF CHAMPIONSHIP

Question No. 1,650—**Mr. Jorgenson:**

1. How many C.B.C. personnel attended the Canadian open golf championship in Montreal?
2. Of these, how many were (a) camera men (b) technicians (c) others?

Mr. J. B. Stewart (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation that the 1964 Canadian open golf championship was given actuality coverage, simultaneously, on the four services of the C.B.C., English radio and television and French radio and television. There were 92 employees engaged in the project of which 11 were cameramen, 42 radio and television technical staff and 39 others including commentators, producers, script assistants, floor managers, scorekeepers, etc.

HUNGARIAN IMMIGRANTS TO CANADA

Question No. 1,651—**Mr. Korchinski:**

1. How many immigrants who had fled from Hungary after the uprising were admitted to Canada?
2. How many have since left Canada?
3. How many have taken out Canadian citizenship?
4. How many applicants for citizenship have been refused because of violation under the Criminal Code?
5. How many applicants have been refused citizenship for other reasons?
6. What was the total amount of money expended by the Canadian government on behalf of these immigrants?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): 1. During the period 1956 to 1960, 37,727 Hungarian refugees were granted landed immigrant status in Canada. The maintenance of separate statistics in this respect was discontinued at the end of 1960 since the bulk of the movement had been completed by that time.

2. Canada exercises no form of exit control over persons wishing to leave the country whether they are citizens or legal permanent residents. Persons leaving Canada are not required to report their departure to the Department of Citizenship and Immigration, and consequently this department would have no knowledge as to how many have left Canada since they were admitted.

3. No statistics are kept which relate to the number of former Hungarian citizens who escaped following the 1956 uprising and who subsequently acquired Canadian citizenship. The majority of such persons would have become eligible for citizenship in 1962. It is known that some, namely the children or the wives of Canadian citizens, were eligible for and were granted citizenship from 1957 onwards. The following table shows the number of former Hungarians who have been granted Canadian citizenship during the calendar years 1957 to 1963, inclusive, and for the first six months of 1964: 1957, 3,242; 1958, 1,651; 1959, 971; 1960, 859; 1961, 727; 1962, 14,604; 1963, 6,551; 1964, 2,403, (January 1 to June 30).

4. The courts do not report statistics of this nature. Therefore no information on this question is available.

5. The courts do not report statistics of this nature either. Therefore no information on this question is available.

6. The immigration branch conducted a review several years ago of those readily identifiable expenditures which were directly attributable to the Hungarian refugee movement during the period April, 1956, to February, 1961. These included such items as ocean and inland transportation, accommodation and maintenance in Canada and grants to the provinces under the special Hungarian refugee agreements and which amounted to $15,231,696.14. It must be remembered, however, that this does not represent the complete picture of the branch's financial outlay since it is not possible to distinguish what portion of the other over-all operational costs such as salaries, communications, travel, etc., can be attributed to the Hungarian refugee movement.

CENTRAL VICTUALLING DEPOT, ESQUIMALT, B.C.

Question No. 1,658—**Mr. Chatterton:**

1. Has the central victualling depot at the dockyard, Esquimalt, B.C., been taken over by the army service corps and, if so (a) on what date did the takeover take place (b) what did the staff of this depot consist of before the takeover (c)

what does the staff consist of as of the end of July, 1964 (d) what is the reason for the increase of staff?

2. Prior to this takeover did civilian drivers make deliveries and, if so, what was the annual cost per civilian driver and what is the present annual cost per army driver including training, pay and allowances, recruiting, uniforms and all direct and indirect costs?

3. Is the army service corps at the depot providing additional space for its operations and, if so, for what reason and at what cost?

4. Has the naval hospital in Esquimalt now been formally changed into a tri-service institution and, if so, (a) what was the staff complement before the change (b) what is it now, and (c) what is the reason for the increase in staff?

Hon. Lucien Cardin (Associate Minister of National Defence): 1. Yes, (a) 1 April, 1964 (b) one officer, 16 men and one civilian typist, (c) seven army, 12 RCN, three civilians, (d) as army personnel have had no previous experience in victualling ships, it was agreed that naval personnel would remain at the depot until 1 October, 1964. On that date the numbers will be reduced to those needed to run the operation.

2. Yes, $4,555.20 per year. No change has been made in the use of civilian drivers.

3. The army are using exactly the same space formerly occupied by the RCN. However, prior to the transfer it was approved to carry out extensive repairs to the cold storage facilities which has resulted in cold storage space being rented from the Canada Packers' plant at Ogden Point while the work is in progress.

4. Yes, the hospital at HMCS *Naden* became part of the Canadian forces medical service on 15 January, 1959— (a) 104; (b) 96; (c) not applicable.

ELECTRIC POWER PRODUCTION AND EXPORTS

Question No. 1,667—**Mr. Caouette:**

1. What amount of electric power was produced in the province of Quebec during the years 1961, 1962 and 1963, and what proportion of that production was exported from Quebec?

2. What amount of electric power was produced in the province of Ontario during the years 1961, 1962 and 1963, and what proportion of that production was exported from Ontario?

3. What amount of electric power from the province of Quebec was exported to the United States?

4. What amount of Canadian electric power was exported to the United States?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): 1 and 3.

Questions

Electric Energy—Province of Quebec
Energy—millions of KWH

Year	Generated	Delivered to other provinces	Exported to U.S.A.
1961	49,762	6,196[1]	74
1962	50,129	6,196[2]	39
1963	49,819	5,222[3]	24

[1]Includes 340 million KWH delivered to Ontario for export to U.S.A.
[2]Includes 269 million KWH delivered to Ontario for export to U.S.A.
[3]Includes 243 million KWH delivered to Ontario for export to U.S.A.

Electric Energy—Province of Ontario
Energy—millions of KWH

2.

Year	Generated	Delivered to other provinces	Exported to U.S.A.
1961	34,872	282	3,891
1962	35,259	228	3,779
1963	37,501	265	3,321

Electric Energy—Canada
Energy—millions of KWH

4.

Year	Exported to U.S.A.
1961	4,180
1962	4,084
1963	3,612

[*Text*]

CANADIAN VOTE ON UN TRADE RESOLUTION

Question No. 1,680—**Mr. Bell:**

With respect to the United Nations conference on trade and development, held in March, 1964, in Geneva, and attended by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, was the special principle reading as follows: "All countries should co-operate in devising measures to help developing countries to build up maritime and other means of transport for their economic development to ensure the unhindered use of international transport facilities, the improvement of terms of freight and insurance for the developing countries and to promote tourism in these countries in order to increase their earnings and reduce their expenditure on invisible trade", adopted by the plenary session of said conference and, if so, how did Canada vote and for what reason?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): The special principle referred to was adopted in the plenary session by 92 in favour, 7 against, with 17 abstentions. Canada together with a number of other industrialized countries abstained because it was felt that the special principle should make it clear that the building up of

maritime transport in developing countries should be based on sound economic criteria.

CIVIL SERVICE COMPETITION 64-1852

Question No. 1,682—**Mr. Aiken:**

1. With reference to competition No. 64-1852 of the civil service commission, to what departments of government will successful applicants be posted?
2. For which positions will a knowledge of both the English and French languages be required?
3. Have any appointments been made under this competition?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): I am informed by the civil service commission as follows:

1. The civil service commission.
2. A knowledge of both the English and French languages will be required for positions in those areas of operations where the incumbent will be required to maintain liaison with educational institutions and other sources of supply and to examine candidates in the French or English language as needed.
3. No.

CIVIL SERVICE COMPETITION 64-661

Question No. 1,684—**Mr. Aiken:**

1. With reference to competition No. 64-661 of the civil service commission for a supervisor of construction accounting, Department of Public Works, what particular duties require the ability to speak, read and write in both English and French?
2. In this competition does a bilingual person have priority over the statutory preference for veterans?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): I am informed by the civil service commission as follows:

1. The incumbent of this position will be required to deal orally and by correspondence with contractors, consultants, etc., some of whom are French speaking.
2. To be successful candidates must be bilingual. The statutory preference for veterans will apply in ranking the successful candidates.

CREATION OF CREDIT AND CAPITAL

Question No. 1,685—**Mr. Côté (Chicoutimi):**

1. For the period January 1, 1954 to December 31, 1963, what was the increase of the money supply or the creation of new credit or capital?
2. What was the amount for each year?
3. What was the percentage of increase for each year?
4. For each year during that period, what was the increase of the new capital of the Bank of Canada?
5. For each year during that period, what was the total increase of new credit in commercial or chartered banks?

[*Translation*]

Mr. L. T. Pennell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): 1, 2 and 3. See Table 1 attached.

4. The capital of the Bank of Canada has been $5,000,000 during the period named. The bank's rest fund was $10,050,367 at the end of 1953 and 1954, $20,403,347 at the end of 1955, and $25,000,000 at the end of each year since 1955.

5. See Table 2 attached.

TABLE 1

As at Dec. 31	Currency in hands of public	Canadian dollar deposit liabilities of chartered banks (less float)	Total of currency and bank deposits	Increase in total of currency and bank deposits during year	
	(Millions of dollars)			Millions of dollars	Percentage
1953	1,430	8,359	9,789	—	—
1954	1,458	8,856	10,314	525	5.4
1955	1,550	9,847	11,397	1,083	10.5
1956	1,605	9,833	11,438	41	.4
1957	1,667	10,256	11,923	485	4.2
1958	1,781	11,466	13,247	1,324	11.1
1959	1,832	11,360	13,193	−54	.4
1960	1,876	12,037	13,914	721	5.5
1961	1,959	13,205	15,163	1,249	9.0
1962	1,994	13,689	15,683	520	3.4
1963	2,084	14,980	17,064	1,381	8.8
				7,275	

TABLE 2

	Increases in major categories of chartered bank assets							Increases in major categories of chartered bank liabilities	
	Loans	Non-govt. securities	Govt. securities	Deposits at Bank of Canada and Bank of Canada notes	Net foreign assets	All other assets (net)	Total of foregoing	Shareholders' equity	Canadian $ deposit liabilities (as in table above)
	(Millions of dollars)								
1954	56	95	553	−97	11	−10	599	102	497
1955	808	448	−254	49	−41	27	1,037	46	991
1956	465	141	−644	42	46	22	72	86	−14
1957	179	91	225	−16	26	−3	502	79	423
1958	−80	406	872	135	−55	13	1,291	81	1,210
1959	707	77	−711	−48	−67	49	7	113	−106
1960	465	−55	254	39	50	2	755	78	677
1961	386	31	741	104	−50	23	1,235	67	1,168
1962	902	28	−428	66	−103	45	510	26	484
1963	590	−10	574	68	104	20	1,346	55	1,291

Questions

[*Text*]

USE OF SPACE, WORLD FAIR

Question No. 1,686—**Mr. Laprise:**

1. To date, how many and which countries have indicated their intention of participating in the 1967 Canadian world exhibition?

2. How many other countries are expected to announce their intention of participating in the exhibition?

3. As a result of the interest shown in the exhibition is it expected that there will be a shortage of space on Notre-Dame and Ste Hélène islands, to the extent that space reserved for green or water areas will be used to increase the size of buildings or for the construction of new ones?

4. If less area is devoted to greenery and water, will the exhibition be less appealing in appearance?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): 1. To date, sixteen (16) countries have officially announced their participation in the 1967 world exhibition. They are: Canada, United Kingdom, Belgium, France, Morocco, Netherlands, Austria, West Germany, Venezuela, Israel, Iran, Sweden, Finland, Denmark, Malaysia, United States of America.

2. There are negotiations on the way with many countries and it is expected that a substantial number will announce their participation shortly.

3. Last fall, when the master plan was being prepared, it was impossible to determine the exact area which would be required without knowing the number of participants and the lot sizes they would like.

Consequently, it was planned to have green and water areas which could allow for expansion or contraction for exhibition area.

Up to the present time, the green and water areas have not been changed to any great extent.

4. We envision no major diminishing of area devoted to greenery and water which would affect the appearance of the exhibition.

[*Text*]

TRAVEL BUREAU BRANCHES, NEW YORK AND OVERSEAS

Question No. 1,694—**Mr. Coates:**

1. What is the estimated cost of operating the Canadian government travel bureau's branch overseas for the fiscal year 1964-65?

2. How many employees are associated with the operation of the above noted branch?

3. How many inquiries have been received to date in association with this branch's operation?

4. What is the estimated cost of operating the Canadian government travel bureau's branch in New York city for the fiscal year 1964-65?

5. How many employees are associated with the operation of the above noted branch?

6. How many inquiries have been received to date in association with this branch's operation?

[Mr. Pennell.]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): 1. The estimated cost of operating the Canadian government travel bureau's branch office at 19 Cockspur street, London, England, during 1964-65 is $115,000.

2. The establishment of this office consists of five continuing employees posted from Canada, three locally engaged personnel, and one temporary emergency appointee.

3. The following is a breakdown of the number of inquiries received at this office: (a) April 1/64 to June 30/64, 21,471 (fiscal year); (b) January 1/64 to June 30/64, 47,959 (calendar year).

4. The estimated cost of operating the Canadian government travel bureau's branch office in New York city during 1964-65 is $103,925.

5. The establishment of the New York office consists of five continuing employees posted from Canada and one locally engaged seasonal employee.

6. The following is a breakdown of the number of inquiries received at this office: (a) April 1/64 to June 30/64, 21,432 (fiscal year); (b) January 1/64 to June 30/64, 34,119 (calendar year).

FEDERAL BUILDING, AMHERST, N.S.

Question No. 1,695—**Mr. Coates:**

What is the government's intention with regard to the construction of a new federal building at Amherst, Nova Scotia?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): This matter is under consideration.

FEDERAL BUILDING, BRIDGEWATER, N.S.

Question No. 1,698—**Mr. Crouse:**

Has the government given any consideration to constructing a new federal building at Bridgewater, Nova Scotia, adequate in size to contain the post office and other federal agencies in the town?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): Consideration is being given to the construction of a new federal building in Bridgewater.

CENTENNIAL COMMISSION SUPPORT FOR INDIAN CONFERENCE

Question No. 1,703—**Mr. Fisher:**

1. Was the recent national Indian council conference at Sault Ste. Marie supported in any way, including financially, by the centennial commission?

2. Was any representative or agent of the centennial commission at the conference in Sault Ste. Marie and, if so, did he or she stay with the council members at the motel from which some of the council members were evicted?

3. Was any money supplied by the centennial commission used to fly any delegates to the council meeting and, if so, how much and for what persons?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): 1. No.

2. No.

3. No.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE OFFICE FOR NEWFOUNDLAND

Question No. 1,704—**Mr. Tucker:**

Has the government given consideration to the opening of a regional office in Newfoundland in which to conduct unemployment insurance business for the province of Newfoundland and, if so, what has been the decision?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): The unemployment insurance commission has considered the need for a regional office to conduct unemployment insurance business for the province of Newfoundland. It was decided that a regional office for Newfoundland could not be justified.

CONTEST FOR CENTENNIAL MUSICAL THEME

Question No. 1,706—**Mr. Prittie:**

1. Has the national centennial administration received a proposal from the Richmond centenary council for a Canada-wide contest among musical composers for a march to be adopted as the official musical theme for all centennial functions?

2. Has the administration rendered a decision on this proposal?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): 1. Yes.

2. No.

EXTENSION OF WHARF, LIVERPOOL, N.S.

Question No. 1,707—**Mr. Crouse:**

Is the government giving any consideration to extending the present government wharf at Liverpool, Queens county, Nova Scotia, which is presently inadequate to handle the shipping in this area?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): Yes, consideration is being given to extending this wharf.

REPAIRS TO TUG "GLENLIVET II"

Question No. 1,708—**Mr. MacEwan:**

1. What were the names of the tenderers and the amounts of the various tenders for repairs to the tug *Glenlivet II*?

2. To whom will the contract be awarded?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): 1. Ferguson Industries Limited, Pictou, N.S., $2,715; Sydney Engineering & Dry Dock Limited, Sydney, N.S., $6,001.60.

2. The contract has been awarded to Ferguson Industries Limited.

PURCHASE OF JET PLANES FOR CABINET USE

Question No. 1,710—**Mr. Coates:**

1. Have negotiations been entered into and/or completed for the purchase of two DC-8 jets for use to transport the Prime Minister, members of the cabinet and other V.I.P.'s?

2. If so, what is the price for such aircraft?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): 1. No.

2. Not applicable.

*MEETING WITH MINISTER RESPECTING FEED GRAIN SUBSIDY

Question No. 1,715—**Mr. Fairweather:**

1. On what date is the Minister of Forestry or his officials receiving a delegation representing the Canadian Federation of Agriculture which will "attempt to negotiate a more equitable and easily administered policy" relative to the interim freight assistance program for feed grains?

2. Will an opportunity be given to members of parliament from areas affected to participate in the meeting with the delegation?

3. What further changes in policy are contemplated which will serve to (a) lower rather than increase prices of feed, and (b) make the method of administration of the interim policy less complicated and expensive?

Mr. B. S. Beer (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Minister of Forestry): 1. The Minister of Forestry and his officials will receive the delegation of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture on Friday, August 21, 1964.

2. The meeting is essentially to give an opportunity to the Canadian Federation of Agriculture to express their views privately to the minister.

3. Such changes if any will depend upon the outcome of the meeting.

TENDERS FOR OFFICE SPACE REQUIREMENTS, OTTAWA

Question No. 1,722—**Mr. Lambert:**

1. How many tenders were received with respect to the tender calls made by the Department of Public Works for office space requirements for (a) the Department of Labour (b) the department of northern affairs?

2. What were the names of the tenderers with respect to the above, and what is the amount of the annual rental with respect to each tender?

3. What was the location of the property with respect to each tender?

4. Were the respective tenderers the owners of the properties in question and, if not, what was the nature of their beneficial interest in the property?

5. If any property was subject to the exercise of an option (a) was any option exercised subsequent to the optioning of tenders, or (b) dropped subsequent to the optioning of tenders and, if so, in either case?

6. Was any mortgage financing on either property for which lease contracts have been signed con-

tingent upon the securing of a long term lease with the government of Canada and, if so, which ones?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): 1. Forty one interested parties took out project briefs and six tenders were submitted from four companies for both requirements.

2. Names of Tenderers	Annual rental
Laurentian Realty Limited,	
proposal "A"	$605,119
proposal "B"	667,937
Campeau Construction Ltd.	616,691
Ottawa Commercial Realties Limited	775,000
Assaly Construction Limited	825,100

The sixth proposal was from the Campeau Construction Limited who offered to accommodate the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources in addition to the Department of Labour in the same building at the same proportionate per annum rate.

3. The property locations were as follows: Laurentian Realty Limited, south side of Laurier between Kent and Bank streets. Campeau Construction Limited, west side of Kent street between Laurier and Gloucester streets. Ottawa Commercial Realties, north side of Laurier west between O'Connor and Metcalfe streets. Assaly Construction Limited, north side of Laurier between Bank and O'Connor.

4. Laurentian Realty Limited obtained an option on the property in question on May 29, 1964, to be exercised up to and including the 30th day of November 1964. Campeau Construction Limited owned the property. Ottawa Commercial Realties Limited owned the property. Assaly Construction Limited held a letter of commitment to grant an option dated July 16, 1964.

5. It is the custom of the department to deal with persons having a firm interest in the property. It is also common commercial practice to do so. In this specific case the department asked the bidders to provide proof of their control of the site whether by ownership or by option and in the event of the latter stipulated that the options run for a period of six months from the date of closing of tenders. The department has not ascertained whether any of the options in question were either exercised or dropped following the opening of tenders.

It is assumed that in section (a) and (b) of the question the word "optioning" should read "opening".

6. No knowledge of this.

[Mr. Lambert.]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

FINANCIAL AID TO MEDICAL STUDENTS, ETC.

Question No. 1,570—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

As of this date, what scholarships, bursaries, loans or other financial aid (in kind, number and amount) does the government of Canada make available to (a) undergraduate medical students (b) postgraduate medical students (c) undergraduate dental students (d) postgraduate dental students (e) undergraduate nurses (f) postgraduate nurses (g) undergraduate pharmacists?

Return tabled.

EMPLOYMENT OF PERSONS CONVICTED OF INDICTABLE OFFENCE

Question No. 1,690—**Mr. Prittie:**

Has the civil service commission or any of the following departments or agencies of the government any regulation or rule which states that persons who have been convicted of an indictable offence shall not be employed and, if not, how many persons in this category were accepted for employment in 1962 and 1963: Department of Justice; Department of Trade and Commerce; Department of National Health and Welfare; Department of Veterans Affairs; Department of Defence Production; Department of Agriculture; Canadian Broadcasting Corporation; national film board; dominion coal board; national capital commission; board of broadcast governors?

Return tabled.

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. J. B. Stewart (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I understand that the materials tabled yesterday by the Minister of Public Works satisfy motion No. 157, and that, consequently, this motion will be withdrawn.

Mr. Lambert: That is correct.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed that this motion be withdrawn?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Stewart: And I ask that motion No. 134 be allowed to stand.

OTTAWA—TENDER CALLS FOR OFFICE SPACE REQUIREMENTS

Motion No. 157—**Mr. Lambert:**

That an order of the house do issue for a copy of the tender calls issued by the Department of Public Works for office space requirements for the Department of Labour and for the department of northern affairs.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

HAL BANKS—FAILURE TO APPEAR IN COURT

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 Minister of Justice, not in any way intruding on the questions which were asked yesterday regarding the elusive Mr. Banks. I should like to ask the minister whether, having regard to the unusual course that has been taken in connection with the Banks case—his ability to get out of the country if in fact he has done so, and all these things of that nature—he does not think a probe into the whole question regarding Mr. Banks should be made in order to remove some of the suspicions that are in the minds of people in respect of the elusive nature of this gentleman.

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, surely there has been nothing unusual in the dealings of the Department of Justice and other departments in relation to Mr. Banks. I think in view of the facts as they have been stated, namely in relation to the stand taken by the crown concerning first the opposition to bail and second the insistence on a very high bail, it would take a really very suspicious person to still be suspicious.

I may add this in relation to Mr. Banks' whereabouts. I have nothing more to report than what I did not state yesterday. The bench warrant which has been issued against him has been remitted to and is presently in the hands of the provincial police of Quebec, and the R.C.M.P. has offered all co-operation for the purpose of locating the object of the bench warrant.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, everything was answered but the question. I will elucidate what I had in mind so the minister will have that information. He said one would have to be suspicious if one were to raise any doubt regarding this man. I am not going into that question. One just has to look at the period of years that he has been in Canada and the protection that he has apparently received from the department of immigration and elsewhere to answer that suggestion.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Apparently the hon. gentlemen of the Liberal party over to the right have a personal interest in this matter. My question is this. Is there going to be an investigation by the Department of Justice into the degree to which this man has been able to flout the laws of this country? Will the Minister of Justice tell us whether there has been any request made of the United States immigration authorities to ascertain whether he crossed into the United States and, if so, when?

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, it is quite clear in my mind that there is no reason to bring about an investigation such as is suggested. However, I agree with the right hon. gentleman that to the extent that information might be obtainable from the United States, it would be proper for me to ascertain whether any such request has been made.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Would the minister say whether up to the present time his department or counsel retained by the federal government have asked the United States about this man, as to whether he crossed the line? Surely that would have been one of the first things done.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to answer this particular question at the moment.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a supplementary question to the Minister of Justice. Does he have the impression that Mr. Banks is still in Canada or does he feel that he has fled the country? What is the minister's personal impression at this time?

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect and friendship for the hon. member for Villeneuve, and without trying to evade the question, I feel it would not be proper for me to express any feeling which is not corroborated by facts.

[*Text*]

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, in view of the interest in and importance of this matter, I should like to ask the Minister of Justice whether he has asked or contemplates asking the F.B.I. in the United States or Interpol to determine the location of Hal Banks.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, this seemed to be implied in the question which was put to me by the Leader of the Opposition—

Mr. Winch: I am asking if the minister has requested the F.B.I. or Interpol to do this.

An hon. Member: Get Perry Mason.

Mr. Favreau: —but I am unable to answer that question at the moment.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, so there will be no misunderstanding may I say it is not the

F.B.I. I have in mind but the Department of Justice.

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): A supplementary question to the Minister of Justice, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister believe that $25,000 bail for a free spender like Hal Banks is a large amount?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, I think I must answer that question. I made it clear yesterday that it would be contempt of court on my part to comment on the decision as to bail which has been rendered by the chief justice of the court of appeal of Quebec.

Mr. MacInnis: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Why does the Minister of Justice insist that Mr. Banks' bail was high? He is the one who has been insisting that this is high bail.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

CYPRUS—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON PRESENT POSITION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. It has to do with the report that Great Britain has withdrawn 198 troops from its contingent in the United Nations Cyprus force. Was the Canadian government consulted regarding this matter? Is this the first of a series of withdrawals, or is this the only withdrawal which is contemplated by the government of the United Kingdom?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, on the 25th of June the secretary of state for commonwealth relations announced that it was the intention of the British government to reduce the size of their contingent in the United Nations force, which at that time numbered 1,800, to between 1,100 and 1,200 men. It is in consequence of that statement that the strength of the British contingent as of the 14th of August was reduced to 1,034.

However, this figure is not to be regarded as completely final because part of the reduction effected consists of troops which are being rotated. There are indications that when this rotation has been completed the figure for the United Kingdom contingent will be increased to the point where the British and Canadian contingents will be roughly equivalent in size. The figure for the Canadian contingent as of the 14th of August was 1,130. British logistic support, which is of course of vital importance to the whole force, is being maintained at its present level.

Mr. Douglas: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister give the house the assurance that there will be no unilateral withdrawal of Canadian troops until such time as the United Nations itself decides that they can no longer fill a useful role as a peace keeping force in Cyprus?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend will remember that I dealt with this question some time ago, and within the context of what I said then, of course, the decision is one for the United Nations.

Mr. Douglas: May I ask the minister a further supplementary question with reference to the announcement that an agreement has been reached between the United Nations and Archbishop Makarios regarding the partial lifting of the blockade against the Turkish Cypriots. I would like to ask the minister whether this does not make it clear that the government of Cyprus has been blockading the Turkish Cypriots and seeking to starve them into submission, and whether this does not make it perfectly apparent that Archbishop Makarios, behind the screen of the United Nations peace keeping force, has been systematically seeking to liquidate his opposition?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend's commentary will speak for itself. There is an agreement now with the government of Cyprus, arranged by the United Nations representatives, to provide for the immediate re-establishment of the water supply in the affected area and to provide for an adequate flow of food and fuel. This arrangement also assumes that the Turkish Cypriots would guarantee freedom of movement for all civilians in the Kokkina and Lefka areas. Provision has been made for the movement of Turkish Cypriots from the Kokkina area under United Nations forces supervision. Finally, the entry of food and fuel into the Turkish Cypriot sector "in reasonable amounts" to be determined by the international committee of the Red Cross has been provided for, with an immediate allocation of kerosene made to relieve the present acute shortage of fuel.

The humanitarian aspect of the situation has been put in the hands of the international committee of the Red Cross, with the full backing and assistance of the United Nations peace keeping force in Cyprus.

CONGO—EFFORTS OF UNITED NATIONS TO PREVENT BLOODSHED

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In regard to the continuing violence in the eastern Congo and Burundi, can the minister tell us whether any effort is presently being made by the United Nations to prevent any further bloodshed in the eastern Congo and to resettle the Watusi tribe that has come across into the Congo from Rwanda?

I also have a related question referring to questions posed last week. How important is the communist Chinese influence behind these disturbances, so far as the government is aware?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I cannot give any precise answer to the last question. I stated recently that there was evidence of this kind of penetration. There have been discussions initiated by the United States, between Mr. Harriman, and the Belgian foreign minister with regard to the situation in the Congo.

Mr. Thompson: As a supplementary question in view of the fact that two prominent United Nations officials were killed yesterday, has there been any communication with the United Nations or any indication by the United Nations of action being planned?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): As my hon. friend knows, the United Nations force has left the Congo. There continues to be a United Nations office there, but beyond that I cannot offer any further information.

MALAYSIA—SUGGESTED TRANSFER OF MUTUAL AID FROM INDONESIA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of reports in today's *Globe and Mail* that President Sukarno of Indonesia is promoting a large demonstration, with shouts of "Destroy our enemies, Britain and America" being carried on, would the government now decide to stop handing out Canadian taxpayers' money to aid this man, and give it to our friends in the area instead?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): As I said yesterday, I will give consideration to the wisdom of the suggestion made at that time by the hon. member and renewed by him today. I would point out, however, that the assistance given to Indonesia is not in the form of military aid. It represents the continuation of a policy which was pursued by the former administration, and up to now, has been observed by this government. I believe Australia, Japan, New Zealand, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Germany and the United Nations specialized agencies are all giving non-military assistance to Indonesia. They have not indicated that as a result of President Sukarno's actions toward Malaysia there is any intention on their part to curtail such non-military assistance. However, the matter is being reviewed.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Can the Secretary of State for External Affairs tell the house the nature of the aid which is being given to Indonesia? Is it mainly food and technical assistance?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): It is wheat flour and some technical assistance.

Mr. Douglas: We are not going to make any friends in Indonesia by refusing to help feed them.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): That is why I said I could go no further than examine the suggestion made by the hon. member for Oxford.

Mr. Nesbitt: Would the secretary of state not agree that the economy of Indonesia is in a very bad condition, and that giving aid to President Sukarno to help him out in this way is helping him in his war-like activities?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I do not believe that giving assistance to countries necessarily means we are furthering their ideological objectives. We are sending wheat to China, but I do not believe the hon. member for Qu'Appelle could be branded as a supporter of communist China.

Mr. Nesbitt: The secretary of state has suggested we are giving wheat to China. We are selling it to China.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I thank the hon. member for telling us the obvious.

Inquiries of the Ministry

AGRICULTURE

QUEBEC—ARDA PROJECTS IN NORTHWESTERN COUNTIES

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Forestry. Does he intend, in co-operation with the Quebec provincial authorities, to set up rural development programs for the ridings of northwestern Quebec, that is, the constituencies of Villeneuve, Chapleau and Pontiac-Témiscamingue?

More specifically, did he receive requests from the Quebec government to encourage the construction of slaughter-houses and cold storage facilities designed to meet the needs of that area?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): Mr. Speaker, the initiative in this field is the sole responsibility of the Quebec government. We have received no request as yet in regard to the matters raised by the hon. member.

[*Text*]

PENSIONS

CANADA PLAN—REQUEST FOR EARLY CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. In view of reports that the Ontario legislation respecting private pension plans does not provide the amount of portability that was anticipated, could we not in this parliament compensate for this disappointment by expediting action on the Canada pension plan, and toward that end could not the new resolution be put on the order paper at an early date?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we are presently examining the whole question of portability with the provinces. So far as expediting the pension legislation is concerned I would be very glad, Mr. Speaker, to approve and support any step that can be taken toward that end, and for that purpose to finish as soon as possible the debate on the resolution now before the house.

Mr. Knowles: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the Prime Minister not aware of the fact that if the resolution respecting the Canada pension plan were on the order paper the desire of all members to get to that order of business might shorten the flag debate?

[Mr. Martin (Essex East).]

Mr. Pearson: Well, Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. gentleman that whether the resolution is on the order paper or not, this is an item of business we will proceed with as soon as we can after the flag resolution is settled.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): In view of the latter statement on the part of the Prime Minister does he now give the assurance that before we adjourn, if the flag resolution is passed, the pension resolution will be brought in and the pension legislation brought before the house?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, as I have already informed the house, when the flag resolution is disposed of we hope to take a very well earned recess, and immediately after the recess we will be in a position to proceed not only with the pension resolution but with the pension legislation.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, that is not the question I asked. Will the Prime Minister, in the interests of the Canadian people, give the assurance—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: —that this is going to be introduced; not the second or third revised edition of the Minister of National Health and Welfare but a final one that will assure that the pension legislation will receive immediate attention? If he does we will be behind him on the pension legislation 100 per cent.

Mr. Pearson: I will be very glad, Mr. Speaker, to give that assurance and I hope my right hon. friend will, in his turn, give me an assurance that we will be finished with the flag resolution in time to deal with the pension legislation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, apparently it is to be postponed until after a vacation. I ask the Prime Minister, is the legislation drafted?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, we will be ready to proceed with the resolution and the legislation, and if the right hon. gentleman will only agree to some reasonable time limit on the debate on the flag resolution we can go right ahead with the pension resolution.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I put it to the Prime Minister that the work has not been completed, the legislation has not been drafted and final agreement with the provinces regarding portability has not been attained.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, as is often the case my right hon. friend is ill informed.

Mr. Knowles: As a further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the Prime Minister, at the adjourned meeting he is going to have with the party leaders tomorrow, will discuss the possibility of shortening the flag debate and getting the first stage of the pension legislation over before a recess.

Mr. Pearson: I will be very glad indeed to discuss that matter and I would hope, as a result of the meeting tomorrow, as a first step in that desirable course we might agree on a time limit that will bring debate on the flag resolution to an end at a reasonable time, and then we can proceed at once with the pension resolution.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Monteith: Closure.

Mr. Diefenbaker: After all the evasion indulged in by the Prime Minister will he now answer me definitely? Has the legislation been prepared, and has there been agreement with the provinces on the question of portability? Why doesn't he answer that? Why does he evade with all of this?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, the agreement with the provinces has been completed, and the legislation is being drafted and will be ready for the house as soon as my right hon. friend will agree to put an end to the filibuster on the flag resolution.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Order. It seems to me we have had considerable discussion on this matter. The time devoted to the question period is very short today, and if there are only one or two more supplementaries I hope we could get through with them very quickly.

[*Translation*]

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

Would he not be prepared, for instance, to consider the feasibility of a quick legislation for a personal pension plan in favour of the Leader of the Opposition, so that the House of Commons may get rid of him forever.

[*Text*]

Mr. Pearson: I would be delighted to give the most favourable consideration to that proposal were it not for the knowledge that my right hon. friend does not approve of increases in the income of members of parliament.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Is this last question to the right hon. gentleman further evidence of the close alliance with the Creditistes?

IMMIGRATION

STATEMENT ON EXTENSION OF CHINESE ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM

On the orders of the day:

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): In reply to questions raised yesterday by the hon. member for St. Paul and the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George, and following my declaration of last Friday on the adjustment statement program affecting immigrants of Chinese origin, I have reviewed the situation in the light of the experience of the last few days. I think hon. members will be interested to know that on Monday alone approximately 400 immigrants of Chinese origin came forward to regularize their status in Canada, which indicates to me that there are still a large number of this category of immigrants who have not taken advantage of this program.

In view of the above, the date of September 1 will apply only to individuals entering Canada on or after that date, and I have so advised my officials. This means in effect that the adjustment statement program will continue for the time being to apply to immigrants of Chinese origin who have entered the country previously. It seems there is a consensus that this program should come to an end. I sincerely hope the members of the Chinese community will continue to exercise their prerogatives and come forward to regularize their status. I intend to keep a close watch on the situation, and will report to the house at an early opportunity.

I will communicate the contents of my answer of today to the editors of the Chinese language newspapers in Canada.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): I am rising on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Does Your Honour not feel that statements such as the one just made by the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration—and I may say in passing that I believe all of us welcome it—should be made on motions, particularly on Wednesday when lengthy announcements of this sort cut into the time allotted for questions?

Mr. Tremblay: I was replying to two questions which had been asked yesterday.

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*Translation*]

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I should like to ask the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration whether the suggestion made yesterday by the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources will be accepted, in order that Chinese may get three months' notice if there is a change in policy?

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Speaker, this suggestion, like all others which have been made, is being looked into, and I shall be glad to consider them when the program is brought to an end.

[*Text*]

CANADIAN FLAG

INQUIRY AS TO ORDER FOR NEW DESIGN PENNANTS

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Chapleau): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister without Portfolio.

Could the minister tell us whether his order for three leaf flags was placed with Japanese manufacturers?

Hon. Yvon Dupuis (Minister without Portfolio): The answer is no, Mr. Speaker.

[*Text*]

UNITED NATIONS

INSTRUCTIONS TO CANADIAN DELEGATION RESPECTING DELINQUENT NATIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Queens): I wish to address a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. It has to do with the United Nations and is based on the action of the United States house of representatives in voting unanimously to urge that country's delegation to press for steps to be taken under article 19 to deprive delinquent United Nations members of their voting rights. I should like to ask the secretary of state whether similar instructions are being issued to our representative at the United Nations.

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Actions taken in the legislature of another country are, of course, matters for that country alone. As to the course Canada will take, the government will of course give our delegates the necessary instructions when the assembly opens. But article 19 is clear. The international court of justice has given an opinion as to the legal obligations it entails. I would hope, however, that it would be possible for the Soviet union and other delinquents to make payments, even partial payments, so as to avoid any confrontation in the matter.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

THOMPSON, MAN.—REPORTED REDUCTION IN NORTHERN ALLOWANCES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill): I wish to address a question to the Postmaster General. In view of the increasing cost of living in many parts of northern Manitoba, and in view of the fact that northern allowances for some federal employees have been drastically reduced while in some areas northern allowances for other federal employees in other departments have remained unchanged, will the Postmaster General look into the situation concerning employees of his department in Thompson, Manitoba, who I understand have suffered drastic reductions in northern allowance payments?

Mr. Speaker: I suggest this is a question for the order paper.

Mr. Simpson: Your Honour has ruled that this is a question for the order paper, but these people have just been advised in recent days that their allowances are to be cut off, or drastically reduced, and I was wondering whether the Postmaster General would not look into this situation.

HOUSING

REPORTED INTENTION TO INCREASE INCENTIVE BONUS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. H. Doucett (Lanark): I should like to ask the Minister of Labour whether the winter house building incentive bonus is being increased from $500 to $750.

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): No, there is no intention to increase the amount of the winter house building bonus.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PAYMENT OF TELEPHONE BILLS OF CREDITISTE MEMBERS

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Girouard (Labelle): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance.

Would the Minister of Finance tell the house whether the government intends to pay the telephone bills of the Caouette's Ralliement members which amount to $1,600, with two especially noticeable, being in the amounts of $457.65 and $412.55?

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order. This question is out of order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérald Laprise (Chapleau): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

The hon. member for Labelle who has asked a question should start by minding his own business.

Mr. Georges Valade (St. Mary): But he pays his bills.

[*Text*]

ANNOUNCEMENT OF COMPLETION OF TRANSLATION OF BEAUCHESNE

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in reply to a question by the hon. member for Quebec East I promised to make a statement concerning the French edition of Beauchesne. On August 7, 1964 my colleague the Secretary of State, in answer to a similar question, indicated that the French edition would be ready at the end of this month. I have been informed this morning that sufficient copies of the French edition will be received from the publisher for distribution on or before Tuesday next.

CANADIAN FLAG

OFFICIAL ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW DESIGN

The house resumed, from Tuesday, August 18, consideration of the motion by Mr. Pearson:

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 the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Diefenbaker, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. More.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rosthern.

Mr. Nasserden: Mr. Speaker, I should like first—

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding—

Mr. Speaker: I should like to advise the house that members of the New Democratic party spoke to me just before I came into the chamber, and it slipped my mind momentarily. I believe there was general agreement that the hon. member for Greenwood would be the next speaker. I am wondering, therefore, whether the hon. member for Rosthern would stand aside for the moment.

Mr. Nasserden: Certainly, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, this house, and perhaps you yourself, sir, will have observed that except for a commendably brief and witty speech by the hon. member for New Westminster, the members of this party have not until now participated in this debate on the subamendment moved by the hon. member for Regina City, nor indeed in the debate on the amendment since it was resumed a week ago.

This is not because we are not interested in this debate. On the contrary, we are very much interested in the debate and have definite views on the subamendment and indeed on the whole flag issue. The reason for our restraint, Mr. Speaker, is our view that an unduly prolonged debate on this subamendment, or on any other subamendment, on the amendment itself or on the main motion, would be extremely damaging to parliament and therefore to Canada itself.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Brewin: Once the main issues have been made clear, continuation of debate on such an emotional subject can only serve to cause bitterness and, what is perhaps equally bad, boredom and irritation about the whole subject. I have found Canadians with a variety of opinions as to the solution of this flag question; but I have found an almost unanimous view that prolonged and repetitious debate is unnecessary and does no credit to Canada or to parliament. I do not deny the right of individual members to put their convictions on this subject on the record if they think they ought to do so, but I appeal to all hon. members, in the interests of parliament and of Canada as a whole, to do so with brevity and restraint.

It is my belief that parliament should not be in almost continuous session. One of our jobs, of course, is to debate in this house; but we have another important job, and that is to get back to our constituencies and discuss with them face to face the issues of today

and correct some of the false impressions about parliament and other public issues which are only too prevalent. As far as I am concerned, I also believe that parliament needs a reasonable recess for thought and recuperation.

As a relative newcomer to parliament I would hesitate to put forward this view were it not for the statements of a great parliamentarian whose authority, I am quite sure, will not be denied by any member here, least of all by members of the official opposition. I wish to read something said by Mr. Winston Churchill in 1931:

> If you wish to say what is wrong with parliament...it is that it sits far too long in the year. I would lay down that except in times of war or great national emergency parliament should not sit more than five months, with the ordinary short intervals, say, occupying six months of the year. That ought to be the maximum.

Then again in 1944 he made a similar statement to which I call the attention of members of this house:

> Do not...ever suppose that you can strengthen parliament by wearying it, and by keeping it in almost continuous session. If you want to reduce the power of parliament, let it sit every day in the year. one fifth part filled, and then you will find it will be the laughingstock of the nation, instead of being, as it continues to be, in spite of all the strains of modern life, the citadel as well as the cradle of parliamentary institutions throughout the world—

I should like to read another quotation from this book, which is called "Our Parliament". It is about the British parliament, and the author is Strathearn Gordon. He discusses the length of sessions and says this:

> Why don't M.P.s work for more than about eight months in the year? The answer is that they do—but not at Westminster.

The same is true of Ottawa:

> Most ministers undoubtedly look forward to the "holidays", when they are free from parliamentary cares, as the periods when they can put their best work into their departments.

I call this to the attention of hon. members:

> But for ordinary members, too, reasonably long adjournments are a practical necessity. When a man has for many weeks been living a sort of double life, spending late nights at Westminster, speaking in his constituency at the week ends, working in the train in between, with his private affairs neglected and his nerves in shreds, it is surely right to allow him time to recuperate and think. Three hundred and seventy years ago the Lord Keeper was expressing the idea in almost lyrical Elizabethan style:
>
> "The sessions" (he said) "cannot be long; by reason of the springtime, 'tis fit that gentlemen should repair to their countries; the justices of assize also to go to their circuits.
>
> "So the good hours"...

[Mr. Brewin.]

I commend these words to the house; they were spoken by the Lord Keeper 370 years ago:

> "So the good hours should not be lost in idle speeches, but the little time we have should be bestowed wholly on such businesses as are needful to be considered of".

I think we should bestow our time reasonably on the sort of business that ought to be considered. There is another reason why this flag debate should not be unnecessarily prolonged and should be terminated at a reasonable time. Important as this issue of the flag is—and no one denies its importance—it is even more important that we should clear the decks of this contentious issue so we can get on with the other tremendously important business that lies before this house.

Today we mentioned the pension plan. There are many other items of legislation that ought to be dealt with. If we prolong this debate now, or put it off until some other time and resume it again, the decks will not be cleared for us to deal with that which is needful to be dealt with.

The subamendment before the house proposes a complicated plebiscite on the flag issue. I believe such a plebiscite would be divisive; I think it would be an evasion of our responsibilities as elected members of parliament. I think it would be productive of strife, bitterness and perhaps even boredom throughout the nation. I believe that we in this house were elected to take the burden of decisions in the interests of Canada as a whole. I think that if we could take a referendum, as was suggested in this house yesterday, to determine whether we should have a referendum on the flag issue, the Canadian people would tell us in no uncertain terms to do the job we were elected to do and to do it soon.

After all, Mr. Speaker, what would the referendum proposed by the subamendment solve? I suspect it would solve nothing at all. It would still leave parliament to act. Supposing, as I suggested frivolously—although it would not be funny if it in fact happened—we had a plebiscite based on the subamendment and found that 30 per cent of the people were in favour of the red ensign, 10 per cent were for the red ensign plus embellishments, 30 per cent were for a single maple leaf flag and, if I get my arithmetic right, another 30 per cent supported the three maple leaves emblem produced by the government as put before us in the main resolution. Supposing we were faced with that situation. Would the referendum have solved

anything, or would we have to renew this interminable debate all over again?

Mr. Willoughby: Would the hon. member permit a question? Does he believe that a preferential ballot would produce a vote such as suggested by the hon. member?

Mr. Brewin: Well, I rather rule out the preferential ballot in my mind because the hon. member for Oxford, who sits on the front benches of the same party as my hon. friend and who was asked that question, said he did not think a preferential ballot was workable, and I rather accept that view. The preferential ballot would contain so many complications and difficulties that I doubt it would solve the problem.

Mr. Coates: There are far too many complications in the Pearson flag.

Mr. Brewin: I think the government flag too is a little too complicated. I would prefer to see a single maple leaf.

There is another reason I suggest the subamendment should be dealt with expeditiously and rejected. It is that there is a solution available which all Canadians, or nearly all Canadians, would accept, I believe with a sigh of relief, and which would represent a non-partisan approach to the problem. This solution would be, in our view—and in this I speak for my party—to amend resolution 44A to substitute a single maple leaf design, and to amend resolution 44B to accept the Canadian red ensign as the symbol of Canadian membership in the commonwealth. The first proposal would satisfy the vast majority of the Canadian people, particularly the younger generation, who seek a distinctive Canadian flag.

Mr. Churchill: How do you know?

Mr. Brewin: Well, I know only from the letters I have received from young people and from those I speak to, and I can assure you there are a great many of them. But I could be wrong. What I want to say to the house is that in our view a single maple leaf design is the simplest, the strongest and the most distinctive design. Above all, if it were adopted it could not be considered as a one party approach to the problem. I know there are people in all parties, including the official opposition, who would be quite willing to accept this single maple leaf design and get rid of the stigma, if it is a stigma, of its being produced by one political party. That is not the sort of flag which perhaps we should have.

The reasons I give for accepting the Canadian red ensign as the symbol of the commonwealth in place of the union jack are these. We all respect the union jack, but it is the national flag of Great Britain. The modern commonwealth is much more than Great Britain. The Queen is the Queen of Canada as well as the Queen of Great Britain. The red ensign—and in this I may get some mild degree of support from the official opposition—as the letters received by many hon. members including myself indicate, has achieved a measure of recognition and loyalty in the hearts of many Canadians. But the solution which we propose—the adoption by this house of a single maple leaf flag as a distinctive flag for Canada, and the adoption of the Canadian red ensign as the symbol of the commonwealth—would in my judgment achieve a greater degree of acceptance than any other solution and it could be supported, as we have found out, by members of all parties in this house.

I believe the overriding consideration which should affect us all is not the views of our constituents alone, although naturally we take them into account. I believe that what should concern us most is that which will achieve the greatest measure of Canadian unity, and best serve the welfare of Canada as a whole. That is the matter which should inspire us. Therefore I urge that all of us in this house move with all reasonable dispatch, without cutting off the right of anyone who wishes to speak, but speaking with brevity and restraint, to such a solution, which I believe would find favour throughout Canada.

Mr. Chatterton: Would the hon. member permit a question? Would the hon. member not agree that any flag, be it the single maple leaf or some other, in order to be free from any partisan political connotation should have been recommended by a non-partisan committee with a fair degree of unanimity?

Mr. Brewin: If we could start all over again I must say that I think a non-partisan committee would be a good way to start. But I do not think we can remake history. We are now well on our way into a protracted debate in this house of a matter which has been fully discussed all over the country, and I think we should deal with the propositions now before us and deal with them soon.

Mr. E. Nasserden (Rosthern): Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate all those who have taken part in this debate and who have participated in helping to define the limits within which the various political parties in this

house are dedicated to national unity. Indeed, sir, there are those who by their silence have revealed a wholesome awareness that democracy still tugs at the hearts of Canadians. It is a reminder to all of us that Canadians have a depth of feeling for and appreciation of national purpose, so much discounted by our press and by many of our fair weather politicians. I would be surprised that anyone should dare suggest that this was a matter to be disposed of in haste lest we all repent it later. I shall have something further to say later in my speech regarding the remarks made by the hon. member for Greenwood.

The forging of national unity and national purpose is no mean task requiring anybody to placidly admit or yield or concede without question the traditions of our heritage. The resolution before us authorizing a distinctive flag for Canada, with the amendment and subamendment, should have brought us to one of those happy, joyous, inspiring moments of our history. It should be a moment of mutual confidence, appreciation, trust and respect.

I say to you, sir, what a pity that is not the case today. I think of the Prime Minister, a man of reputation, a Nobel peace prize winner. I think of his zealous claims as to his devotion to diplomacy. I think of this minority government and the opportunity allowed him to share with all Canadians the choice and popularity of a national emblem. I remember the boasts made by his colleagues in his party during the election campaign that this was a man who cared about his country and its people. I think of those first few brave words of his in regard to this matter, that there would be a free vote in parliament.

Thinking of these things, sir, I also think of his threat of a general election should his party fall on this issue. I am reminded of those other careless acts committed by this government. This ill-fated parliament, born of minorities and intrigues, is witnessing another of those acts of carelessness which so vividly portray the petulance of the present Prime Minister.

We might well have overlooked that in itself, in the normal course of events had parliament been given an opportunity to fulfil the function for which it was created, the orderly dispatch of the business of this country. This measure before us was not a part of the planned program of this government for this session. Suddenly several weeks ago it was thrust upon us as a challenge to a general election. This party in the official opposition has no confidence in the present Prime Minister or his government, but we did not challenge the government to a general election. That challenge came from the lips of the Prime Minister. My leader, Right Hon. John G. Diefenbaker, and all of us on this side of the house deplore this interruption of the business of the parliament of this country.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nasserden: By the same token we on this side of the house cannot neglect our duties even in the face of the blatant threat of the Prime Minister. We have said before, and I wish to say again today, that in comparison with the urgent and vital problems facing Canadians, this appears to be a most trivial manoeuvre undertaken by the Prime Minister. There are compelling reasons, sir, to believe that this manoeuvre is the most provocative in all Canadian history. Several months ago I indicated in this house that it was apparent that this is the most careless prime minister in Canadian history. Events since then have confirmed and strengthened that belief. Indeed, a few days ago I was not surprised to hear the hon. member for Leeds credited with drawing attention to the fact that this was also a stubborn prime minister.

I ask you, sir, what has that carelessness on the part of this Prime Minister cost in terms of national unity? That question can be measured in part by the increasing cost of living borne by every household and by the multiplying burdens of those in distressed circumstances wherever they reside in Canada. That, sir, is only a small part of the cost, measured in frustration, that has been occasioned parliament, which has labelled this as one of the most unproductive parliaments in Canadian history, and which throughout its course has revealed the chief magistrate of this house as most irresponsible in the performance of his duties. The attitude taken at the time of the first Gordon budget and maintained here in the aftermath of that catastrophic event, paved the way for the present impasse.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Nasserden: Those weak, misguided and indeterminate groups, the third, fourth and fifth opposition parties, have encouraged that carelessness in this house.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I certainly do not like to interrupt the hon. member's interesting speech, but if he could restrict himself to the subamendment it would be very much appreciated.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I should like to speak on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Your Honour listened to a speech by the hon. member for Greenwood who time after time departed from the subamendment. Surely the same rule should have applied to him. I say that with great deference.

An hon. Member: What about the Minister of Trade and Commerce?

Mr. Diefenbaker: The Minister of Trade and Commerce yesterday afternoon, when I was not in the house, made a gratuitous attack on me, but when I came in he said no more.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure that hon. members will appreciate the difficulty of defining relevancy. I was a little upset at the course that the remarks of the hon. member for Greenwood were taking, but he seemed to tie them in at the end. I have been listening very carefully to the hon. member for Rosthern, and I hope he is going to do the same thing.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, may I speak on the point of order. I should like to draw your attention to the fact that last night the member for Quebec-Montmorency dealt with sales tax, nuclear arms and a scout jamboree held in Greece. Surely if hon. members are to be called to order in this house the rules should apply equally to all hon. members, and not just to a special selected group.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Let me make it clear. I have not called the hon. member to order. I just suggested that if he could confine himself to the subamendment he would be very helpful indeed.

Mr. Byrne: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Byrne: It may be difficult to define relevancy in respect of the speech by the hon. member for Rosthern, but I think if we look closely we can find one rule which you may be able to enforce, and that is the rule in respect of a member reading his speech.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Byrne: It is apparent that the hon. member is reading his speech word for word, as has been done by so many other members in the course of this debate.

Mr. Starr: Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak to the same point of order. I had no intention of doing so, but because of the interjection just made by the hon. member for Kootenay East, who has the gall to bring to your attention the fact that hon. members are reading their speeches, I must say that he himself cannot even deliver a speech in this house without reading it.

Mr. Byrne: Mr. Speaker, I have no argument with what the hon. member may say in respect of whether my speeches are good or bad, but I can say that I have been in the house since 1949 and have not read one speech in all that time.

An hon. Member: That is far too long.

Mr. Byrne: Perhaps I have not delivered a good speech, but neither have I read one.

Mr. Speaker: In an attempt to settle the issue may I say that in my opinion the hon. member for Rosthern is merely referring to his valuable notes.

Mr. Nasserden: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I really appreciate your assistance, because I intend to tie together the ends I have left so far and some others I wish to refer to, bringing my argument to bear on the very matter before the house at the present time. I must say that I have yet to hear the hon. member for Kootenay East make a speech in this house. I dare him to make a speech in this house on this particular issue.

When I was interrupted to receive your valued advice, Mr. Speaker, I was about to indicate how the third, fourth and fifth opposition groups in the House of Commons have individually and severally contributed to that sense of security within which the Prime Minister has sought to satisfy his search for a place in Canadian history. Each of these groups in turn has risen to save the face of the Prime Minister and his minority government. I think it should be noted, and I direct these remarks through you, sir, to the hon. member for Greenwood, that it was the N.D.P. members who were so zealous in this regard at the time of the vote on the first budget, when the first revealing indication of the ineptitude of this government was given. They sat in their places and refrained from expressing an opinion, the only opinion that could have affected the course the Prime Minister might have taken at that particular time.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member addressed a question

to me which I would be very glad to answer, but it seems to me to be totally irrelevant. Therefore I think I will not answer it now.

Mr. Nasserden: Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of phony points of order, but that is not even a phony one. Thus it is that the time of parliament has been frittered away by cabinet ministers who are not required to do their homework. Budgetary items and legislative items have been presented prematurely.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Nasserden: Valuable time has been consumed and the study of government proposals has been a fruitless wasteland.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I assume these are rather rambling introductory remarks to the subamendment. Would the hon. member please get to the subamendment as soon as he can? In saying that I am simply trying to enforce the order of the house.

Mr. Nasserden: Mr. Speaker, that is my desire, and I want to point out that this matter raises the whole question of national unity in this country and the strains and stresses that are in effect in various sectors of this nation today. Surely at this time when the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) has placed so much emphasis on this important matter we are not to be debarred from bringing in the background of what has taken place that has brought parliament to the impasse in which it finds itself today. Everyone in this country knows that the real and tangible problems of Canadians have been left almost untouched. In no province has this carelessness been felt more acutely than in the fair province of Quebec. Farm conditions in that province have deteriorated—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Nasserden: —below those which prevailed when this government came to office. Unemployment has become a spectre—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order.

Mr. Nasserden: —in large areas of that province—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. I certainly do not want to interrupt the speech which the hon. member is making. It may well be that in certain phases of this debate the remarks he is now making might well be in order, but at this particular phase I think it is necessary for him to adhere fairly closely to the terms of the subamendment, and I would ask him to do so.

Mr. Nasserden: Mr. Speaker, I assure you that if we are to deal with the subamendment we have to deal with the factors that are present in this nation today before we can decide on what should be presented to the Canadian people in a referendum or plebiscite for them to make a decision. I was about to say that as a result of what has taken place unemployment had become a spectre in a large part of the province of Quebec, when the rest of the nation is booming. We have heard an arrogant discounting of the seriousness of the situation by cabinet ministers across the way. All of these things have contributed to that feeling of neglect that is so evident and so widespread in the province of Quebec at the present time.

There is another disservice that has been committed against the province of Quebec, a disservice that has been nurtured by the Prime Minister and his colleagues in the cabinet as they have gone about the country emphasizing the divisions, emphasizing the suspicions, emphasizing the prejudices, all of which has resulted in a further isolation of Quebec from the rest of Canada. We in this party, the official opposition, deplore that measure of encouragement that has been given the advocates of separation by these thoughtless, immature manoeuvres shared by almost every member of the cabinet opposite.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Nasserden: Into that divisive atmosphere this careless Prime Minister has thrust this resolution, contemptuously seeking to drive the wedge of division even to the point of an election if necessary, all that coming from a Nobel peace prize winner, all that coming from a diplomat, all that coming from a man who was said to care for his country and his people. I say to you, sir, that this is one of the most pitiful, one of the most shameful manoeuvres ever undertaken by a Canadian prime minister. It is also the single most irresponsible action in Canadian history ever given priority over urgent domestic issues.

Mr. Byrne: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Nasserden: It is held out to Quebec as a shelter against the outrage of promises unfulfilled by successive Liberal administrations.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. The hon. member for Kootenay East on a point of order.

Mr. Byrne: Before you came to the chair, sir, I drew to the attention of Mr. Speaker that the hon. member was reading every word of his diabolical speech. I think there should be a ruling on this point at this time. I would ask that the Sergeant-at-Arms go and stand beside the hon. member to determine whether or not the hon. member is reading his speech.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Ricard: I think you are irresponsible.

Mr. Churchill: You had better give the fascist salute.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order.

Mr. Nasserden: This measure is held out as a gesture to Quebec—

Mr. Favreau: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Nasserden: —as a shelter against the outrage of unfulfilled Liberal promises.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. The Minister of Justice on a point of order.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, it seems quite clear that the way into which the hon. member who has the floor is engaging at the moment has nothing whatsoever to do with the subamendment. The discussion on the subamendment must, as has been ruled, assume that the amendment would carry, and what the hon. member is doing at the moment is denying the fact that the question of the flag ought to be dealt with at all. Personally I must add quite frankly that the rule to the effect that it is not appropriate to read speeches has never appealed to me. That is my personal opinion. I think it is a good thing at certain times for members to be allowed to prepare written statements so they may state carefully what they wish to tell the house. However, here is one example of the fact that the rule is appropriate sometimes because the hon. member, not being able to depart from his text, cannot abide by the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. Pugh: Mr. Speaker, we have just heard from the Minister of Justice but I noticed yesterday that when the Minister of Trade and Commerce was directing that famous tirade against us the Minister of Justice pounded his desk, even though much of what was said by the Minister of Trade and Commerce was totally irrelevant. I also noticed that the same thing applied when the hon. member for Greenwood was speaking this afternoon. The minister was pounding his desk at a time of total irrelevancy. I say that what is fair for one should be fair for the other. The Minister of Trade and Commerce certainly was reading his speech most of the time, but I am not worried about that. I am talking about irrelevancy.

Mr. Favreau: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, in all fairness the hon. gentleman will remember that I said personally I did not disagree with the reading of speeches, and approved of it so that members could more carefully prepare their notes. However, I also said that in some cases the fact of being glued to a text and not being able to depart from it may prevent a member from abiding by the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. Coates: Is that why you did not object to the Minister of Trade and Commerce?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. Members of the house are all aware that the reading of speeches is not conducive to the best form of debate, but there are times when a member has to refer to notes that he has in his possession. I am somewhat more concerned at the moment with the content of the hon. member's speech than I am with the extensive notes to which he appears to be referring. I know the hon. gentleman will agree with the Chair when I say to him it is at times very difficult to draw a hard and fast line of relevancy, but in view of the subamendment and the ruling by the Chair, confirmed by the house the other day, I am sure the hon. gentleman recognizes that, having made his introductory remarks, he should now continue with remarks which are relevant to the subamendment. May I ask him again to assist me in seeing that this is done?

Mr. Skoreyko: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker; on reading the speech of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp) in yesterday's *Hansard* I notice that, as reported on two pages, he was brought to order at least three times. A minister of the crown deviating from the subamendment, as he did yesterday, would seem to me to be a course of action which it would be all right for the rest of the members of the house to take. Since the minister was not ruled against yesterday, and since the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) was not ruled against today, I cannot honestly understand how Your Honour could

ask the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Nasserden) to restrict his speech precisely to the subamendment.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Plourde: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. There is a difference as far as hon. members of the other parties who spoke are concerned: they were not dealing with the amendment to the amendment, but were rightly protesting against the filibuster which Conservative members are staging.

Members of the other parties were discussing the filibustering tactics of the Conservatives which is pure nonsense in the eyes of the people. In fact, that party has shown by its actions that it is the most separatist party. It is a fact that it is trying to set our two racial groups against each other.

I think representatives of the other parties in the house should try, and this is important, to calm down members of the Conservative party who are still keeping us here in the middle of August.

[*Text*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): With reference to the point of order raised by the hon. gentleman, when the Minister of Trade and Commerce was speaking yesterday I happened to be in the Chair, and if the hon. gentleman will look back over *Hansard* I think he will see I asked him to do the same thing as I am now asking the hon. member for Rosthern to do. If we are going to have any order in debate we have to abide by the rules that the house has given to the Chair, and which the Chair is now trying to encourage hon. members to follow. I would think that the hon. member for Rosthern could continue now, and I hope he will make remarks that are relevant to the subamendment.

Mr. Nasserden: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised at the Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau). He has shown a facility during the life of this parliament to seize the rules to stifle debate and prevent the expression of opinion in this house. Always he likes to hold a gun to your head, as he did prior to the Easter recess. I do not intend to be intimidated by his repeated undermining of the purpose of the rules. The rules were not made to facilitate the government itself. The rules were made for the House of Commons and its members, and I would suggest that this minister of the crown is one of those handicaps the Prime Minister has had to contend with in trying to get business through the House of Commons.

The Minister of Justice might well listen to the opposition. He might well open the door to his own backbenchers to take part in this debate.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rondeau: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order—

[*Text*]

Mr. Nasserden: I am not surprised—

Mr. Rondeau: On a point of order—

Mr. Nasserden: —that the Prime Minister—

Mr. Rondeau: On a point of order—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. Will the hon. gentleman sit down please. May I ask the hon. member for Rosthern to continue his remarks on the subamendment in relation to the questions that should be contained in a plebiscite for the flag.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rondeau: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I would ask you to refer to standing order No. 34, paragraph (2), of the House of Commons.

> 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.

Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to apply this standing order in the case of the hon. member who has the floor now.

[*Text*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. The Chair is well aware of the standing order to which the hon. member refers, and I am sure the hon. member would wish to leave it in the hands of the Chair as to whether or not this standing order should be applied. At the moment I am just encouraging the hon. member for Rosthern to make remarks that are relevant to the subamendment before the house at the moment.

Mr. Nasserden: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When the interruption took place I was about to mention those new frontiers of development and achievement that Canadians in every part of the country are looking toward today. I wanted to say that the province of Quebec is no different from any other province in that respect, except perhaps in the

magnitude and complexity of the particular problems involved in the retention of continuity of things that are of greater importance in that part of Canada than in many other parts of the nation. I do not know why members on the government side want to deny me the right to say that, particularly the Minister of Justice.

In trying to come to the meat of the amendment and subamendment we should take a look at our history. I do not think there is a more romantic chapter in our history than that of French exploration and settlement in Canada. The church, of course, carried much of the early work in New France. In reading our history we cannot help but acknowledge the contribution made by both Protestant and Roman Catholic missionairies who were the first to recognize fully the importance and the significance of the discovery in North America.

At that time both France and Great Britain were enterprising nations competing for world commerce. The struggle for supremacy in North America is one of the intriguing stories of world history, and none of us need feel too much ashamed of the struggle that took place. Nor should we ever sell short the destiny that the results of that struggle gave to Canadians. That history is the story of the development of self-government. Nor should it ever be forgotten how tortuous the road might otherwise have been had it not been for the decision of the 13 colonies to establish an independent republic south of the border.

Indeed, sir, all of these events influenced and shaped the commonwealth of nations that is the great heritage that Great Britain will leave to the ages. I like to think that the union of French and British Canadians contributed something worth while to the development of the commonwealth as we know it today, despite the competition between the commerce, ambitions and achievements of both the mother countries.

The pioneers came to mark and hack out a new world. Many of them wanted to free themselves and future generations from the old controversies, the old traditions and old prejudices that had failed to fulfil their hopes in the lands of their origin. All of us sometimes regret the restrictions which are allowed for only a limited and somewhat token achievement of the destiny which should be ours. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that despite this fact, Canada is still a land of hope and promise, and I am convinced it is also a land of hope and glory.

Many of the restrictions to which I have referred have been the product of compromise. During the past 97 years a new factor has enriched our national life. Thousands and thousands of new Canadians have chosen to dedicate their lives and their toil to the building of this nation. These people have come from many lands. These people have a varied background. They and their families today comprise more than a third of the population of Canada. These people are anxious to be recognized as Canadians, without any prefix or qualifications. National unity, for them, is a simple matter. They seek no special privilege. They seek only the guarantee of equality within this nation with the rest of the people of Canada. Those new Canadians who have settled in the old province of Quebec have been quick to respond to the atmosphere and environment of that province, as have Canadians who settled in other parts of the country where the response has been equally harmonious. These people recognize that more important than the origin of their neighbours is the spirit of their neighbours.

It is natural that an emerging and developing nation should have growing pains. This does not mean that our foundations should be discarded and forgotten. The founding influence of France and Britain cannot be washed from our history. It is a matter of fact. The battle of the plains of Abraham defined a new challenge for those who would inhabit the area comprising our country. The decision on Queenston heights held a measure of victory for all who claimed this territory as their home. As a consequence, French Canada was able to exert an influence in the developing commonwealth and in world affairs which might otherwise never have presented itself.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Nasserden: The Act of Union of 1867 was an act of convenience not without some measure of tolerance and compromise—

Mr. Byrne: Subamendment.

Mr. Nasserden: —and it has changed, or, rather, Canada has changed in the intervening years. The importance and significance of a united nation north of the forty ninth parallel is more vital today than it was a century ago. The challenge of tolerance and compromise is still with us though the means have changed and the purpose has, to some extent, changed as well. We who are new

Canadians are impatient with those, whatever their origin, who live in the shadows of suspicion sipping the poison of prejudice and division. We deplore the treachery of those who have lived to nurture the narrow ambitions of political parties. What I have to say in this regard is not poetry. It is the chronicle of a political party which has for more than 50 years sought to isolate Quebec and French Canada and to treat French Canadians as their private preserve.

An hon. Member: Shame.

Mr. Nasserden: Who has not heard the proud boast of the Liberal party, particularly during election campaigns or times of stress, that they alone were capable of representing Quebec and French Canada? I have heard it in my constituency and I say that this tactic has mutilated national unity. I would have hoped that the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) would have learned something from the slogan of the Creditistes—"You have nothing to lose".

An hon. Member: By listening to you.

Mr. Nasserden: That slogan, and its temporary acceptance in the province of Quebec, indicates the extent to which the past 50 years of Liberal appeals has borne fruit, as far as the people of that province are concerned. I find it difficult to believe that ministers who have gone up and down this country during the last two years feeding the fires of isolation could be unconscious of the effect this would have on national unity in Canada. My sympathies are with the people of the province of Quebec. I see the cry of separation as a cry against the treachery of the Liberal party, rather than as a cry against other Canadians. The results of the actions taken by this government have been most divisive and most provocative, and I ask you, Mr. Speaker: Is this the kind of leadership we need in this country today.

An hon. Member: Never.

Mr. Nasserden: Is this the action of a man who cares? Is this what we expect from a Nobel peace prize winner? Is this the policy—

An hon. Member: No.

Mr. Smallwood: On a point of order, the hon. member for Kootenay East (Mr. Byrne) has been sitting in his seat throughout this debate making interruptions and reading his paper. Last night, when the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Fane) a veteran of two world wars, a man who carries the scars of one of them, was speaking, he did not have enough courtesy to keep quiet—

Mr. Byrne: I have sat here with some restraint, Mr. Speaker, since drawing to your attention the fact that the hon. member has been reading his diabolical diatribe word for word, and now another member has brought the matter to my attention I ask you once again to rule on the question of whether the hon. member is, or is not, reading a speech which has been prepared elsewhere. He is uttering words which he neither understands nor can he pronounce.

Mr. Smallwood: On that point of order, the minister not only read his speech but he released it to the press before he read it. We should like to hear the hon. member get up and read one instead of being afraid to do so.

Mr. Byrne: I should like to read citation 144 of Beauchesne's fourth edition. As far as I am concerned, there is no question but that the hon. member is reading his speech word for word. I can see he is doing so. I can see him turning the pages as he reads. Citation 144 states:

> **It is a rule in both houses of parliament that a member must address the house orally, and not read from a written, previously prepared speech for the reason that, "if the practice of reading speeches should prevail, members might read speeches that were written by other people, and the time of the house be taken up in considering the arguments of persons who were not deserving of their attention."**

It is my contention that one person has been writing most of the speeches we have heard from the other side during this debate. His views should be entitled to a hearing only once during the course of this discussion. As I say, the hon. member is reading his speech word for word. If it were a reasonable speech I might put up with that, but it is a diabolical diatribe against the Prime Minister, and I ask the hon. member to make an oral speech of his own or to leave the chamber.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): It is my submission, Mr. Speaker, that the words used by the hon. member for Kootenay East (Mr. Byrne) are unparliamentary. He should be asked to withdraw the word "diabolical".

Mr. Otto: On the point of order, I wish to deplore the attitude of some of the members on this side of the house as well as in the other corner, as shown by the constant interruption of speakers. Mr. Speaker, you are in the chair; you are paying attention.

If it is the right of anyone in this house to bring a speaker to order, it should be yours, without interruption from other members. I would respectfully ask all members to respect Mr. Speaker, who is listening, paying attention and, we trust, will bring the speaker to order if he thinks it necessary.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Byrne: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member from Toronto takes objection to what I am doing. One only has to refer to Beauchesne again to see that it is the duty of an hon. member to rise and point out to the Chair when the rules of the house are being violated. This I am doing, and I intend to continue to do so as long as the hon. member continues to read such a diabolical speech.

Some hon. Members: Withdraw.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order, please. I think all hon. members of the house know that every member who rises in his place to speak has the right to speak without being interrupted other than by a legitimate point of order or for the purpose of asking a question. The hon. member who is now making a speech has the right to continue without being interrupted. I have also made remarks as to what the house expects of hon. members who are speaking, namely that they should not read their whole speech from a prepared text. I have advised the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Nasserden) that the Chair would expect him to make a speech on his own, even though he did at times have to refer to his notes. I think the hon. member should be allowed to continue although the time allotted to him has expired. Because of the number of interruptions with which he has had to contend, I want to be fair to the hon. member and will allow him a few extra moments.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nasserden: Mr. Speaker, I want first of all to thank you for your ruling. I also want to congratulate the hon. member for York East (Mr. Otto). He has shown himself in this house to be one backbencher across the way who does not knuckle down to the whip on that side of the house.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nasserden: I might also say that I have always made my own speeches and my own notes. While I refer to notes at the present time, I make no excuse for doing so. This is a very important matter, and on the pages of Canadian history each one of us will be recorded—what we say and what we do not say. If the hon. member for Kootenay East (Mr. Byrne) will consider that, he may think about what he should say on this occasion. The subamendment before us—

Mr. Byrne: Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Byrne: I believe I am completely in order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Is the hon. member rising on a question of privilege or a point of order?

Mr. Byrne: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member infers that it is improper of me to draw to Your Honour's attention the fact that he is reading his speech. This is quite in order, and I still contend that the hon. member is reading his speech. I cannot prove it is not his own speech, that he did not write it, but at least I do know and can see with my own eyes that he is reading it word for word.

Mr. Nasserden: Mr. Speaker, the subamendment before us is an appeal for common sense. It asks the Prime Minister to consult the Canadian people as to their wishes in this regard. I ask you, sir, what request could be more reasonable than that, on a matter of such great consequence not only to us but to the generations that will follow in Canada? I ask the Prime Minister, why has he insulted parliament with his "take it or leave it" attitude, reinforced by the threat of a general election?

But there are other questions to which the handling of this matter gives pre-eminence. I ask the Prime Minister, why has he taken unto himself the choice of a national emblem design? I will deal with that design at the proper time, Mr. Speaker, if this measure is proceeded with. In the meantime I would like to put on the record my own stand made in regard to this matter on a former occasion in the House of Commons when a private member's bill was before the house. I refer to the bill brought forward by the then hon. member for St. Boniface:

> I am inclined to believe that the flag of Canada should emphasize that dual personality and preserve it for future generations. This is a matter that is taking on more importance with the passage of the years. As the intermingling of the two great races, and those others included in our third dimension, are gradually and surely changing by a process of erosion and diffusion, the differences that in the beginning seemed so important are today still important because they

are giving this nation a distinctive character and personality before the world.

I referred to some of the new Canadians in these words:

> Many of them fled the old lands of Europe and other continents to escape conditions and circumstances that these institutions have prevented from taking place here in Canada. To many of them the union jack will forever be a reminder of their homeland or birthplace, simply because it represented a haven here in Canada against the old established inequities which had held for them little or limited hope for the future in the land of their birth. To them a Canadian flag without some resemblance to the union jack just does not seem possible.

I went on further to say:

> Whatever the design finally approved by parliament and the Canadian people, it should be a reminder to us of our beginnings as a nation. It should reflect the part that Great Britain played in the development of our institutions. It should also reflect the personality of Canada as it has developed under the enriching influence of French culture. But more than that, it must also reflect the personality of a nation having that third dimension, that of those who chose Canadian citizenship after the destiny of Canada was decided in the articles of confederation.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. I think this might be a good time for me to advise the hon. gentleman that the time allotted to him has expired.

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Nasserden: Mr. Speaker, there were a great number of interruptions.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): I would say to the hon. member for Rosthern that there were quite a number of interruptions, some by hon. members of the house and by the Chair, too, on occasion. I have given the hon. gentleman a fair amount of extra time. However, if the house would agree to giving him another moment or two—

Some hon. Members: No.

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Then I have to advise the hon. member that I think his time has expired, even with the allowance I have made for him.

Mr. Steven Otto (York East): Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure there are no notes on my desk from which it could be presumed that I shall be reading my speech. I am rising to take part in this debate because I feel, as many members here have expressed, this is a very, very important issue. I do not agree with those members or those people who have said this is not an important issue;

nor do I agree with those members who have accused some hon. members on the opposition side of the house of having some motive for their speeches other than that of deep concern for their constituencies and their nation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Otto: I, for one, choose to believe, rightly or wrongly, that everyone who has taken part in this debate has done so with sincerity, integrity and believing that he represents his constituents and speaks for them. It is probably a matter of some surprise that constituents could be divided on this issue, just as this house is, but I sincerely believe this is so.

Some have said that the proposed flag was an appeasement of Quebec. We have heard a denial from the minister that the three maple leaves design was an appeasement of the province of Quebec. Possibly some hon. gentlemen do not believe the minister, but I say now that it was not an appeasement of Quebec. I am not a minister nor likely to be one. Neither have I ever said anything in this house which I did not sincerely believe to be true; and in this case I know it to be true.

Some hon. members, including the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) and others, have said that this flag will divide the country. No flag, sir, will divide a nation that is not already divided; nor will it unite a nation which prefers to live in separate solitudes.

The flag issue is not the real issue here. The subamendment is not the issue either. We are not debating here these four choices. We are not debating whether there should be a plebiscite. We are not really debating the flag. What we are really debating is our national unity, which is a matter of great importance. I think we should recognize that this is what we are really debating.

Accusing fingers have pointed to our side of the house, and it has been said that this is a matter of great excitement; that we are going to excite the people and that this is the wrong time. It is said that this is the time for reason, for calmness, for coolness, sometimes even procrastination. I for one believe in excitement if the issues involved and the theme of it is great. I believe in excitement if it helps to bring to the surface grievances which have existed for some time, and if it helps to solve them. So there is nothing wrong with excitement. As to calmness, reason—that cool, calculated sense which is desired of us—this is not going to be possible in this issue. For as I have said we are dis-

cussing our national unity. We are discussing our destiny. The real issue is our love for our country. It does not take reason to love: It takes heart and guts to love.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp) made a very impassioned speech, and there is no doubt in the world that every word he uttered was a matter of great concern to him. On occasion we have to say what we have to say no matter what the cost. On occasion we have to shed a tear or a drop of blood. But we have to love our nation and the unity of our nation.

At other times we will fear for our nation and be afraid for it, and this brings me to the topic which, as I have said before, we are really discussing. We on this side have wondered how it is that so many people in Canada are staunchly entrenched behind the red ensign, a fact we did not expect, people who would otherwise have fondly and readily welcomed a new distinctive flag. It is because they are afraid, and have gathered under the ensign in fear and apprehension of one thing —the division of this nation. They fear the division and separatism about which they have heard.

Let me review for a moment some of those matters which might have given rise among Canadians in English speaking Canada to such apprehensions, which might have caused the red ensign to become the banner for English speaking reaction, as I believe it has. Let me review some of these matters, not in the light of what we see here, because we have the benefit of listening to speeches made by, for example, the hon. member for Verdun (Mr. Mackasey) and others, which have pointed out that separatism and division is not the clamour of most of the people in Quebec. We know that the cries for separatism and for division are really the mumblings of political idiots and charlatans. But the people of Canada who rely on the newspapers and radio for their information do not know this. They think that this is something which is desired by all of the good people in the province of Quebec. That is not so; but as I say, they do not know it. Let us consider this for a moment. Do not let us consider the acts of violence, but some of the statements of the premier of Quebec regarding the role of French culture. I recall reading in a brief presented to the federal-provincial conference that he stated it is the role, in fact the duty—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. It is of course, extremely unpleasant for the Chair to have to rise, perhaps all too often, to interrupt hon. members in the course of their speeches, but I do feel it is my duty to remind the hon. member of the decision taken by the house the day before yesterday to the effect that, at this stage at least, remarks should be limited to the very specific aspect of the sub-amendment. I would therefore entreat the hon. member to relate his speech to the sub-amendment.

Mr. Otto: Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat what I said at the outset, that we are not really debating the four points of the sub-amendment. I am saying that what is really involved is the question of our national unity, and I am trying to prove to you why. Surely you cannot deny me the right to do this. I have been referring to some of the strange statements which have been made and which might have given rise to fear and apprehension, and this matter will not indeed be solved by the four questions contained in the sub-amendment. These fears and apprehensions have been caused by statements made by the premier of Quebec and his ministers.

Indeed, in this very house the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency (Mr. Marcoux) said in a speech about education that there are two official races in Canada. What are we non-official Canadians to think about this? Is there some cause for concern in the rest of Canada among the six million who are supposedly non-official Canadians? I should like the house to consider the economic policies of Quebec, especially in connection with giving preference to business. I am not dealing with efficiency, but strictly provincialism. I want to review all of the things which in all fairness lead one to the conclusion that at the present time there is not a national political party in this house. I could refer, for example, to some of the strange statements made by the group on Your Honour's far left. All of this has led to apprehension and fear in Canadians. And fear for what? For national unity and for all we so vigorously seek.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that we are united, that we do have a feeling of identity and unity. Otherwise we would not be objecting. No one would object. Therefore it is our duty at this time throughout the course of this whole debate, not just when discussing the four questions, to state emphatically and irrevocably that this unity shall be preserved. Then the support behind the red ensign will fall. There is no reason for it at all except fear, and it is up to this house to show this. It is not enough to hear from the treasury benches that in all probability there will be

no separatism or division because it is not economical or feasible.

I think it was a perversion of the national feeling for the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas) to recommend to this house that a committee be formed to study the effects of separatism. Division and separatism are not subjects for study, even academically. In this 97th year of our life we should be able to take for granted that this country is united and will always be united, and that there is no other choice or possibility of choice. In that way, sir, there would be no need for this subamendment or a plebiscite. There would be no need for support for the red ensign, as there obviously is at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, I have said time and time again that I do not acknowledge or recognize any form of division in this land. I should like to say that unless this House of Commons proclaims that this nation is united and that the provinces shall be united for better or for worse, and will so remain. Such action would be followed by adverse reaction, until militant action will be followed by militant reaction. At that time we would have only one choice; to choose sides and wait.

Mr. Speaker, I support a new and distinctive flag, and will do so if it comes to a vote. I support the three maple leaves design because I am not afraid of division or separatism in this country. I am not afraid because I will not tolerate such division or separatism. I will not tolerate in my mind even a suggestion of division. I would not even consider a thousand reasons produced by a special committee why separatism is feasible. I will not listen to even one member of this House of Commons who declares the possibility or advisability of separatism. I am not afraid to support the new distinctive flag on the basis of that feeling.

In conclusion may I remind hon. members of what we have done during the course of this debate, by amendments and subamendments. When the resolution was first proposed the idea caught fire from coast to coast. Every Canadian, whether naturalized yesterday, or whose forefathers have lived here for 300 years, was concerned. During this debate we have, little by little and bit by bit, abused this great idea and converted it into a plaything for all the members of this house. We have degraded this great idea and converted it into a cudgel that one right hon. gentleman may use to hammer at the head of the other. We have turned this great debate into an internal palace dialogue which only we can understand. We have left the people of Canada completely on the outside and they have now lost patience with us. They do not understand the temper of this debate. We are going to lose their respect, as they have lost respect for this house.

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.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Chapleau): Mr. Speaker, the few suggestions I will make to the house this afternoon, concerning the amendment and the amendment to the amendment moved in regard to motion 44(A) asking for a referendum, are not intended to extend unduly this debate, but rather to put forward the views of my constituents on the matter, as well as the views of my own party on the amendment and on the amendment to the amendment.

Mr Speaker, this debate on a really Canadian distinctive flag will, at least, have served to bring to the fore Conservative members whom we had never heard before, because yesterday, for instance, we saw and heard for the first time in the house this session the hon. member for Portage-Neepawa (Mr. Enns).

Mr. Speaker, this debate gives us an idea of what eternity will be like. Except for one or two, the speeches made by the Conservatives and their leader did nothing but pit one race against the other and they give us quite a true picture of what eternity will be like in hell.

Mr. Speaker, to say that I am against consulting our electors on important matters would not be true because with regard to the flag, I took the initiative of sending a letter to all the family heads in my riding, asking them what they thought. The 3,500 replies I received, in addition to the numerous conversations I had with people personally or by telephone every week end in my riding, enabled me to know the general opinion of my electors on that matter. Mr. Speaker, I feel that if the Conservative members had acted thus, they would not have to evade their responsibilities by calling for a plebiscite.

Some hon. members would like the motion to be referred to a parliamentary committee. In my opinion, that suggestion is unacceptable and is no solution, because the next time the

matter would be raised in the house, we would have to start all over again.

This debate has to be brought to a conclusion as quickly as possible and the problem must be solved without delay. Let us put an end to this discussion and carry on with the nation's business. We have been elected to represent our respective ridings and our countrymen. Let us discharge the responsibilities with which we have been entrusted.

For some weeks now, the administration of the country has been bogged down by the slow progress of parliament's business which is due to the systematic filibustering of the Conservatives. The house is losing considerable time listening to the empty speeches of the Conservatives who call for a plebiscite to determine whether the Canadian people are in favour of the red ensign, of a modified version of the red ensign which would include the main symbols of the two founding races, a three-leaved flag or a flag with only one maple leaf.

Why does the amendment to the amendment stop there?

Mr. Speaker, day after day and week after week, we have been getting and are still getting numerous suggestions about the flag design. Most models are quite interesting and would be truly acceptable. Why should they not be included in the referendum? Why limit the choice to four designs?

Some Conservative members told me that they would be ready to accept a flag showing the union jack, the maple leaf and the fleur-de-lis. Someone told me, one day, that a flag should not be a collection of "imperial botanical specimens" including the maple, the thistle, the rose and the lily.

Mr. Speaker, a referendum on that matter would be useless and unfair to the Canadian people; it would only divide the country even more. While the Conservatives persist in stretching the debate on the flag—

Mr. Vincent: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question—

Mr. Laprise: —Canadians suffer unfairly—

Mr. Vincent: May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Laprise: Yes.

Mr. Vincent: The hon. member for Chapleau said that Conservative members are bent on having this debate go on for ever. Could he tell us how many members of the Ralliement Créditiste have spoken in this debate so far. What percentage of the total number? Could he tell us also whether that percentage is larger or smaller than the percentage of Conservative members who spoke on this matter?

Second question. How much time did the house spend some time ago to settle the internal problem of the Social Credit which was by far less important than the national flag issue?

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Speaker, to answer the first question asked by the hon. member for Nicolet-Yamaska, I may say that if he had intelligently followed the discussion, he would know that I am the first member of the Ralliement Créditiste to take the floor on the matter of a referendum, on the amendment and on the subamendment.

One thing that I find strange and quite ridiculous, is that the leader of the Conservative party moved himself an amendment to the main motion 44(A) and not being satisfied—he probably made an error and recognized it—his party moved an amendment to that amendment. That is the most ridiculous and most stupid thing I have seen in this house.

As far as the second question asked by the hon. member is concerned, I shall reply this: not only in the interest of the house, but also in the interest of the whole country, it was much more important, for the future of the nation, to ascertain where the Ralliement Créditiste should sit in this House of Commons than to discuss the flag issue as it is being discussed now.

Mr. Speaker, Canadians are going through an economic crisis comparable to that of the thirties, before the last world war. We are living through a similar crisis: the farmers and the workers, especially those in eastern Canada, are made to suffer unfairly from that situation. And the Conservatives persist in preventing measures which could remedy that situation from being presented to the house.

Unemployment is undeserved—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I listened with much interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Chapleau, but it seems to me that by referring to this debate, to the number of speakers who participated and to points of that nature, he strayed away from the subject matter under consideration, that is the amendment and the amendment to the amendment, and I would ask him to come back to the subject matter before the house.

Canadian Flag

Mr. Vincent: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. In order to be—

An hon. Member: —to be what?

Mr. Vincent: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege because the hon. member for Chapleau referred to certain things which I shall not mention, except his statement to the effect that yesterday the hon. member for Portage-Neepawa was taking part for the first time in a debate this session. In that connection, I should like to refer him to page 107 of the index of *Hansard,* French edition.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member will admit that he is certainly not rising on a question of privilege. If he feels that certain remarks of the hon. member for Chapleau are incorrect, he will have the opportunity to take part in the debate and to reply himself.

Mr. Vincent: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member was not in the house earlier. I am sure that if the hon. member for Portage-Neepawa had been in his seat a few minutes ago—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Could the hon. member resume his seat? I appreciate the point the hon. member for Nicolet-Yamaska is trying to make but if later the hon. member for Portage-Neepawa wants to make a correction to the remarks made by the hon. member who now has the floor, he will have an opportunity to do so. Even if he has already spoken, he will be able to take part in the debate a second time to make the correction he wants to make.

Mr. Laprise: I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your remarks and your advice on that matter but you will admit just the same that I was led afield by the remarks made by the hon. member for Nicolet-Yamaska. Here is what I want to point out about his question of privilege. About the hon. member for Portage-Neepawa—and I checked the index of the debates of the House of Commons—I did not find his name anywhere.

Now, to revert to the subject of the sub-amendment, I would like to say in conclusion —not because I was intimidated by the remarks and the interjections which were made, but because I did not intend to speak at length—that Canadians—I received many letters and comments in answer to the personal inquiries I made in my riding—or most of them do not insist so much on a particular flag design, but rather on a distinctive flag, which will represent all sections of Canada.

What Canadians ask especially is not so much a red flag, a blue flag or a white flag including all kinds of flowers or symbols one can think of, but rather a small green flag with figures on it, which would enable them to buy the things they need to give their families a decent living.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that instead of continuing this debate indefinitely, we should adopt the distinctive Canadian flag, settle this matter once and for all and then revert to the business of the house in order to introduce pieces of legislation likely to solve the problems facing the Canadian nation today.

[*Text*]

Mr. Enns: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I am told that the previous speaker said that my speech yesterday was my first intervention in debate on the floor of the house. I would merely refer the hon. member to the index of *Hansard* where he will see that there are some 14 or 15 entries under my name. In fact to be exact there are 22.

Mr. D. V. Pugh (Okanagan Boundary): Mr. Speaker, it was most refreshing to hear the speech of the hon. member for York East (Mr. Otto) today and it makes what I have to say a good deal easier. I should like to ask that member, however, to concentrate his thoughts on what is the real reason for the division in Canada today. What has brought about the trouble of the moment? There is no question in my mind that the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) is the prime mover behind it all. What I have to say today makes me a little annoyed, because in an offhand remark earlier today which the Prime Minister should never have made he used the word "filibuster".

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

An hon. Member: Shame.

Mr. Pugh: It is all right for you over there to say "shame" but I am the one who is saying "shame" and I intend to make my speech. I simply want to refer the Prime Minister to his original remarks in this debate when he emphasized the fact that he wished every member to make his contribution. To my mind it is totally unreasonable for him in an offhand way to try to deny us our rights as representatives of our constituents and to use scare tactics by referring to a filibuster. I wanted to make those comments before proceeding with my main remarks.

My purpose in speaking today is twofold. First, I believe quite sincerely that the Prime Minister has put the Liberal party in a rather poor position. My second point is that in my own humble way I would like to offer a few suggestions and if possible give him a little help, because if he does take my advice, ultimately he will be helping Canadians.

At this stage in the debate we are on the subamendment moved by the hon. member for Regina City (Mr. More) which without reading it into the record, says that in any plebiscite there will be contained questions on four flags, the red ensign, a modification of it, the government's proposed flag or a modified form of the government's proposed flag.

Mr. Churchill: That is the N.D.P. proposal, the last one.

Mr. Pugh: Yes, the N.D.P. proposal. The government has got itself into a rather impossible position brought about by a so-called mandate. Speaking for my own constituency, I know that no such mandate was sought. The first we heard of it was a rather long and extraordinary series of questions put to the Prime Minister with respect to a new flag. In an election these things are known to the people and eventually they trickled down to British Columbia, where the candidates were asked questions about the flag issue.

I do not know what the Liberal members now in the house said they would do, but I just wonder how the Liberal party can claim in any way shape or form that it actually got a mandate from the people on the flag issue. Prior to the election the Liberal party published advertisements in the newspapers in British Columbia outlining the policy it would follow if returned to office. I shall not make reference to all the things they said they would do, and later on said they would do in 60 days, but have not done. I am looking at this published manifesto of the Liberal party and no reference was made in British Columbia to a new flag. What I have in my hand is a full page advertisement from the Victoria *Colonist* of March 31, and nothing about the ensign was mentioned in it.

However as I have said the news trickled down into British Columbia, and at the election meetings which were attended by the four candidates—Liberal, New Democratic party, Conservative and Socred—we were asked, and I remember it so well, "If a new flag is proposed, would you do away with the red ensign?" The Liberal candidate replied, "You will throw away the red ensign over my dead body."

Mr. Byrne: That fellow isn't here.

Mr. Pugh: He isn't here now, but he was a good Liberal. You may make your speech in your own time. Often enough you read your little book and point out "We shouldn't really interrupt the person who has got the floor and is speaking." My Liberal opponent spoke a lot more sensibly than some members opposite, and said they would only do away with the red ensign over his dead body.

Mr. Moreau: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Pugh: No; afterwards if you like. The government has got itself into a ridiculous position with respect to the red ensign, a position that is untenable.

The second point I wish to make is in reference to the feelings of people in my own constituency. I have received many letters, and a preponderance of them were in favour of the red ensign. In fairness I say I have received some in favour of the government proposal, others who would like a modification of the government proposal and others still who say, "Let us look for another flag altogether." The opinions expressed in the letters were backed up by those I received as I went through my riding.

With regard to polls, I would like to quote from the Penticton *Herald* which conducted a local poll as a direct result of the clamour that was going on over the flag issue. This is the issue of the *Herald* for June 10 last and the heading is, "For ensign 89 per cent."

> Almost 90 per cent of all those *Herald* readers who voted in the flag poll which ended last Saturday backed the red ensign, and this surely is significant. Many red ensign backers even went to the limit in their vehemence by defacing the ballot coupon provided for readers supporting Pearson's maple leaf flag. One reader scrawled across the maple leaf side—"No, no, a thousand times no, I'd rather die than say yes." But most ensigners simply cast their ballot without emotional embellishment.

There is a lot more in this report which is not very favourable to the Liberal party, dealing with the manner in which the flag issue was introduced, but I shall not read that.

We have also had independent Canadian polls, and when I heard the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) say the vast majority of people favour the new flag I thought he might have dropped dead in his tracks. If he knew anything about polls he would know

that in eight out of nine provinces there is a preference for the red ensign.

I next wish to deal with the so-called free vote. These are points on which the government has got itself so far out on a limb that it must do something, and I will have suggestions to make later which I think will be helpful. When you consider a free vote it looks nice. The Prime Minister is a great man for making nice statements right off the bat. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Coates) asked him a question on May 12 as reported at page 3164 of *Hansard*. He asked: What about a free vote; are you going to give us one? Those are not the hon. member's exact words but that is the substance of the question. And the Prime Minister replied—and these are his exact words:

> 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 would be no question of confidence or non-confidence in a party sense.

That is fine. Everyone would say: the Prime Minister is a good boy. It will be a free vote and no party whips will be in evidence. The right hon. gentleman changed that pretty quickly. I think someone else started to talk to him. Anyway, a week later, on May 19, the Prime Minister said the government would stand or fall on the flag question. Well, I sure hope they fall flat on their faces, because, boy, do they deserve it! They have done a most divisive thing. The hon. member for York East (Mr. Otto) was talking over there, and I liked some of the things he said, but he slithered over one little thing. He did not bring out why we were having this divisive thing at the present time. He said Canada is great, we are all here; there is no division; we should all pull together. I agree with him 100 per cent. But he missed one point. The Prime Minister has brought this question before the House of Commons and in all petulancy he says: A free vote? Nothing doing, boys, you are going to sit here until this thing is voted upon. Furthermore, you are going to miss your holidays. Mr. Speaker, I enjoy holidays as much as anyone else though I do not regard time spent in my constituency as a holiday, but rather as a chance to get to know the views of the people in my riding. That is one of the sensible things the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) said this afternoon. I think we would all like to get home, not as I said to have a holiday, but to keep in touch with our constituents.

The hon. member also said a rather silly thing. He said we should be getting on with the other business of this house. I am sorry. We have finished the business which was proposed by the Prime Minister and by the leader of the house over there. We have finished every last scrap with the exception of this flag question. I remind hon. members that we have finished the other business which was before us, and now we should sit until we have finished this, regardless of how long it takes and regardless of loose statements such as the one made by the Prime Minister today regarding a filibuster.

I mentioned the divisive effects of this issue. Many people have spoken on this subject. It is a matter of opinion, depending on what one stands for, how it is treated in this house. There are two sides to every question, but apparently, there are five sides here. I feel strongly enough on this subject to be willing to sit here all through the summer and through the fall if necessary. I couldn't care less, because I feel I am right and that I am speaking for my constituents and for a great many more.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pugh: Let us not divide Canada. Last night I was feeling a little blue because I could not get on the list, there were so many extra speakers. I went upstairs and just before six o'clock I was having a talk with a friend. I asked the question: Who do you think is winning in this flag debate? And he gave me a very sensible answer. He said in answer to my question: Do you think anyone is winning? From that point on we began to discuss the effect of this flag debate on Canada. I rather liked his remarks. They were good. Let us not worry about winning in the House of Commons; let us start worrying about what is happening in our various constituencies throughout Canada.

Who would have thought when we got into this flag debate we would have seen such a variety of feeling? May I quote from an article entitled "Another Slant on Flag Issue" written by the Rev. A. V. Bentum, pastor emeritus of St. Andrew's presbyterian church, Penticton. He is not a man of my faith, but he is a man I respect, and I quote from this article because of its acute and reasoned assessment of certain qualities to which we as Canadians in many instances pay only lip-service. The article is a little long but I think it is necessary for me to read it at this time.

> Few would have suspected, when Mr. Pearson in his election speeches promised to do something in the matter of a distinctive flag for Canada,

that it would have provoked such a variety of feelings when implemented. One cannot help feeling, nevertheless, that it is good to have these feelings brought out where we can look at them.

A large number of Canadians may feel that the matter is a "storm in a teacup". Some have said that they "couldn't care less". Such an attitude is as much to be deplored as the one which rabidly and unreasoningly takes sides. The flag is a symbol of the feeling which binds us together as a people.

No matter how much we may desire to expand nationalism into the wider internationalism, we shall not succeed unless we can learn to feel something positive for each other in the smaller groups. In a culture which exhibits a trend to the impersonal, one becomes apprehensive of this "couldn't care less", attitude. It is, unfortunately, all too prevalent.

Again, there are some who regard the attitude of these Canadian veterans who prefer the red ensign as reactionary, obscurantist and die-hard. The feelings of this group of citizens should not be sneered at, or passed lightly over.

Ties which have bound men together, especially in grim situations and circumstances, are not easily broken or cast aside. Those who have never lived outside the security of their own land cannot know the feelings which such a symbol as a flag can evoke.

We appear to be living in a day and generation when loyalty and veneration for anything, except oneself, is all too rare. Displays of positive sentiment may be considered weak or outmoded. Chivalry and courtesy belong to the dead past.

Violent and destructive feelings are more in evidence in many groups and areas of the world. There seems to be a rebellion against tradition and authority, which could be useful if constructively directed, but with it there seems to go a rejection of discipline.

That very word implies regard for others, since it comes from the same source from which we get the word 'disciple'.

There may be something intriguing about "sweeping the board clean", as it were, and starting out with an entirely new flag design. Is this attitude not too consistent with what we have been saying; the apparent desire to disown one's own history?

Some sections of our society find their ideals and leadership in their own peer groups. They do not want any part with ancestors or past history.

The end results of this are to be seen in the often-lacking idealism, and the failure to profit by past experience, which is really historical perspective.

We in Canada are not a nation without ancestors, past history or historical ties. It must surely be part of a nation's strength to foster and preserve these. It may be the lack of them which causes new nations and cultures to go to emotional excesses in trying to find causes and binding ties. Those nations which have shown strength in the past have usually been the ones which have had respect for ancestors, and venerated their own history.

One hopes that we in Canada, while adding new chapters, through new sons and daughters both natural and adopted, will not discard the heritage that is ours, in a willingness to appear modern, by being cynical about sentimental attachments to the past.

Whether the red ensign should be the flag for Canada or some other, need we obliterate all reference to the cultures which have played such a large part in the making of the nation?

A truly Canadian flag need not be less Canadian in character should it show in its composition some relationship to the flags which so many sons and daughters have loved, fought under and for which they have lived and died.

I am glad I have read that to the house.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: May I interrupt for one moment?

Mr. Pugh: Absolutely. I do not mind.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: When the hon. member began his remarks he indicated that they would be related to the subamendment and I am just wondering whether he is not departing now, to some extent, from that purpose.

Mr. Pugh: Mr. Speaker, I am glad you let me finish putting that on the record. As I said at the beginning of my remarks, this government has got the country in an uproar, and I want to try and do something to help this situation. I related this to the fact that the mandate which was given out with regard to the red ensign—which is No. 1 on the plebiscite—was never a mandate in my riding; it was never a request by this government. In fact, it was directly and distinctly, on more than one occasion, denied by the Liberal candidate who ran against me in the last election. Incidentally, this flag question was raised during a previous election campaign; I believe in 1962. Like many other members in this house at that time, particularly those from British Columbia, I believe there was a denial that the red ensign would ever be taken away from Canada. Have I much time left, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I might advise the hon. member that according to the record I have from the table he has until ten minutes after five o'clock.

Mr. Pugh: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I do not intend to take the full time because I believe I have pretty well covered what I wanted to say. I will now deal with the choices which are offered by this plebiscite, and I want to talk particularly about the red ensign. The red ensign is not a new flag, as some people would have us believe. I do not wish to read too much material into the record, but we all know that up to 1904 —when we had a Liberal government also— the red ensign fluttered over these parliament buildings. It had been flown on parliament hill from the time of confederation until 1904. It is a flag which over a long period of time

—ever since I can remember—I have felt was my own flag, and my friends felt the same way. We used to put it up on my house on May 24, I remember so distinctly. There was never any question that it was Canada's flag. However, in 1904 somebody, on orders from the Liberal party, ran up the union jack. Questions were asked in the house, and finally the ensign, which had been hauled down, was put up again. Canadians had come to regard the red ensign as their flag.

In this connection I often think of one or two men for whom I have a fair regard. I do not mind saying that. An old fraternity brother of mine, Right Hon. Mackenzie King, had no illusions about changing this flag or, I think, about the diversity it would cause in Canada. In fact, when talking to General Crerar when he came back after the war and they drove up to the parliament buildings, he said, "General Crerar, your soldiers have decided one thing; that is, Canada's flag". He was referring to the red ensign which was flying over the parliament buildings. There is another man who many of us feel was a responsible citizen. He was a prime minister of this country, and his name is Louis St. Laurent. That right hon. gentleman said, when approached on the subject of a new flag, that he would not introduce a new flag because it would be too divisive of Canada.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that the feeling that was evident throughout Canada at that time is the feeling that should be evident today. This is a divisive subject. I agree with the hon. member for York East (Mr. Otto), although I may differ as to the end result. The hon. member said we should take a new flag and, quite frankly, I think that was the one fault in a rather good speech. I do not think we should take a new flag at the present time.

An hon. Member: When?

Mr. Pugh: An hon. member said, "When". There could come a time when this is necessary, and no one should ever close the door for ever and ever on any change whatsoever in respect of a nation. My own views on the flag are well known in my constituency. I stand for the red ensign and I have made no bones about this. I think the first letter I received in parliament was asking my views on the red ensign—this goes back to 1958—and I answered that letter just as I have answered every similar letter I have received, whether they have been for or against the red ensign. I always say I stand for the red ensign.

[Mr. Pugh.]

I said, Mr. Speaker, there were two matters that I wanted to bring out in my speech. The first was that this government has got this country into an unholy, divisive mess. Consequently I believe this is a time for a little wisdom to be shown and I wish to offer one or two suggestions. I believe that the flag issue is far too explosive to be decided now. In my opinion the whole question should be stayed pending a very thorough and more mature consideration of this question. This is a time for an appeal to common sense. A plebiscite should finally be held.

I am not in agreement that we should put everything on this plebiscite, in whatever way, shape or form; but I suggest that a parliamentary committee, or a joint committee of the House of Commons and the Senate, be held, and that the previous findings of the earlier committee on this subject should be considered. Incidentally, they were rather fine findings. However, they should be considered by the committee, and it should take a little time on this matter. They should go into everything that has happened in this regard since then, and should pay a little attention, perhaps, to this b. and b. deal that is running around Canada—not that I think much will come out of that. In any event, the committee should consider the results that come out of this royal commission.

Having used the word "finally" in regard to a plebiscite, I would say the committee's findings and recommendations should be put in the form of a plebiscite, preferably containing as few flags as possible. This plebiscite should then be put to the people of Canada. This is my suggestion, Mr. Speaker. It has been made before, but it is one I have felt right from the beginning was a proper suggestion.

I do not think a flag should be forced on Canada. This issue is too highly political in nature and it is divisive in the extreme. In my opinion Canadians should never have been put in this position. Let us not have a "take it, or else" flag. Now is the time—and I am using the words of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp) last evening—for a responsible course to be taken by a responsible statesman. We have in this house different points of view, different forms of approach; and believe me, Mr. Speaker, this is not a time for railroading something through. This is a time for extreme caution, not because of the flag alone but also because of the dangerously explosive situation which exists in Canada. The flag is only one mani-

festation of this explosive situation. We hope that when a flag is decided upon it will be with us forever, and this is no time for undue haste.

Mr. C. E. Millar (Middlesex East): Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in this debate I make no apologies to anyone. In fact, it would appear that the time is fast approaching when those members who do not participate are the ones who are going to have to make apologies, not only in this House of Commons but in their home ridings as well.

In the riding I represent, Middlesex East, I have well over 100,000 sincere Canadian citizens. I am well aware that not all of them favour either side in this issue. I have had many letters from constituents, the large majority of them in favour of the red ensign. Many are in favour of a distinctive Canadian flag; but I have yet to receive one in favour of the Pearson pennant. How can the government of Canada deny to the people of this country the right to express their opinion, as requested by the amendment and the subamendment which have been proposed in this house? Frankly, I favour the retention of the red ensign. This is not unreasonable because I have a typical Canadian background and ancestry.

An hon. Member: What is that?

Mr. Millar: When I say that, I am referring to Scots-Irish. I make no apology. Nor do I belittle any other ancestry in this country.

An hon. Member: What about the Indians?

Mr. Millar: What about them? Are hon. members opposite going to give them a chance to express their views on the flag issue? I think it is true that in every constituency in Canada there is a division of thought. I do not think there is any member in this House of Commons who could stand up and say that all his constituents were in favour, one way or the other. How, then, can the government take a stand and say to the people: "This is what you will have as a flag. This is what you will accept; take it and like it"? This does not make sense. How can this minority government—and I repeat "minority government"—force their choice of a flag on the people of Canada? Is this their interpretation of democracy?

It is quite true that the government of the day would have us believe that they carry a mandate to introduce a new flag in this country. Nothing could be further from the truth. The present Prime Minister came to the city of London during the last election campaign and spoke to a group of over 5,000 people—a Liberal estimate, Mr. Speaker. During his speech to all these sincere Canadians the fact that this government contemplated the destruction of the red ensign was never mentioned. It is very difficult, as many speakers have said, to find any reference to destroying the red ensign and replacing it with another flag. However on turning to the *Globe and Mail,* in a report which carries a quotation from Winnipeg some time in April, 1963 this appears:

> Liberal leader Lester Pearson yesterday rejected the red ensign as Canada's official flag. He told a group of editors of ethnic newspapers that a distinctive Canadian flag should be one that could not be mistaken for the emblem of any other country.

Why did the Prime Minister not tell that to the 5,000 people he spoke to in London, Ontario, if it was part of his platform? It is one thing to promise a distinctive Canadian flag, but it is quite another to come to this parliament and say: "We have decided the flag that the Canadian people will have. This is what we have chosen for you: accept it and like it. Should this house not accept that flag we will be faced with an election".

Mr. Sharp: Parliament will decide, not this party.

Mr. Millar: Yes, with a free vote and a Liberal majority.

Mr. Sharp: No, there is no Liberal majority.

Mr. Millar: Look at your friends to the left. There is no question where they stand.

Mr. Sharp: They are supporting us.

Mr. Millar: I cannot help but think how interesting it will be when the next election comes along and the Liberals, the N.D.P. and the Ralliement Créditistes are all taking the platform and claiming credit for introducing the new flag. I never saw such a group of M.P.s so determined to commit political suicide as we have in the left hand corner of this house. I am wondering whether they are labouring under the illusion that the Liberal party will withdraw the Liberal candidates in their ridings.

If I may return to the *Globe and Mail*—and I think I am getting back to the subamendment—

Mr. Moreau: About time.

Mr. Millar: I do like to hear these interjections from the other side because it indicates that one is getting close to the truth. And it

really hurts sometimes. If I may refer again to the *Globe and Mail*, Mr. Speaker, it does appear that there is still one Tory who writes for that newspaper who has not yet received the hatchet treatment. I refer of course to the columnist Mr. Bruce West, who remains loyal to the red ensign and is not afraid to say so, for which I give him credit. Bruce West in his column for Thursday, August 13, sums up the whole flag issue in one sentence when he says:

> I am sure that many of us who now oppose the scrapping of our present proud flag would be willing to shut up and bow to the will of the majority if a referendum indicated that a new flag were desired by this country.

Further to that, Mr. Speaker, I should like to state my own position, which is simply this. If the people of Canada indicated by a referendum, by a free vote, that they were in favour of any one particular design, I would be prepared to accept that design without even seeing it. This, I believe, is democracy. The majority should rule.

Mr. Moreau: The blind leading the blind.

Mr. Millar: That is what you would have us believe.

Mr. Boulanger: You are hardly supporting the red ensign.

Mr. Millar: Why doesn't the hon. member stand up and say that?

Mr. Boulanger: Yes, I will do that. I say to my hon. friend that he does not stand up so much for the red ensign when he speaks like that, saying that he will accept any flag.

Mr. Millar: What I said was that I myself prefer the red ensign; but if the majority of the people of Canada indicate that they want something else, then I will accept that.

Mr. Moreau: A majority of the house.

Mr. Byrne: Let us have a look at it.

Mr. Millar: It will be the will of the majority. We have to sit and look at you, and you represent the majority.

Mr. Speaker, this is the whole question. What proof is there that the people of Canada want a new flag? What indication has there been of this fact? If the Prime Minister is as brave as he would have us believe, why does he not go to the people of Canada and give them an opportunity to express their opinion? I would love to see some of the hon. members opposite, particularly those from English speaking ridings, squirm when this flag issue is brought up at the next election.

An hon. Member: I did not squirm.

Mr. Millar: You may squirm the next time.

Mr. Starr: What other word could you use to describe it?

Mr. Millar: If the Prime Minister is convinced that the people of Canada are so anxious for a new flag, he should have no fear of providing them with an opportunity to so indicate by a vote; or is it a fact that the Prime Minister, in his manoeuvring, would like to solidify certain necessary elements of support before he takes that gamble?

It is time, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Canada were informed that this flag issue is not holding up the business of this country, or the business of parliament. The Prime Minister himself stood in this House of Commons this afternoon and said that he hoped the flag debate can be terminated so we can consider a well earned recess, and then return to this house and take up the pension legislation and other important business. Why does the press, as well as many other individuals, attempt to lead the people of Canada to believe that we are obstructing the business of this house and this country when it is a fact, as corroborated this afternoon by the Prime Minister, that the business of this session is now completed?

It is openly admitted inside and outside of this house that many people object to placing the union jack on any part of a distinctively Canadian flag. My question, Mr. Speaker, is this: Why were those same people so strangely silent at the time they were happy to accept the protection of the union jack in two world wars? There is no answer to that question.

The union jack and the red ensign represent the basic freedoms everyone in this country enjoys. Those flags denote the reason why many people from all over the world have chosen to come to this country and take the oath of citizenship under the red ensign. Should we be ashamed to display the red ensign as part of any flag of Canada? The answer to that question is no. Should we be ashamed to have the red ensign as part of any Canadian flag? The same answer applies to that question. Should we destroy parliament itself simply because it is patterned after the mother of parliaments at Westminster? If that reasoning is good on one side it must be good on the other side. This must also apply to our whole system of justice.

The whole purport of the amendment, as moved by the right hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker), and the subamendment, as moved by the hon. member for Regina City (Mr. More), is to give the people of Canada an opportunity to express their feelings and wishes. I think that is a democratic practice and we on this side of the house are in support of it.

Mr. Matheson: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Millar: Certainly.

Mr. Matheson: Can the hon. member indicate to this house any democratic country that has adopted a flag through the procedure which has been suggested by the hon. member?

Mr. Millar: I cannot name any country that has done this, but how many countries have had a flag shoved down their throats by one Liberal party? I shall go further, how many countries have had a flag forced upon them by the Prime Minister and a man such as he who is on his feet?

Mr. Matheson: Does the hon. member remember the fashion in which the interim flag that has prevailed since 1945 was selected? It was done by order in council.

Mr. Millar: I support this flag because it is a flag that I love.

Mr. Sharp: Are you going to impose your flag?

Mr. Millar: This flag has already been imposed, and it was a Liberal government that imposed it on the country. I am prepared to accept it. I refer of course to the red ensign.

Mr. MacInnis: Would the hon. member for Middlesex East permit a question?

Mr. Millar: Yes.

Mr. MacInnis: My question is prompted by t.v. commercials. Does the hon. member realize that the remarks being made by the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Dupuis) and the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp) can be likened to television, where there are more commercials than programs?

Mr. Millar: I should like to thank the hon. member for his question, but remind him that this condition is normal.

Mr. Sharp: The hon. members are enjoying themselves.

Mr. Millar: This government is the only government in the history of politics that has 29 different speakers, and every time someone on this side of the house makes a remark they object to, 27 of those speakers shout "order, order". They have not the nerve to stand up on their feet and say what they have to say, but hide behind their hands.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Millar: We love that sort of performance, and we are used to it.

Mr. Sharp: I had 50 members interrupting me yesterday.

Mr. Millar: You are an outstanding speaker. Mr. Speaker, I should like to state I enjoyed the speech made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, but I do not like his attitude when he attempts to convince us that the government has made a decision for us and that we should say nothing more. I do not like his suggestion that the government has made a recommendation, and the Liberal party can make no mistakes, and that we accept their recommendation and keep quiet. I refuse to follow that suggestion.

I intend to conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker—

Miss Jewett: Oh, no.

Mr. Millar: I am sorry to disappoint the hon. member for Northumberland (Miss Jewett). I suggest she would do well to spend some time in her own riding in an attempt to discover the feeling of the Canadian people there whom she is supposed to represent.

Miss Jewett: I just came back from there.

Mr. Millar: I hope you have, and I hope to see you here after the next election.

Miss Jewett: I have news for you.

Mr. Millar: Mr. Speaker, in the entrance hall in front of this chamber there is a bronze statue in honour of one Lieutenant Colonel George Harold Baker, a member of parliament, who gave his life in defence of this country. As a part of this memorial there is a stone tablet upon which is carved a verse from probably the best known of all Canadian poems, which reads as follows:

> 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.

Mr. Moreau: That was not the red ensign.

Mr. Millar: Just listen Moe, and you will get it.

Mr. Speaker, to many Canadians, including myself, that torch is symbolized in the Canadian red ensign. I say that this government is breaking faith with every man or woman who has ever served in armed forces of Canada.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, if this resolution is forced through the House of Commons, then the government should commission the stonemasons working on the building to destroy that tablet, because under this legislation it becomes a mockery.

Thank you.

Mr. Mac T. McCutcheon (Lambton-Kent): Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that not much new can be contributed to this debate—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. McCutcheon: —by a humble backbencher like myself. However, like the previous speaker I make no apology whatsoever for getting to my feet and taking the time of the house. It is my right and my duty as an elected representative, and I am merely acquiescing in the invitation extended to me by the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) of this country. I should like to pause for a second and ask: Who is there in this house to deny me the right to voice my opinion?

Some hon. Members: No one.

Miss Jewett: Who is?

Mr. McCutcheon: The Prime Minister invited us to speak. Yet this afternoon he referred to our participation as a filibuster. Be that as it may, I say in all humility that I hold the forlorn hope that in my humble way I might suggest something that could bring, so far as the greatest number of people in Canada are concerned, a happy solution to this impasse. I should like to say that whatever flag is chosen for this great dominion of ours I will honour and revere it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. McCutcheon: Furthermore, to put hon. members' minds at ease may I say I intend to heed the counsel of the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) who suggested this afternoon that perhaps we should be brief.

I have examined in some detail most of the speeches that have been made in this so-called flag debate. Last Wednesday the hon. member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Winkler) led off and the purport of his remarks was to the effect that we should deport ourselves like gentlemen and members of parliament. Other hon. members have suggested that we should have a free vote. In my humble opinion the fact is that at the present time this is an impossibility because the political machine has whipped the boys into line and I do not honestly think that a free vote could be held.

A further suggestion that appears in reading some of the speeches is that the government might appoint a joint committee of both houses to study the situation. It has also been evident in practically every speech that has been made that there is a heartfelt desire on the part of every member that we should do our utmost to build unity in this country. Another good suggestion was made by the hon. member for Greenwood this afternoon, and I believe he quoted Winston Churchill as his authority. He suggested that members should be allowed to go home and discuss the situation with the people.

Every speech that has been made has contained certain common denominators, first a plea to achieve unity, and second a plea to remove the flag from party politics. Another common thought that has been expressed is that we should let the people themselves decide, as they should in a democracy. This thought is contained in every speech I have read, with the notable exception of one. I was disappointed, indeed I was dismayed, that the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp) was the only one who did not have in his remarks—at least, it was not apparent to me—any idea that the people themselves should decide. His was an unswerving, dictatorial attitude with no give and take. His was the only speech I could discover in which the speaker actually referred to appeasement of Quebec.

I discovered something else in going through these speeches and it is something I do not particularly like, something that pains me a little. I refer to the fact that in so many places references have been made to the Prime Minister and he has been described as being autocratic, petulant, domineering and arrogant because, they say, of his insistence on a vote on the flag before a recess. I do not share these sentiments. I do not believe a man could become prime minister of this country and leader of a large political party unless he was a man of some stature. However I do believe that the Prime Minister is listening to bad advice from some cocky, opinionated advisers and if he persists in continuing to listen to them I feel he must be held responsible. Believe me, Mr. Speaker, this government has no reason to be arrogant or cocky. They have no mandate to force their will on the public. They should listen

to the voice of the people. The government is in just about the same position as I am personally.

An hon. Member: Bankrupt?

Mr. McCutcheon: No, Mr. Speaker, not bankrupt financially, although I must admit I am not blessed with too much of this world's goods. However, the government is in the same position as I am so far as a mandate is concerned. When I get feeling too big for my britches and start to feel quite important as a member of this house, I turn my mind back to the election in April and rediscover the fact that I was elected by the large majority of 24 votes over my closest opponent. Now, this is not the point. In the election there were 931 more votes cast against me than for me, and those people who did not vote for me are entitled to their opinion and I believe I should endeavour at least to consider their viewpoints. This, Mr. Speaker, I propose to do so long as I am able.

I intend to try and be a representative of the people of my constituency and to be considerate of all of them. I would recommend this course to the present government because it is in exactly the same position as I, so far as a mandate is concerned, only it is worse percentagewise. I must realize that out of almost 8 million people casting votes, only 3½ million cast votes for the Liberal party. For these reasons I say consideration and moderation should be the approach of the Liberal party to the flag issue.

Now, Mr. Speaker, heeding the advice of the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) I intend to conclude, and I have just this one last thought to leave with you. I say to the Prime Minister that this is a time for greatness. This is a time for him to stand for democracy. This is his opportunity to rebuff those phony advisers who are leading him down the garden path to oblivion. I say, Mr. Prime Minister, make your own decisions; appoint a committee or have a referendum; do something which will give the people of Canada a democratic chance to pick out their own symbols divorced from party politics.

Mr. Sharp: I have listened to the hon. gentleman's speech very carefully and I would like to ask a question of clarification. Was he advocating a plebiscite or a committee of this house, of members of parliament, to make a decision on the flag? I was not sure which.

Mr. McCutcheon: If the minister will read my speech tomorrow he will see that the door was left open for either one.

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland): Mr. Speaker, on entering this debate for the second time I first wish to comment on the contributions made by hon. members to date. It is my considered opinion that the calibre of the speeches delivered has been of the highest quality during this debate, in fact the highest since I took my seat in 1957. There is good reason for this high calibre. It is because hon. members who have been speaking have been speaking from their hearts, have been speaking with a feeling that is only evident when speaking about symbols that represent your country, your history and your tradition.

We have heard many complaints from newspapers in this country, through their editorial writers, that too often speeches in the House of Commons are as dull as ditchwater and thus unfortunately, too many newspapers have reached a decision to print little or nothing of what is being said in the house on this important matter. I ask, when has the point been reached that the newspapers of this country make an assessment beforehand of what their readers should see and what they should consider?

If the newspapers of this country were realistic, if they were to go out into any group in any area of this country and sit down and talk with the people, they would find that no issue is more important or more discussed at present than this specific flag issue. I have discussed this issue with many people in many areas, and as a result of my discussions I wish to pose certain questions to the Prime Minister in the hope that he might, when he has the opportunity, take his seat in the house and give answers to these questions.

Mr. Choquette: Order paper.

Mr. Coates: My friend, if you consider this is the type of thing that should go on the order paper then I say, sir, you should not be allowed to sit in the House of Commons.

Mr. Choquette: I will resign then.

Mr. Coates: I believe the time has arrived when the Prime Minister must reconsider the position in which he has put the House of Commons on this important matter, for I am sure all members will agree that this debate has far reaching implications for the future of our nation. Many have contended that an election campaign based on this volatile issue would not be in the best interests of the nation. Accepting this as a correct premise, I ask the Prime Minister to consider what is

happening in parliament now, and if this is really a substitute for an election campaign that is of benefit to our future?

I ask him this, sir, because no matter what is said in the house, he is the Prime Minister of the country; he is the man who determines what we debate and when we debate it. He can talk about meetings of party leaders all he desires but he is still the man who runs this country, or is supposed to be running it at this time.

I ask the Prime Minister if he does not believe that the flag design which he proposes as an alternative to the Canadian red ensign is not the type of design that will offend a large number of Canadians in every province of this nation? The Prime Minister in proposing this design suggested that we should have a resolution authorizing the flying of the union jack as an alternate design. It was his hope that those who would be offended would derive some consolation from the second flag.

Mr. Sharp: May I ask the hon. gentleman where he gets the idea that this is an alternative flag?

Mr. Coates: I beg your pardon.

Mr. Sharp: Where is your authority for saying this is an alternative flag?

Mr. Coates: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp) will wait I think I will indicate it to him. It has to be an alternative flag. There cannot be two flags flying from every flag pole in this nation. Let us be realistic. One flag.

Mr. Sharp: One Canadian flag.

Mr. Coates: Right. I say to the hon. gentleman: Is this really an honest approach to the flag question? Can there be any assurance that any second flag which may be adopted will become a part of our Canadian nation for any length of time? The hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale) in his speech outlined what transpired in relation to a second flag in South Africa. Would this not also be the history of a second flag in Canada?

Now, I ask this question: Who is deriving the greatest pleasure from the action taken by the government on the flag issue? I suggest to the Prime Minister that he is providing a degree of pleasure for the separatists in the province of Quebec which they are not worthy of deriving. He has also produced a degree of extremism among many loyal Canadians throughout the nation which makes future Canadian unity a questionable subject. Does the Prime Minister want a flag which will aggravate the feelings of large sections of the population? Do French Canadians generally consider a flag design satisfactory when it will displease large sections of the population? I do not for one moment consider they wish any such result. Indeed, except for the vociferous separatist element in the province of Quebec I find little to indicate how the sensible and realistic Canadian in that province feels about this flag issue. I ask the Prime Minister to tell me how the good citizens in the province of Quebec who desire a united and progressive nation feel about Canada's flag. Surely, there must be some method of determining how the people of that province feel with regard to its design, or with regard to a design which would have an association with our history and traditions.

Mr. Sharp: Would the hon. member permit a question? Has he inquired of his own members from the province of Quebec to get an answer to those questions?

Mr. Coates: I certainly have and I find there is a degree of responsibility indicated in their replies to me which has certainly not been evident among the members on his side representing the same province, as indicated by the interjections they make every time—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Perhaps I can take advantage of the interruption by the minister to inform the hon. member that he is obliged to direct his remarks to the subamendment. The hon. member is in a particular situation inasmuch as he has already participated in the debate; he spoke on June 17 last in connection with the amendment. Today, of course, he is speaking on the subamendment. It is a basic rule of this house that a member can only speak once on a question. It is in order, of course, to speak a second time on the subamendment, but surely any speech at this stage should be relevant to the new question and not to the old question on which he has already spoken.

Mr. Coates: Thank you. I think Your Honour will have no difficulty in finding that I will be speaking on the subamendment before the house.

I support the contention that the government has mishandled the flag issue so badly that it is not possible now to make a realistic appraisal of the subject within the confines of the House of Commons. Once it became a government measure, the flag design proposed by the Prime Minister became a government flag. It became a flag closely associated with the Liberal party. Such a flag

has little hope of acceptance among those who do not adhere to Liberal philosophy in this nation. Indeed there are many who have adhered to the Liberal philosophy who cannot associate that philosophy with the design presently proposed. For this reason it would appear to be best for the nation if a plebiscite were held, since, apparently, this is the only means of taking the flag issue out of partisan politics.

At the same time it seems to me that in reaching a conclusion as to what the new flag design should contain the government has attacked this problem in reverse order. Would it not have been more sensible to have assumed that a large proportion of the Canadian public favours the Canadian red ensign? Before producing a new flag design, they should have assumed that this support was present and, in order to develop a new design which would inspire an even greater acceptance, they should have tried to evolve a design based on the Canadian red ensign—a flag which would have embodied in it an association with our history and tradition, as well as symbols which are not now contained therein but which could be developed in a new flag without making a complete break with the past.

I would have thought the government's study of the great flag debate in South Africa if it did nothing else, would have provided it with sufficient experience and knowledge to appreciate that the people of a nation, especially a nation which is bicultural in character, would not allow the rights of either a large minority or a small majority to be trampled upon. When this occurs, as is demonstrated in Canada today, only the extremists derive pleasure from the results of the decision.

As members of this house are aware, I have been a strong advocate for the retention of the Canadian red ensign. So long as this government considers that the only alternative available to the Canadian red ensign is their own proposed flag design I shall fight their action by every means at my disposal. If these two designs are the only alternatives which must be decided upon, then I feel I am doing my duty as a Canadian in avoiding a proposal which would destroy and eliminate any association between the flag of our nation and our history and tradition. At the same time, if the government were to indicate that they were endeavouring to introduce a flag design which would be more acceptable to the great majority of Canadians in all parts of this nation, a design which would also have an association with our history and tradition, then I would be the first to try to assist that government in arriving at a satisfactory conclusion.

Among all the letters I have received from every part of this nation I have found few whose authors, though they confirmed their belief that the Canadian red ensign should remain as our flag, were not also willing to concede that they would agree to alterations in that flag which would give greater recognition to the bicultural character of our nation as long as the union jack remained as a continuing symbol of the contribution we have received from our connection with the British commonwealth of nations.

Mr. Pepin: It is called the commonwealth of nations, now.

Mr. Coates: It is kind of you to correct me.

Mr. Pepin: You should know.

Mr. Coates: As far as I am concerned it is still the British commonwealth of nations.

Mr. Pepin: We know that perfectly well. It is obvious.

Mr. Coates: Surely this house cannot continue indefinitely—

An hon. Member: Certainly not.

Mr. Coates: —with a debate of this type. Surely, at some time, the government must realize that we have to reach a conclusion which will end the debate. To date, the government has been adamant that this house must accept the flag they have produced or else debate forever.

An hon. Member: May I ask a question?

Mr. Coates: I am not going to answer a question right now. Surely it is not the responsibility of the Leader of the Opposition or of any of the opposition party leaders, but it is the responsibility of the Prime Minister of this nation—

Mr. Sharp: Which he is discharging.

Mr. Coates: No, he is not discharging it. I cannot agree with that at all. He is not discharging his responsibility to this nation as long as he persists in trying to force this parliament to adopt a design which he realizes a large proportion of the members of the house find totally unacceptable.

Mr. Moreau: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, Your Honour pointed out some time ago to the hon. member that the question to which he should be addressing himself was that of a referendum. I have listened to the

hon. member with considerable attention, and I fail to see how the remarks he has made to this time are relevant to the matter now before the house.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak to the point of order. I think it would be a good thing to invite the hon. member for York-Scarborough (Mr. Moreau) to occupy the chair for a while.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member who has the floor indicated a moment ago that this is the question to which he intended to address himself. I know he recognizes that, in view of the fact he has already spoken in the debate on the amendment, he is perhaps in a position where he should as much as possible limit his remarks to the specific question before the house. I feel that to some extent he has done that until now, but I would invite him to keep this in mind.

Mr. Coates: Surely, Mr. Speaker, when I am discussing two of the particular designs that are involved in the subamendment, I must be talking to the question before the house. If I am not, then I do not know when I would be. The point I was trying to make was that we cannot continue forever in this fashion, so long as the government persists with its plan to make parliament accept the design it is proposing at the present time. There are too many members in this house who say this design is totally unacceptable.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Coates: Surely, Mr. Speaker, in view of this fact, if the Prime Minister is determined to produce a flag he must move in the direction of trying to produce one that is acceptable to a majority, and a large majority. I might refer to the suggestion made by the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton (Mr. Flemming), that a flag is not something that should be decided upon by a bare majority of the members of the House of Commons. Surely we should have the type of support in the House of Commons, for whatever new flag is accepted, which will mean that at least two thirds of the members of this house find the design acceptable to them, which would be an indication that at least two thirds of the people of this nation found the design acceptable. At the moment there are 50 per cent of the people of this country either in favour of the design the Prime Minister has produced, or some other design, and 50 per cent of the people—or close to that percentage—are in favour of the present flag. There is no hope of ever reaching a conclusion of a debate based on two propositions when there is not any strong support for either one.

I might refer for a moment to the speech of the hon. member for York East (Mr. Otto). If he did anything, he made one point abundantly clear. He said he did not imagine there would be the support in the country for the Canadian red ensign that is evident today. I think when this debate started there was not this degree of support for the Canadian red ensign, or else people had not made up their minds about the flag; they had not thought about it. However, Mr. Speaker, the problem is that suddenly they became aware of the fact that there was going to be a change, and they looked at the Canadian red ensign and saw it as a flag that represented freedom and liberty. When they saw what was going on, they rushed to this flag because it had provided in the past this freedom and liberty. What better reason is there, what better example of why we should have a flag that is representative of our past history and tradition, if it is not for the fact that at times of doubt people look to it and see in it those things that are representative of the history, tradition and liberty that we so dearly love.

In concluding my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Prime Minister to give leadership to the country in this matter; to admit that what he has produced in this resolution with regard to a flag is not something which at this time the nation is willing to accept; that it is one which does not carry the large majority that is needed in the House of Commons for the adoption of a national flag. This majority is not available to him. The Prime Minister should either withdraw his resolution and introduce another which is more acceptable, or honestly say to the Canadian people, "This is not the time, I have found, to go forward with a new flag design. The Canadian nation is not ready for a new flag. I hate to admit this, but I have honestly found this out, and in all sincerity I now withdraw the flag resolution that I introduced into the House of Commons".

Mr. Speaker, many Canadians would have more respect for our Prime Minister if he were willing to adopt this attitude, rather than the attitude of endeavouring to produce a flag and foist it on the Canadian people, aggravating thousands, if not millions of people who do not want this flag, will not accept it and will not respect it even if it is pushed through this House of Commons. That is the thing that bothers me more than anything else; I do not want to think that we in

the House of Commons are going to adopt a flag that a great many people in this nation will have no respect for, once it is hoisted on the flagpoles of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I see it is six o'clock.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask about the business of the house, particularly the estimates that will be called for Friday.

Business of the House

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, I take it that the flag debate will continue tomorrow. On Friday—if we reach Friday—we will proceed with the examination of the estimates of the Department of Forestry, to be followed by the estimates of the Department of Industry, to be followed by the completion of the discussion on the estimates of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, August 20, 1964

The house met at 2 p.m.

COMMUNICATIONS

TABLING OF AGREEMENT RESPECTING GLOBAL SATELLITE SYSTEM

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table copies, in French and English, of the agreement establishing intergovernmental arrangements for a global, commercial satellite communications system. This agreement is being signed in Washington today.

POWER

ONTARIO—ANNOUNCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION OF NUCLEAR-ELECTRIC STATION

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Defence Production): Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of hon. members that the premier of Ontario and the chairman of Ontario hydro are today announcing in Toronto that Ontario hydro has decided to build a one million kilowatt nuclear-electric power station. This project is the second largest nuclear power station planned anywhere in the world.

This decision is a major landmark for Canada in two respects. Ontario hydro has selected the type of nuclear power station that has been pioneered and developed by Atomic Energy of Canada Limited. Also, Ontario hydro will build this station as a commercial venture. The two earlier and smaller nuclear power stations in Canada near Chalk River and at Douglas point on lake Huron were, in large measure, prototypes for purposes of experiment and demonstration.

By reason of the contingent financial risk in building a very large nuclear power station at this relatively early stage in nuclear development, participation by governments was desirable. No full sized nuclear power station of this type is yet in operation, so there remains a slight measure of uncertainty today as to how well they will perform. This will change when the 200,000 kilowatt nuclear power station at Douglas point, which will soon be completed, has shown that it operates successfully.

Agreement has been reached among the federal government, the Ontario government and Ontario hydro regarding the financing of this project. The estimated cost of the nuclear power station is $266 million, and this money will be subscribed by the three parties as follows. Ontario hydro will be responsible for an amount equal to the cost of the coal burning power station of the same capacity they are building at Lambton, estimated to be $120 million. The balance will be subscribed by the two governments in the ratio of 1.2 to 1, with the federal government advancing the larger portion. In terms of the present estimates of cost the federal government will subscribe $79.5 million and the Ontario government $66.5 million. It is anticipated that the capital advanced by the parties will be fully repaid with interest at normal rates out of the net operating revenues of the station. There is a good possibility of profit in government investments and reduced costs in the production of power. If all goes as planned, base load nuclear power will be cheaper than electricity generated from coal burning stations in the Ontario hydro system.

The location of the station has not yet been decided. As hon. members will know, the atomic energy control board has to be satisfied regarding safety and other aspects of any nuclear power plant for location at a particular site before it will issue a permit for construction. The board will wish to make a careful study of the proposed plant design before approving a specific site location.

I am sure all members of the house will share my deep satisfaction that the energetic and imaginative efforts of the federal government, through Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, to bring Canada to the fore in the field of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, has led and is leading to constructive and profitable undertakings of this kind.

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, this is a most interesting announcement by the Minister of Industry, and I am sure everyone in Canada will be delighted. The atomic energy program, which has been operating in Canada now for about 20 years, has proved a major success. Successive governments have shown equal interest in this type of development.

Construction of Nuclear Power Stations

In 1958, when we had the privilege of holding office and the problem of the development of atomic energy in Canada was under consideration, acting on the advice of the highly skilled personnel of Atomic Energy and using our own judgment we decided that we would advance the program by two years, which we did, taking a calculated risk that the development of the use of natural uranium and heavy water would really fulfil the expectations of our highly competent scientists.

That paid off, and our program was advanced. The nuclear development program has been operating the small nuclear reactor near Chalk River for almost three years now, and it is the basic plant to indicate the cost of producing power by this means. As a result of that decision which we made some years ago CANDU, the larger plant near Kincardine, has gone ahead and I think is to be in operation in 1965, working according to plan.

This new announcement is further confirmation of the successful work of our atomic energy scientists, who deserve the thanks of all Canada for what they have done over the years. Their activities have been observed by the world. Other nations working with a different type of uranium—enriched uranium —and other modifying agents, were perhaps earlier in the field, but they have come to see that natural uranium plus heavy water is likely to be the most economical method of producing electric power through the use of atomic energy.

The government of India and governments of other countries in the world are interested in Canada's satisfactory experiment, and I think we have a great future in the export of our knowledge with regard to this method of producing power. Almost every country is now power hungry. Even in our own country the supply of hydroelectric power has about reached its limit except in respect of a few major developments that may be under way. With the steady increase year after year in the demand for electric power I think this method will provide the answer, and in the long run it will relieve Canada, and certainly the province of Ontario, from dependence upon the import of United States coal for steam power stations. It has been estimated that by 1980, I believe, if we did not have this other source of power we would have to expend about $300 million a year for the import of United States coal. So the balance of payments will eventually be affected to our advantage.

[Mr. Churchill.]

I am sure everybody welcomes this announcement by the minister, and I should like to pay my tribute to Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, with which I have worked for a number of years, and to the scientists who, working here in Canada, have produced something which has received world wide attention and has proved a great success.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, the members of this party wish to join in expressing a word of commendation to the Minister of Industry, to Atomic Energy of Canada Limited and to all those responsible for concluding this agreement. We feel this is another forward step in developing the use of atomic energy for the generation of electric power.

At the present time experiments are going on in various parts of the world in the field of atomic energy plants. At the present time the cost per unit is still uneconomic compared to hydro and thermal power, where there is cheap fuel available. But undoubtedly the cost of both hydro power and thermal power plants is going up, and with additional research in the field of atomic energy the costs in this field are going down. Undoubtedly the time is coming fairly soon, and I think engineers estimate that time at between ten and 12 years, when atomic energy will be competitive. We look forward to the day when we will build a national power grid in Canada, in which we will make use of hydroelectric power, harnessed tidal power, using atomic power particularly for peaking purposes. This would round out our whole power picture in Canada.

This is certainly a field of endeavour in which government planning and public enterprise can play a very important part in industrial development. This is certainly one of the legitimate fields for public enterprise and government planning. We commend the minister for this forward step and wish him every success in this undertaking.

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, we too share in the approval that has been expressed of such an agreement as has been announced today, as it relates to the production of power. It is to be noted that this project indicates the tremendous advance that Canadian scientists have made toward the economic development of nuclear power. Not only does it relate to our ability to produce reactors, but also to our scientists who have improved methods that make economical and practical the function of such reactors.

I note that this new project is going to mean a tremendous increase in the demands for uranium and heavy water. Certainly it will have widespread effects throughout our economy. I note too that the power to be produced by this project will feed into the area around the city of Toronto. I would refer to the need we have in this country for a national power grid, and I trust that the government is taking steps to bring about discussions with the provinces on such a project, because we will not have economic use of the electricity produced unless we do have a national grid.

I am somewhat concerned about the cost involved in this project. I note that it is going to cost the federal government some $80 million in addition to what will be raised by the other two contracting parties. This brings up the point again that money used in this way for public purposes falls into the category of social capital, and that there really is no need for the cost of such projects to be doubled as far as the taxpayers are concerned before they are paid off if we would make a few adjustments in our financial set-up.

Again, Mr. Speaker, we would commend the minister for concluding this agreement. We trust that further developments to meet the need for electricity in the rest of the country as well will go forward on an even more satisfactory basis.

[*Translation*]

Mr. C. A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, it gives us pleasure to join with the spokesmen for the other parties in saying how glad we are to have heard the announcement just made by the Minister of Industry (Mr. Drury). We are happy to find that the government has decided to provide funds for the construction of atomic power plants.

We wish to support the government's efforts in the development of such power plants for peaceful purposes. We hope Canada will play a leading role in the use of the atom for works of peace and that people will finally stop thinking of this famous atomic power only in terms of destruction, so that the human race may some day benefit from this marvellous gift God has given to man.

[*Text*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

CYPRUS—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON PRESENT POSITION

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, is the Secretary of State for External Affairs in a position to say what has been the result of discussions between the secretary general or someone acting on his behalf and Archbishop Makarios regarding the increase, expansion or augmentation of the powers of the United Nations force? Has there been any forward step in this connection? Further, is he in a position to make any observation on the statement made by the French information minister calling for an end of foreign interference in Cyprus? What is the meaning of that expression, Cyprus being associated with the Congo and South Viet Nam in the statement to which I have alluded?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I indicated yesterday that there had been an improvement in the situation in Cyprus. As a result of the negotiations between the United Nations and the government of Cyprus, agreement had been reached with regard to the problems I described at that time. In so far as the further extension of the powers of the force is concerned, this is still under discussion and we are awaiting a report.

I am not in a position to comment on the statement attributed to the minister of information of France concerning foreign entanglements in Cyprus. I would simply point out, however, with regard to the statement made by another country, that NATO's interest in the Cyprus situation simply involves the natural concern of NATO with the problems of any member of the alliance. In this connection I am happy to note, as I am sure the right hon. gentleman and hon. members will be, that the governments of Turkey and Greece have returned to NATO the forces which they withdrew for the purpose of meeting what they regarded as their foreign policy, responsibilities in connection with Cyprus. NATO has a definite interest in this matter, but it is not an interest that is contrary in any way to the initiative of the United Nations, nor would it in any way interfere with this initiative.

Mr. Diefenbaker: In view of the fact that the hon. gentleman has suggested I might agree with the commendation of the fact that both Turkey and Greece have once more shown their faith by action in NATO, I want to say that this is something that gives new hope of NATO assuring the peace of Europe.

I should like to ask the hon. gentleman whether there has been any reaction on the part of the government of Canada to the

representations from France concerning the question of foreign interference, to which I alluded in my earlier question.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I am not aware that there have been any representations. There has been no official indication of any objection registered by France to the action taken by countries other than those directly involved in the Cyprus situation. Another country did make an objection. As a matter of fact the participation of France in the proceedings of the NATO council warrants me to believe that my interpretation is the correct one.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Stuart A. Fleming (Okanagan-Revelstoke): I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Can the minister clarify the situation with regard to the financing of the United Nations force in Cyprus, in the light of the statement by the secretary general today that the force may have to be withdrawn even before September 26 because of the lack of funds to maintain it?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): It is true the secretary general indicated today that the financing of the Cyprus operation is causing him concern. As I said in the house a week ago, Canada and Ireland, the only countries which with Britain are paying all the costs of their contingents, are not participating in the fund which is being provided voluntarily by certain countries. The fund is now delinquent by some $2 million. I would hope that as a result of the statement made by the secretary general today, other countries which have an equal obligation with regard to peace keeping under the charter of the United Nations will see that the United Nations is not rendered incapable of performing its functions.

CONGO—SAFETY OF CANADIANS FOLLOWING UN FORCE WITHDRAWAL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): I wish to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of rapidly deteriorating conditions in the Congo can the minister tell us whether there are any Canadian citizens in this danger area and, if so, how many there are? Can he tell us also whether arrangements are being made to remove them to places of safety?

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Last week I was asked a question along these lines. I indicated that we were making an assessment of the number of Canadians there and that we had asked Britain and the United States to assist our mission in making sure that precautions were taken for the security and welfare of Canadian subjects. I cannot give the house the precise number at this moment, but I will.

PUBLIC SERVICE

INQUIRY AS TO SALARY INCREASE FOR GROUP B

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance, and ask him whether salary increases have been announced for group B, and whether he can give any information regarding them. I should like to ask him if it is correct that the increase has ranged from $90 per month to $240 per month for those receiving salaries from $2,400 to $9,100. Is it correct also that grade 1 clerks, stenographers and typists have received an increase of only $90 per year, that they have had no increase in 1961, and that there will be no review until 1965, which would mean an average increase of $15 per month for six years? Can the minister tell us if this information is correct?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (President of the Privy Council): Perhaps I should answer this question. There was a press release at twelve o'clock noon today announcing salary increases for group B civil servants.

The hon. member asked, among others things, whether it is correct that a great many things are true. As to part, at least, of his statement, it is not correct. These are increases in rates of pay. The increases range in certain classes and grades from $90 up to $700.

While the increase in the rates of pay as announced is 3.4 per cent, the increase in the actual pay for this group since the last pay revision two years ago has already amounted to 6.4 per cent. If the hon. member considers those figures together he will find that the increase in the earnings of the employees involved here will now amount to 10 per cent over the two year period, rather than the figure which he gave.

Mr. Douglas: I was asking about a particular category, not the percentage increase for the entire group. I was asking the minister whether it is correct that for grade 1 typists, stenographers and clerks the in-

crease amounts to only $90 a year; that they have had no increase in 1961, and there will be no further review until 1965. This means that over this entire period the average increase will be only $15 a month for these three categories.

Mr. McIlraith: I do not agree with the hon. member's way of stating the position. It is not correct to state it as he does. In any event I can tell him that the increase in grade 1 rates just announced is $90 per year. That part of his statement is correct. The other inferences are not correct.

Mr. Douglas: Is the hon. gentleman, as the minister responsible, satisfied that a $90 a year increase for this category is an adequate amount in view of the services these people are rendering?

Mr. McIlraith: Yes. The treasury board gave a great deal of detailed attention to the study of this problem. As the hon. member knows, increases or adjustments in pay are arrived at after a study of comparable pay outside the service without taking into account fringe benefits, and if the increase in any particular class or grade is found to be smaller than in another it is because that grade receives more than comparable classes outside. This is without considering the fringe benefits. As is known, the fringe benefits in the public service cost about 25 per cent, and the best estimate of the cost of fringe benefits in comparable employment outside the service runs at about 13 per cent.

Mr. Douglas: When was the last increase given to this group? I understand they had no increase in 1961, no increase until now, and that there will be no review until 1965. This will be a six year period with only one increase.

Mr. McIlraith: The cyclical reviews take place every two years. I believe certain classes in group B did not receive an increase when the last review took place in 1962.

CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

CONSULTATION WITH PROVINCES RESPECTING METHOD OF AMENDMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): I wish to address a question to the Prime Minister. In view of the statement by the premier of Quebec that there is a strong possibility that an agreement on the repatriation of the British North America Act may be reached next month at the premiers' conference, can the right hon. gentleman tell us whether he has been in communication with the other premiers or whether plans are being made for a general discussion on the matter, which is so important to this nation?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Yes, I have been in communication with the premiers of all the provinces on this matter within the last week.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Is any amending formula being placed before the premiers for consideration, and would it be possible for this to be made available?

Mr. Pearson: I am not in a position to make it available now. I think the general understanding is that we begin where we left off at the last conference, at which agreement was very nearly reached. If there is anything I can report on the details of an amending formula before the Charlottetown conference I shall be glad to make a statement.

Mr. Douglas: Are we to take it for granted that the government is starting on the basis of suggesting an amending formula, under which amendment will only be possible by the consent of all the provinces and of the parliament of Canada?

Mr. Pearson: No, but we would start where we left off when agreement was nearly reached and a formula was agreed on by practically all the provinces.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): I take it the Prime Minister is referring to the conferences which were convened during the period when the Conservative party was in office. I would ask him this. Has there been any change in the formula advanced by the federal government at that time, or any suggested change by any of the provinces, which causes the right hon. gentleman to express the hope that possibly, now, agreement can be achieved?

Mr. Pearson: I can only say that my hope, as expressed in the house the other day and as confirmed by Mr. Lesage's reported statement yesterday, is based largely on certain informal conversations which took place at Jasper at the recent provincial premiers' conference.

The right hon. gentleman is quite correct when he says I am referring to the conference of 1961 as a starting point.

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the

Minister of Transport. The Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources (Mr. Laing) told us today that he will drive a spike in the Great Slave lake railway line when the latter crosses the 60th parallel north on August 29. Can the Minister of Transport tell us when the house will have the pleasure of hearing him say that he will drive the first spike of the Matane railway in the province of Quebec?

[*Text*]

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): I think I had better take that question as notice.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

RETIREMENT OF VICE CHIEF OF NAVAL STAFF

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Associate Minister of National Defence.

Has he any comments to make about the compulsory retirement of Commodore Fraser-Harris at the age of 47?

Hon. Lucien Cardin (Associate Minister of National Defence): No, Mr. Speaker, I have no comment to make on the matter. I simply wish to say once again that the compulsory retirement of senior officers is part of our integration process.

It was understood that the integration program would entail retirements, not only among lesser ranks but also among senior officers. This is part of the normal integration process.

Mr. Martineau: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a supplementary question to the Associate Minister of National Defence.

Can he tell us who will assume those duties from now on?

Mr. Cardin: Mr. Speaker, the aim of that integration and the reason for laying off those officers is that there are no positions for those who are being retired.

[*Text*]

AIR TRANSPORT

PROVISION OF DIRECT SERVICE FROM NOVA SCOTIA TO BERMUDA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Gerald A. Regan (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport. In view of the public demand for direct air service between Nova Scotia and Bermuda, can the minister indicate whether it will be possible for Air Canada to initiate such service for the forthcoming winter season?

Some hon. Members: Order paper.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Pressing as this problem is, nevertheless this would be a good question for the order paper.

Mr. Regan: This is a question of urgency, Mr. Speaker, because it not only concerns passenger service but also freight service between Halifax and Bermuda.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Chicoutimi (Mr. Côté).

Mr. Regan: I would like to raise the matter at 10.30, Mr. Speaker.

MEDICINE HAT—REQUEST FOR PROVISION OF SERVICE BY AIR CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. In view of the fact that the runways are now completed, and in view of the pressing need for air line service into and out of Medicine Hat, I wonder whether the minister is prepared to make representations to Air Canada so this service can be established.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to convey the hon. gentleman's suggestion to T.C.A.

INCOME TAX

DEPOSIT OF DEDUCTIONS BY EMPLOYERS IN LOAN AND CREDIT INSTITUTIONS

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Maurice Côté (Chicoutimi): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Revenue.

In view of the announcement made by the minister that 300,000 employers will be able to deposit in their local banks their employees' monthly income tax deductions, will the government allow the small and medium employers doing business through caisses populaires or credit unions to deposit such income tax deductions in those credit and savings unions and will arrangements be made with the federations of caisses populaires and credit unions to that effect?

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: It does seem to me that, requiring a detailed answer as it does, this is a good question for the order paper.

HOUSING

HALIFAX, N.S.—LOW RENTAL ACCOMMODATION FOR NAVAL PERSONNEL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Postmaster General. It is the same question that I addressed to the President of the Privy Council a few days ago when the Postmaster General was absent. Is it proposed to have a conference on housing, as to the use of the recent amendments to the National Housing Act in Halifax? If it is, in view of the urgent need for low rental housing for naval personnel in Halifax, will the minister see that representatives of the Royal Canadian Navy are invited to any such conference?

An hon. Member: If there are any of them left.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the hon. member and other hon. members of the house, that the first of a series of meetings to discuss the amendments to the National Housing Act that were passed recently has been arranged. It will be held in Halifax on September 21 and 22. I will be there with senior officials of Central Mortgage and Housing; the provincial government will be represented, with their advisers; the city of Halifax and I hope other cities concerned will be represented. Certainly the point the hon. member has mentioned, namely the desirability of looking into the housing needs of naval service people, will be kept in mind and an invitation will be extended to an appropriate person or persons to attend.

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. Can the minister say whether this is the beginning of a general program of housing conferences right across Canada? If the decision has been made to hold a series of regional conferences, is there anything the minister can report to the house in this regard?

Mr. Nicholson: As I intimated, Mr. Speaker, this is the first of a series of such meetings. It is hoped that meetings will be held in other provinces, and perhaps in more than one place in several provinces. This is the first of the series; another meeting is contemplated in Newfoundland in late September, and I am meeting with the Ontario provincial minister, Mr. Randall, next week and will discuss with him the advisability of arranging for a meeting in Ontario at an early, convenient date.

Mr. Gerald A. Regan (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, would the minister assure the house that representatives of the city of Dartmouth will also be invited to attend this conference, because this city is as much involved as the city of Halifax?

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Further to the last answer given by the minister, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask him whether the holding of one of these conferences in any particular area is contingent upon a request from the provincial authorities, or whether they are being arranged on the minister's own initiative.

Mr. Nicholson: Mr. Speaker, it is our intention, if the Halifax meeting is the success that we hope it will be and if the Ontario meeting is equally successful, to approach the proper authorities or officials in the other provinces, and municipalities concerned, and hold a series of these meetings in capital or other cities in most, if not all, of the provinces.

Mr. Scott: One further supplementary question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. In view of the report released this week by the world health organization of the United Nations, in which it is said, "After the question of keeping world peace, metropolitan planning is probably the most serious single problem faced by man in the second half of the twentieth century", can the minister say whether he has given the consideration he stated he would give to the suggestion that we have a royal commission on urbanization in Canada? If such consideration has been given, is there any decision he can give to the house?

Mr. Nicholson: The matter is still under consideration, Mr. Speaker. In fact, when I was in the United Kingdom I had discussions with the minister of housing and local government along these lines. If a decision is reached to establish either a royal commission or a committee of this house to study housing, it will be announced in due course.

Mr. C. F. Kennedy (Colchester-Hants): Mr. Speaker, might I ask the minister this question. Would he not agree that the 113 surplus housing units at Beaverbank might be well utilized in taking up the housing shortage for naval personnel at Halifax?

Inquiries of the Ministry

CANADIAN FLAG

INQUIRY AS TO IMPORTS OF NEW DESIGN FROM JAPAN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (Queens-Lunenburg): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Can the minister confirm reports appearing recently in the Halifax *Chronicle-Herald* that quantities of what is referred to as the "Pearson pennant" have been imported into Canada from Japan?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): I cannot confirm this, Mr. Speaker. I have no knowledge of the matter at all.

Mr. Crouse: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In the event that the present resolution on the flag is altered, will disposal be made of any surplus stocks of the Pearson pennant through Crown Assets Disposal Corporation?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. gentleman is fully aware that the government has purchased no flags of this kind at all. These have been purchased by enthusiasts who like the flag.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Georges Valade (St. Mary): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Would the minister inquire into the quantity of three maple leaves flags being imported from Japan into this country? In view of the quantity being imported from Japan, does he think this is a good thing for industry and employment in this country?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I do not think we should use import controls to restrict in any way the activities of private citizens who are expressing their views and otherwise acting in what I consider a completely proper way.

Mr. Valade: Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak on a point of order. Rule 178 of Beauchesne in part states that any member may ask informative questions of cabinet ministers. In this regard I asked the minister whether he would inquire as to the quantities of the three maple leaves flags that were being imported from Japan.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I shall be very happy to do so if the hon. gentleman will put his question on the order paper.

Mr. Valade: Mr. Speaker, I rise on another point of order. I think this question is quite urgent because—

[Mr. Kennedy.]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There is no point of order there. The minister has given a reply, and that is all that is required.

WORLD FAIR

POSSIBLE CHANGE TO INCREASE CANADIAN CHARACTER OF SYMBOL

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Hon. Théogène Ricard (St. Hyacinthe-Bagot): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Could he tell us if the internal economy committee of the 1967 Canadian World Exhibition Corporation is now considering the question of giving a more Canadian character to the symbol already adopted by that organization?

[*Text*]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, the symbol adopted by that organization has proved to be very satisfactory. As the hon. gentleman knows, it received the highest accolade that it possibly could receive. In the circumstances it is being used extensively and is very successful indeed.

Mr. Martineau: What about parliament?

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): I wonder whether the minister has ever compared the symbol with one that came to my hand the other day, which was used by the nazi women's farm army.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I am sure you would not expect me to answer such a contemptible question.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I recommend that the hon. gentleman look it up. He is going to get an awful jolt.

EXTENT OF PARTICIPATION BY COMMONWEALTH COUNTRIES

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Georges Valade (St. Mary): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Can he tell us how many countries, members of the commonwealth, other than the United Kingdom, have expressed their intention to take part in the 1967 world fair?

[*Text*]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, there was a question on the order paper about this which was answered the other day. I suggest that the hon. member should refer to it; I am sorry, I do not keep that information in my mind.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Valade: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since the government wishes to adopt a second flag, namely the union jack, as a symbol of our membership in the commonwealth, can the minister assure the Canadian government of the participation of the member countries of the commonwealth, other than the United Kingdom, at the 1967 world fair, so that this membership will be expressed in a concrete rather than a theoretical manner? Can he assure the house of the contribution of member countries of the commonwealth, other than the United Kingdom, at the world fair?

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: If the minister is able to answer quickly I suggest that we get rid of the question; if not, I suggest it be put on the order paper.

Mr. Valade: Then I want to debate this question on the next occasion, Mr. Speaker.

AGRICULTURE

CHEESE—REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF POLICY

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture and ask whether within the last few days he has received representations from the federation of manfacturers of milk products, and from the dairy industry of Quebec, pointing out the rather serious condition of the dairy industry and suggesting reconsideration by the government of its cheese policy, to restore the 30 cents per hundredweight subsidy on milk or refund the premium of 3.6 cents lost by cheese factories on grade 2 cheese; and what is going to be the attitude of the government regarding this question, which is of such importance to the dairy industry?

Some hon. Members: Order paper.

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the first part of the question, I did meet a delegation so far as this matter is concerned, and we are considering it. We are looking at all the various problems which were raised at the meeting. So far as the dairy industry is concerned, the Prime Minister and myself met the president and secretary of the national dairy council this morning, and they assured us that the dairy industry is in the best position it has been in for 15 years.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is not what the report says.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Clément Vincent (Nicolet-Yamaska): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture. If the situation of the dairy industry is better than it has been for the past 15 years, can the minister tell us then why the Quebec and Ontario federation of manufacturers of milk products has asked him to take immediate steps concerning the dairy policy he announced last April 29?

[*Text*]

Mr. Hays: Mr. Speaker, the statement I made was just repeating what the president and secretary had to say. I indicated to the right hon. gentleman that we are looking into the processors' problems. I think the president and secretary of the national dairy council were referring to the producers.

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister accept an invitation from me to come into my riding and make the statement he has just made in the house to the farmers in my riding?

Mr. Hays: Yes, Mr. Speaker; I would be very pleased to go into the hon. member's riding.

Mr. Grafftey: And to make the statement the minister just made in the house regarding the state of the dairy industry, which is just not in accordance with the facts.

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington South): I should like to address a supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the statement he has just made, that the dairy industry is in the best condition it has been for years, has the minister any intention of removing the butter subsidy?

Mr. Hays: Mr. Speaker, certainly we are not satisfied with it, and we are going to do everything we can to make it better.

Hon. Théogène Ricard (St. Hyacinthe-Bagot): A supplementary question. Is this

state of perfection and overwhelming prosperity in this branch of agriculture due to the fact that the minister took away $11.5 million from that industry?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

FINANCE

INQUIRY AS TO POSSIBLE TAX REDUCTION

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lucien Plourde (Quebec West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Finance. Seeing how much the tax reduction in the United States has been beneficial to the American economy, is the minister considering a similar step for Canada in the near future?

[*Text*]

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): I think we should wait until the next budget, Mr. Speaker.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SUGGESTED DAILY MEETING OF PROCEDURE COMMITTEE

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Auguste Choquette (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice as house leader.

Since parliamentary reform is more urgent than ever, would the house leader consider, as a suggestion, that the committee on procedure and organization sit every day and hear witnesses, for the purpose of improving our parliamentary system, since we have to face a useless filibuster?

Mr. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I take note of the suggestion.

[*Text*]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INQUIRY AS TO ACTION TO ACHIEVE PRICE STABILITY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Pictou): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. In view of the continuing rise in the cost of living index in Canada I wonder whether the minister has received a copy of the report from O.E.C.D. which comes out against price control by government as a means of ensuring that prices and profits are kept in line, but which further suggests that governments cannot stand by indifferently with respect to the behaviour of prices I wonder whether the minister has received that report and, if so, does he intend to bring forth a policy such as that brought forth by Britain and France to achieve some price stability?

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps my hon. friend has reference to the fact that the cost of living and prices generally have risen in European countries to a far greater extent than they have in Canada. As he probably knows, the increase in the cost of living in Canada and the United States has been less than in any other countries in the world.

Mr. MacEwan: A supplementary question. Has the minister received a copy of the new report by O.E.C.D. in this regard?

Mr. Gordon: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacEwan: Does he intend to study this report quite closely?

HEALTH AND WELFARE

SUPPORT OF ROYAL COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS BY FEDERATION OF AGRICULTURE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Has the statement of strong support for the Hall commission's health charter for Canadians, issued a day or two ago by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, been drawn to the minister's attention? If so, will it be considered by the minister and by the government in connection with the decision as to when to bring in legislation on this matter?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, it has not been drawn to my attention, so that I thank my hon. friend for mentioning it. May I assure him that I will look at it and, as always, everything which the Canadian Federation of Agriculture has to say will be listened to with great and sympathetic attention.

Mr. Knowles: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. When the minister looks at the document will she take note of the fact that the letterhead to which it is attached has on it a strong, solid, bold, single maple leaf?

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON MEETING OF PARTY LEADERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Steven Otto (York East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Prime Minister. Could he make a report to the house as to the result of the summit conference held this afternoon?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I do not like this expression "summit conference"; it somehow puts us apart from the other members of the House of Commons. We did have a meeting this morning, but as we were not able to conclude our deliberations by lunch time we are meeting again tomorrow morning.

URANIUM

BANCROFT, ONT.—REQUEST THAT FLOODING OF MINES BE STOPPED

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. A. Webb (Hastings-Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement today by the Minister of Industry that a new large nuclear thermal generating plant will be built in Ontario, and inasmuch as this probably substantiates the recent statement by Mr. Gilchrist, president of Eldorado, that perhaps the experts had not been accurate and optimistic enough in their forecasts for the demand for uranium, will the minister take the necessary steps to delay or halt the flooding by Metal Mines Limited, Bancroft, whose mines were closed down at the end of June this year? I understand that this flooding and repumping process is very expensive and cannot help but have some effect on the price of uranium.

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Defence Production): I will be glad to have this matter looked into, Mr. Speaker.

COMMONWEALTH RELATIONS

INCREASED AID TO CARIBBEAN COUNTRIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Gerald A. Regan (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Could the minister indicate to the house what progress has been made in the investigation relating to the expansion of aid to the Caribbean area?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is aware, of course, that under the expanded external aid program, additional funds are being made available to the commonwealth Caribbean countries. Bilateral talks are now under way with those countries on specific projects.

Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Pictou): I should like to ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will this be enlarged to include the Virgin islands?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister suggests that I remind the hon. gentleman that the commonwealth is free from the Virgins.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I should like to divorce myself from the recent observation of the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is quite right. I was referring, of course, to the Virgin islands.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

VISIT TO OTTAWA BY NEW ZEALAND OMBUDSMAN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Justice which relates to a very distinguished citizen in another part of the commonwealth much more distant to that which has just been under discussion. In view of the visit of the New Zealand ombudsman, Sir Guy Powles, to speak to the bar association in Montreal in a few days, and in view of the fact on the eve of his departure from New Zealand he announced that he would be visiting the Minister of Justice here in Ottawa, could the minister inform us whether steps are being taken to make it possible for Sir Guy Powles to meet with the committee on privileges and elections in relation to the bill that is now before the committee in respect of an ombudsman in Canada?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I think this is an excellent idea, and I will take it up with whoever is concerned.

HAL BANKS—FAILURE TO APPEAR IN COURT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice. I should like to ask him whether he has consulted his department and can give a report to parliament

relating to the whereabouts of the elusive Mr. Banks.

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that the R.C.M.P. is doing everything possible to obtain the required information in this respect, but I am not in a position as yet to report more precisely to the house.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, is the minister now in a position to advise whether United States immigration authorities have been asked whether Mr. Banks went into the United States and, if so, at what port and when?

Mr. Favreau: I have no information as yet on this subject.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Have you asked?

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the Leader of the Opposition, if his question was limited to whether or not I have asked I must say that I did ask my officers yesterday to ascertain whether we had asked the United States authorities, and I have just found a note, which was placed in my file before I entered the house, to the effect that the F.B.I. have been asked for information.

CANADIAN CENTENNIAL

CONSTRUCTION OF COMMEMORATIVE BUILDINGS IN PROVINCIAL CAPITALS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question asked by the hon. member for Saint John-Albert on Tuesday, I wish to say that I have re-examined our agreement with New Brunswick under the confederation memorial program, and it does not give to the federal government any control over the selection of subcontractors.

INDUSTRY

CAPE BRETON—POSSIBLE SALE OF DOMINION COAL AND STEEL CO.

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Industry whether he can give any information to this house about the possible purchase of Dosco by interests in Quebec, possibly acting on behalf of the Quebec government.

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Defence Production): Mr. Speaker, I think this would be a transaction entirely beyond the ambit of the federal government. I know no more about this than I have read in the newspapers, like the hon. member.

Mr. MacInnis: I have a supplementary question I should like to direct to the Minister of Labour concerning the interest in and the dependence of the coal industry on government subsidies. Could the Minister of Labour look into this matter so as to alleviate any concern there may be in Cape Breton at this time?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to do that.

EDUCATION

STUDENT LOANS—ADMINISTRATION OF PLAN IN B.C.

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stuart A. Fleming (Okanagan-Revelstoke): Mr. Speaker, I have a question I should like to direct to the Minister of Finance. Can the Minister of Finance say whether arrangements have now been completed with the province of British Columbia for administering the student loans act in that province?

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, there was a meeting on Monday of this week with the officials of all the provinces, and we hope to have all the formalities worked out by the end of next week.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): I have a supplementary question. I should like to ask the Minister of Finance how many of the provinces other than Quebec which will be operating on its own, have already designated agencies to look after applications under the student loans act?

Mr. Gordon: I hope to be able to make an announcement about this next week. I am not certain which provinces have finalized this particular matter.

SHIPPING

REMOVAL OF WRECKS FROM WATERS NEAR BRUCE PENINSULA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. John Loney (Bruce): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transport. Would the minister's department investigate the activities of the salvage boat *Maitland Clipper* which is removing antique wrecks of historical value from the waters off the shores of the Bruce peninsula?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I will be delighted to look into this urgent matter.

HIGHWAYS

BRITISH COLUMBIA—FEDERAL ASSISTANCE IN CONSTRUCTION THROUGH YELLOWHEAD PASS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. William Skoreyko (Edmonton East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Works. On August 12 the hon. member for Okanagan-Revelstoke asked the minister whether he was in a position to announce the government's intentions regarding participation in the announced program of the British Columbia goverment to construct a highway through the Yellowhead route. At that time the minister said he was not in a position to answer. In view of the fact that a week has now elapsed since the question was asked, can the minister answer the question today?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, no decision has been reached on this matter as yet.

Mr. Skoreyko: In view of the fact that the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources gave some assurance to officials concerned with this highway, while in Edmonton last week, I wonder whether the parliamentary secretary to the minister would ask the minister to report tomorrow in respect of this matter?

CANADIAN FLAG

OFFICIAL ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW DESIGN

The house resumed, from Wednesday, August 19, consideration of the motion of Mr. Pearson:

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 the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Diefenbaker, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. More.

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, it was just one week ago today that the hon. member for Regina City moved his subamendment listing four possible alternatives that might appear on a plebiscite if one were held on the flag. In the first six days after the debate started there was one speaker from the Liberals for every Conservative speaker, and each of the other parties put forward three speakers. However, in the last five days the type of debate has changed somewhat, in that the Conservatives have been putting up most of the speakers while the Liberal party has contented itself with two and the other parties with one each.

I suggest that one of the big changes that has come about because of the subamendment is a recognition by those on the government side of the house, in the press gallery and across the country that the debate on the flag has been dignified by very powerful speeches. One reason these speeches have had quite an impact is that people are now beginning to recognize that they are sincere expressions springing from the minds and hearts of the people who are speaking. These are not delaying speeches. Those members who have spoken are not only speaking for their constituencies but are speaking from the depths of their beings. This is why an impact is beginning to be felt not only in this house and in the press gallery but all across the country, and the realization is spreading that we are debating a most important subject in the history of Canada.

On June 30 I took part in the debate on the original amendment and at that time, thinking ahead to what future amendments might be moved, I used these words as found on page 4887 of *Hansard*:

I am not going to delve into the intricate problems of the wording of the plebiscite.

I used those words because, as hon. members who may wish to read my speech at that time will see, I was aware that one of the great arguments for a plebiscite was to give the people of the country the feeling that regardless of the variety of their opinions, they would be able to indicate their feelings to the government through a plebiscite. The subamendment moved by the hon. member for Regina City lists four choices on which the people of the country can focus their minds so the government of the day may have a realistic indication of where the weight of public opinion lies with regard to each of these choices.

When discussing the subamendment yesterday the hon. member for Oxford made a suggestion that aroused considerable interest among those of us who were listening. After

listing the four alternatives in the subamendment he suggested that once the government had an idea of how the people felt about these alternatives, the government would then be able to see more clearly what they should do. He suggested a small committee of all parties in the house, and this suggestion immediately attracted interest and questions from every party in the house.

I should like to take the suggestion of the hon. member for Oxford and say to the government that rightly or wrongly they have got themselves into a mess on the subject of the flag. If hon. members will read the speech from the throne they will see there is not a single word in it about the intention of the government to bring forward a resolution on the flag, let alone three. It is obvious that some time after the writing of the speech from the throne somebody came up with a brilliant public relations idea. They said to themselves, we are in trouble on several matters before the house, we cannot get agreement with the provinces on several of our proposals, so let us create a great smokescreen by bringing up the issue of the flag and having a long debate on it which will give us time to resolve our differences with the provinces and get our material ready for the house, and maybe make the people forget the difficulties we were in during the first few weeks of this session.

Whoever proposed that idea must accept the responsibility for having led the party he supports into probably one of the most desperate traps into which this country has ever seen a government fall. They are in a desperate situation because of the trap into which they have fallen, in that at a time in Canada's history when everybody should be working toward unity the government unwittingly has introduced a subject that is divisive.

It is the responsibility not only of the government but of all responsible members of the opposition to try to suggest some way for the government to get out of the mess and the trap in which they now find themselves. We on our part have tried to suggest that one way out is by some form of plebiscite. We have been explicit to the degree that we have outlined four potential choices that should be included in the plebiscite. There may be others.

The hon. member for Oxford has gone one step further, and I think his suggestion should be considered by the government. Whether they like it or not, whether the country likes it or not, we in Canada are in a situation today that has explosive potentialities and no one wants to exploit that situation. The government are faced with three or four major decisions. A plebiscite is one way in which they can turn over the decision to the people. Ordinarily members of parliament do not favour the idea of a plebiscite as a good way to decide issues, but sometimes an exception has to be made in the case of moral or emotional issues.

When I spoke on June 30 I gave the precedent of the conscription debate. If I had been a member of the house in 1942 when that debate took place I think on the basis of the material before me and my knowledge of the facts I would probably have spoken against the idea of holding a plebiscite. But looking back with a historical perspective we realize now that, regardless of the logic of holding or not holding a plebiscite in that explosive situation, the plebiscite did serve to lessen the cleavage in our country.

When the time came for conscription to be enforced in Canada, the Canadians of English speaking background and of French speaking background who had been opposed to conscription accepted the will of the majority and served their country with distinction. They could do that because in spite of their opposition to conscription, the majority had spoken and they themselves had been given an opportunity to express their will.

We have put forward to the government, therefore, one way out of the difficulty, and that is the plebiscite. We have been explicit in connection with the plebiscite by outlining four choices that could be made. Now the hon. member for Oxford has outlined one more way out of the difficulty. I should like to expand that idea and add one major new ingredient. We know the government have to lose face in this situation, but that is their responsibility for getting into the mess. We have some responsibility on this side for helping them to lose as little face as possible, because this is a subject that concerns the very deep emotions of the people of this country.

I am suggesting to the government that they should consider the idea of a committee of all parties of this house. It need not be a large one. It should be small enough to do the job in several months yet big enough to encompass the opinions of all parties. In a democracy you can come to virtually unanimous agreement. I am positive, knowing the members of the house on all sides, that we can come up with something on which we can all agree. I know there has to be a

willingness to see the other person's point of view. I know there can be no compromise on principles, but within those principles you can make adjustments. Nothing has been said during this whole debate across Canada which means we have to throw up our hands and say this is a complete impasse. If we allow people to talk together long enough, to meet with each other, then with reasonable good will we will be able, as we have in the past, to arrive at a solution to the impasse. We have no less belief and we have no less good faith toward our country today than we have had in the past.

I suggest that the idea put forward by the hon. member for Oxford might be a course the government could consider even before a plebiscite. I think I can speak for many members in this house when I say that we would be willing to accept this. However, the minimum demand for accepting this idea and closing up this house while the committee went to work would be that the government thoroughly understand four simple principles. The first principle is that, regardless of the pride of anybody, this flag must be something upon which the majority of Canadian people could unite. It must not be any sort of party symbol, because that will divide us for generations. It must be something on which we in this house and the people of this country can find virtual unanimity.

Furthermore, as part of this suggestion that the government join with us in setting up an all-party committee, there should be agreement by the parties going into this committee that they would support the conclusions of the committee if those conclusions are virtually unanimous. We cannot expect complete unanimity in a committee. If there is that willingness to agree beforehand, if there is that acceptance of the fact that the political realities of Canada demand we recognize these four principles which I am listing, then I think we can get out of this situation. Yes, there will be some loss of face here and there. If we do succeed in getting an almost unanimous opinion from this committee I am positive the majority of people will follow along. We do not want to divide Canada. We want a united Canada.

Mr. Francis: May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Hamilton: I wonder if I may conclude my four points; then at the end of my speech I will welcome any questions.

The second principle I have to emphasize has already been stated by the Leader of the Opposition. If we are to remain true to our background and our cultures, then any flag that brings unity must afford some recognition of our past history. This country was originally a colony of France and also several colonies under the British king. We have seen a slow evolution in growth from colony to nationhood. This is the warp and woof of our history. Without conflict we were able to come to the point where the descendants of these two founding races could live together. We have come to this point where we can live together because we have always honoured a declaration which was made in the eighteenth century by Governor Carleton that the language and religion of the French speaking members of this new country would always be honoured and protected. This is the foundation upon which the country of Canada was built and has continued to build. We must always, as good Canadians, remember the pledge that was made to the French Canadians at the time of the seven years war, that we would always honour their religion and their language.

We have been able to develop economically in this country to the point where we rank with the top five or six nations of the world. With the tremendous resources that we have, with the business and scientific know-how we are developing, our future is unlimited in a material sense. This material future must not be impeded by getting into the type of struggle or confrontation that nobody wants. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, this is the second principle; that any flag that is going to create unity in Canada must contain symbols of the past. To me it is not a concession to those of English speaking background that their symbols be on the flag; to me it is not a concession that the symbols of our French speaking fellow Canadians be on the flag. So far as I am concerned this committee would have my blessing and full support if it gave equal rights to both founding races on that flag.

No superior race or cultural group; no inferior cultural group; is that too much to ask? Is it too much to ask that the flag of our country should tell the story of how people from two different language groups came, for various reasons, to this continent, have learned to live together and intend to live together?

And we intend to live together by making certain that nothing of the culture of one group shall be destroyed. We are proud, and we should be proud, of the cultural inheritance we have received. So the second principle is that there shall be recognition of the

cultural beginnings of our country. It can be done and these, I think, are reasons why it should be done.

When I was speaking on June 30 and thinking along these lines I used these words:

> I think if the people looked at this situation with all the political realities as they are—and the whole country both east and west wants this country more united—here is one way that I suggest would help. Whether there is going to be, if this plebiscite idea is accepted, a committee of intellectuals, a committee of this house, or even a committee representing the provincial governments, regardless of what type of group you get together to plan the bare terms of this plebiscite I think a plebiscite could be worked out whereby the great majority of these people who now feel they are a minority would feel they had a chance to express themselves.

I felt then, and I feel today, great faith in the democratic process. If you get people together, regardless of their political party or the colour of their skin, and they fail to find their way out of an impasse, then there is a lack of genuine democratic feeling somewhere. Now we have a history of democracy in this country which goes back a long time. We can solve the present difficulty as we have solved worse difficulties in the past. I say this to hon. members who distinguish themselves by speaking very rarely in the house. I am trying to put forward a proposal which will get the government off a hook of its own making. I suggest that if we were willing to agree to set up a committee, and if we could agree to accept the decision of that committee, then providing these principles were honoured—

An hon. Member: If.

Mr. Hamilton: Is there any great difficulty about honouring the principle that there should be recognition of the traditions of both the founding races?

The third principle which I think I should put forward has received relatively little attention during the course of this debate. I say that if we are to use a committee in place of the suggested plebiscite, such a committee would have to accept as a term of reference the proposition that there must be something of religious significance on the flag. We have nothing against a maple leaf as a Canadian symbol. What shocked many of us about this proposal of a flag with three maple leaves or a single maple leaf was the loss of a symbol which we have held most dear in western civilization for 800 or 900 years. When our ancestors gathered on the deserts of the eastern Mediterranean, trying to secure control for the Christian world over the home of Christianity, they had to find symbols around which to rally, so they picked different crosses. I am not ashamed of that, Mr. Speaker. Apart from the pennants of the knights and the nobles, this was the first use of flags on a major scale. These symbols, whether chosen by men from Britain or France or Germany, were the first in western Europe, and ever since our flags have borne something of a religious character to remind us of the history of western civilization.

I think this principle has to be followed by the Canadian people. When this matter comes to be considered in every home and in every church in Canada I do not think the people will be as happy with a flag which lacks any religious significance as they would be with one containing something to remind them that we are a part, if a small part, of western civilization with its Christian heritage.

I say this without any sense of pride or superiority for any religion. I say it simply because a nation without some realization that there is a power greater than material power lacks a necessary ingredient of greatness, both in this world today and in the future. Unless we submit to the realization that mankind is not perfect; unless we submit ourselves in all humility to the truth that there is only one power which is perfect, namely Godhead itself, a vital element is missing from our civilization. If we were ever to think that we in our mortal lives are capable of solving every problem, we would be running into grave danger. Unless we have sufficient humility of spirit to accept that on our symbols there should be a sign of superior power we are likewise sacrificing an important part of ourselves. These symbols may have weakened over the centuries, but there is still recognition in them of a power greater than we possess on this earth. So the third proposal is that any flag which would meet the terms of reference must be a flag of religious significance to some degree.

The fourth principle will be hard to explain, but I must try. Previous speakers have mentioned that ours is an evolutionary flag; it is not a revolutionary flag. I wish to draw attention to the significance of that suggestion before proceeding to consider another principle which I think we must accept. If we are to achieve the unity which we desire and which is necessary—this 80 per cent or 90 per cent unity in Canada—we must recognize that whether we like it or not this is a country of minorities. One minority, the French speaking Canadians, have always felt compelled to fight for their culture whenever

they felt it was under attack. They have developed such a consciousness of this culture that they sometimes overlook the fact that the English—or les anglais, as they call us—are also a minority. French speaking Canadians, to use round figures, represent roughly one third of the population of this country. Canadians with English speaking backgrounds also represent roughly one third of the population. Now there are some six million new Canadians, or descendants of new Canadians, in this country, and they come from countries where other languages are spoken.

So we are all minorities. The political reality, therefore, is that we must always be careful when dealing with things which affect the spirit and the culture of our people. This means that we have to move slowly. We have got along so far because we have always protected the rights of French speaking Canadians as to their religion and language. We can get on in future if each minority group respects the basic needs of the others. One of the things which the Anglo-Saxon minority holds dear is the presence of its national symbol on the flag. This is simply a political reality.

The hon. member for Ontario spoke in this debate the other day in answer to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. He used an expression then which I hope will not pass unnoticed. He said he felt sorry as he saw his French speaking fellow Canadians in a confrontation with his English speaking fellow Canadians. As I read that statement, to his mind there is a confrontation between English speaking and French speaking Canadians, but that is not the way the French Canadian sees this question, Mr. Speaker, if I read the French newspapers correctly. The elite of the French Canadian editorial writers are pointing out—

An hon. Member: Why don't you let your French members speak on this question?

An hon. Member: Why don't you?

Mr. Hamilton: —the fight that is going on among English speaking Canadians. They see the English speaking people of Canada divided. They say that this matter of a flag is not one of life and death to the French Canadian; he has many more serious problems to worry about. To realize this, one has only to consider the economic living standards of the people of rural Quebec and those of the workmen in the cities and towns of Quebec.

An hon. Member: And the unemployment in Quebec.

Mr. Hamilton: These are the French Canadian's worries. Certainly he would like a flag, if he is asked, I suppose, along the line that has been proposed by the government; but it is not a serious matter to him, according to the writers in the French Canadian newspapers. But read the English newspapers, Mr. Speaker. I refer, for example, to the newspapers of Alberta which supported the Liberal party in the last election. They say this proposed new flag is a massive concession to Quebec; that Quebec people insist on this new flag. But they do not insist on it, if you can believe the French Canadian newspaper writers; and the French Canadian today is wondering what all this fuss is about. It is said that the Quebec people feel the government should get out of this mess and go on to other things. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I suggest in the face of the political realities that exist today in Canada we have an opportunity to lay down a pattern for future behaviour in matters of this sort that will stand us in good stead for many years to come.

I have mentioned this fourth principle, for example. Anything we do in Canada affecting the culture of our minorities must be of an evolutionary nature. One of the great dangers that I see in the present technique of this government is that they have put before this house a simple resolution designed to change the flag of Canada. They have decided something that affects the deep moral and emotional feeling of a great segment of our nation, one of our great cultural groups; and by way of a simple resolution they have decided this flag is going to be our national flag, regardless of the fact that probably 35 per cent of the people of Canada very sincerely want something else that is part of their whole culture and tradition.

Perhaps we have a precedent in this regard. Let us go back to the words of a former prime minister, Right Hon. Louis St. Laurent. If my memory serves me correctly he said that by a simple resolution we could change the constitution of this country with regard to language.

An hon. Member: That was in 1950.

Mr. Hamilton: My colleague says that was in 1950. If we are going down this slippery slope of letting simple resolutions decide matters which so deeply affect minorities, we will always be in a state of alert in this country. I sometimes wonder, when we know that discussions are to be held among the federal and provincial governments on the constitution,

whether one of these evolutionary steps could not be taken with regard to something that is missing from the British North America Act. I wonder whether the discussion should not only concern changing our constitution but should not also deal with a matter such as the flag, which is now so deeply a part of most of us. Should not the question of the flag be included in any change in our constitution and incorporated therein? It could be changed, but slowly and in an evolutionary way, without forcing a minority to its knees.

I have spoken at some length on these four principles, Mr. Speaker. I am going to repeat them. I would like to say to my hon. friends opposite that I put these principles forward with the realization that they commit me, and I think many of my colleagues here, to the acceptance in advance of a decision by a committee. If we are willing to accept this, the only limitations are the four principles I have mentioned; and surely we are all good enough Canadians that we can accept those four principles. Here they are. The first is unity, in order to get a virtually unanimous opinion on this question. In spite of all the cynicism I know this is possible. These four principles are broad enough for anybody who loves his country to accept. Unity means that you get virtually unanimous support in this committee. As I have said, I think it can be done, not in 60 years but in four or five months.

The second principle is that the symbols of our past should be on that flag, and that the symbols of the two founding races should be given equal place. There is no question of one group appeasing another and people saying that one group represents one third of our people and the other two thirds. This matter concerns our history, and you do not measure quantitatively how many there are in each group. It can be done, Mr. Speaker, if we accept equal recognition, with no superior group and no inferior group. If this is done I believe we can achieve virtual unanimity all across the country as well as in a committee.

The third principle, which I trust every member of this house supports, is that on the flag there has to be something of religious significance of this nation, because without that there is nothing ahead of us; we are just—without mentioning any names—in the position in which many of the new nations of the world find themselves, with no background, no common series of principles on which they can unite. As a result they have great difficulty building a nation.

[Mr. Hamilton.]

The fourth principle is very important for the future. We must accept the fact that with regard to matters on which minorities feel very deeply there must be evolutionary change, as opposed to revolutionary change. If you bring in a simple resolution such as we have before us to change a symbol that is so dear to the hearts of many of us—a flag—and force this down our throats, you will leave in Canada a near irreconcilable minority for at least a generation; and I know whereof I speak. The period of irreconcilability may be much longer.

We are suggesting that these four principles be used as terms of reference, to give the government a chance to close off this debate, to get something moving forward so that we may have a distinctive national flag, to get back to those matters that were contained in the speech from the throne, and bring unity to this country. I think these principles deserve consideration, Mr. Speaker.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, who will be dissatisfied with this type of proposal? Who will suffer from these four principles? First of all, I know the extremists will, and there are extremists on all sides. Second, those who want separation between the two founding races will be disgruntled. Third, those who believe in a republic will be dissatisfied; but there are not many republicans in Canada. Fourth, the communist party will feel dissatisfied because they want a flag which has no religious significance, and they do not want anything at all on the flag which refers to the fact that the French and English had a colonial background. We are proud of the fact that we have grown from a colony to full nationhood so peacefully and under evolutionary techniques.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that very few would feel disgruntled at this type of situation. And if I might just descend to the depths for a moment, there is another little group that will be dissatified; that is all these private enterprise friends of one or two members who are producing these new flags. They will have to call them all back in and lose a little money. However, I do not worry about them.

I suggest that if we keep these principles alive in our minds and accept the fact that the political reality today is that we are all minority groups; if we want to set an example of living together here, not only for our own satisfaction but for the whole world—we have done this in the past and we think we can do it in the future—then one of the courses open to the government is to hold a

plebiscite. But if that is unpalatable to the government, then here is another suggestion which we have made, namely that this question be referred to a committee.

I should like to thank the members of the press gallery who in the last few days have been indicating to the people of the country that those of us who are speaking in this debate believe in what we are saying. I think this is right. We know now that we are speaking for our history and our principles, and we shall continue to do so regardless of the personal cost to each one of us. We cannot and we will not retreat beyond the principles I have just enunciated. Just as our fellow French Canadians cannot and will not retreat when their culture is attacked, so do some of us who are another minority refuse to change our minds on this essentially fundamental matter. I feel that if all good Canadians fight for the rights of those who have these feelings about their culture, to protect that culture, then this country can go forward.

I hope this suggestion which I have made, one week after the hon. member for Regina City moved his subamendment listing the four choices, will be accepted. This suggestion was originally proposed by the hon. member for Oxford as a follow-up to a plebiscite. I have now proposed that this step should be considered even ahead of a plebiscite, and I put it forward as a second alternative to enable the government to get out of the mess they are in. Because there is only one other choice, a choice that we all know no one wants, and that is that we go back to the country and fight this matter out in the wildest dogfight of Canada's history. And we will split this country as a result.

The country demands of us all—not only the opposition but the government as well—some effort to clear this situation away. You cannot get out of it now without losing some face. The flag was never mentioned in the speech from the throne. Hon. members opposite are in this mess through their own fault, and they will have to make some concessions to get out of it. But I am telling them now that I am not speaking in this way just because I am a Conservative; it is because I believe that my background and the background of many millions like me gives me the right as a minority to demand, and to always demand, that on the flag of this country there be something to represent the contributions we have made to this country in the past.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question before he sits down?

Mr. Hamilton: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Knowles: In view of the hon. member's suggestion that his proposal could possibly have the effect of closing off this debate, I wonder whether he would comment further on his statement that if his proposed committee brought back a report we should accept it, I think he said, immediately. Does he propose that in these circumstances we would not reopen this whole debate?

Mr. Churchill: Don't commit yourself on that.

Mr. Hamilton: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think I made it pretty clear in my remarks. One of the advantages of this suggestion is that we are trying to take this whole matter of the choice of a national symbol out of the realm of mass confrontation in this house and into the realm of a committee composed of members from all parties, which would be given the chance to see whether it could not come up with a suggestion which would meet these four principles. I do think there has to be some sort of understanding that there be a willingness on all sides, after the usual formal debate, to seriously consider the matter as something we should all stand behind.

Mr. Knowles: May I ask—

Some hon. Members: Make your own speech.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The time of the hon. member for Qu'Appelle has expired by several minutes, but due to the importance of the suggestion I thought the house would not object if he continued. However, if he is going to make many more replies we need the consent of the house. Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, may I ask just one more question, because I think the suggestion was put forward seriously and we have the right to understand its implications. Since the effect would be to cut off debate now, can the hon. member say whether he and his party would agree, when a report did come back, that there be either no debate or limited debate so that a decision could be made without reopening the matter all over again?

Mr. Moreau: Would the hon. member permit a question? I think he has put forward an interesting proposal. Would he prevail on

the members of his party to allow the sub-amendment and the amendment which are now before us to come to a vote so he could put forward his suggestion in the form of an amendment to the main resolution?

Mr. Hamilton: Mr. Speaker, I made my proposal to the government in the hope that the leader of the government, who has some responsibility as the real house leader, would come before the meeting of the leaders of all parties with some tangible suggestion. I have put forward the proposal together with the terms of reference, but I think it is up to the Prime Minister to take some type of leadership. I have been putting forward an idea which I took from the hon. member for Oxford in the hope that it would receive serious consideration.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Speaker, for the past three weeks we have been having a single debate, that on the resolution to give Canada a distinctive national flag. During those three weeks, we have heard very few members from the province of Quebec, and I think that many factors may be instrumental in the lack of participation of the Quebec members in the said debate, up to now.

We were quite aware, we from Quebec in particular, of the scope of the problem and of the discussions which the government proposal would stir up, and we did not want to add in any way to the discussion.

But I believe, following everything which was said since the beginning of the debate, that the time has come for us to break the silence we have kept so far, in this corner of the house in particular, in order to express another point of view and to bring, if possible, a little relaxation in this august assembly.

I must admit, although I recognize that all hon. members have the right to speak freely in the house, that one must be really thick-skinned not to jump out of one's seat upon hearing some of the arguments put forward since this debate started.

If I were sarcastic and mean, I could rejoice because we have witnessed since the beginning of this debate what looks like a fight to the finish between some English speaking elements. We have been used in the past to seeing French Canadians fight among themselves, discuss things fiercely, sometimes disagree deeply, but this time we are witnessing this disagreement within the country's English element.

But, Mr. Speaker, this does not make me happy, any more than I rejoice or will ever rejoice to see disunity among people of the same ethnic group.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think we could be happy with such a situation.

I will surely not try to refute all that has been said but there is one particular point on which I should like to set the record straight. On several occasions and no later than last night, some hon. members stated that the flag resolution is a surrender to the province of Quebec and that the Liberal party is selling the red ensign for the 75 Quebec votes.

Nothing could be farther from the truth, Mr. Speaker. Like their fellow Canadians, the people of Quebec have long been waiting for a distinctive flag; consequently, they are not the only ones who wish to have such a flag. Indeed, if the new distinctive flag is not accepted throughout Canada by the majority of the people, Quebec will not know what to do with it. It will just become another half kept promise probably carried out to get more votes.

Mr. Speaker, we would not know what to do with a flag which would not meet with the approval of the majority of Canadians, and if it is to be flown only in the province of Quebec, we do not want it. Our province already has its own flag and if we advocate the adoption of a distinctive flag for Canada, it is because we are convinced that the time has come to show some national pride and maturity.

If there is any one here who thinks that the Liberal members from Quebec were elected because of such a vague promise, let me tell him that he is sorely mistaken.

On the other hand, if some Liberal members from Quebec think they will be re-elected just because a new flag has been adopted, let me tell them that the people of our province have a most disagreeable surprise in store for them.

The Liberals are not entitled to any gratitude on the part of the Quebec people if they give them that so-called flag. That gratitude has already been expressed through the heavy vote Quebec has given the Liberals in the past following the many promises made on each occasion.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, if the Liberals think the problems of Quebec, as well as those of Canada as a whole, are going to be solved simply by means of the flag issue, they are bound to find out that those problems are much too complex to be settled merely by adopting the flag.

It was claimed for a long time that this matter of a flag was of the utmost importance to the Quebec people. But, to back the point I am making, let me refer to certain achievements of the Conservatives, when they were in office. The Conservatives have indeed given simultaneous translation to the House of Commons, requested so many times and even promised in the past. Has it helped the election of Conservatives in Quebec? No, Mr. Speaker, because today Quebec is aware that its problems will not be settled by symbols only. Its problems, like those of the whole country, go much deeper than that.

Mr. Speaker, should Quebec favour Liberal candidates at the next general election, it will surely not be because of the popularity of the Liberal party, but because the opposition parties will have failed to express their views and offer a much better solution to our present problems. If the Liberals win the next election, I think that it will be due to the weakness of the opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I have always been a strong supporter of any proposal to give national symbols to our country.

Today, the circumstances are such that I am one of those who are entrusted in this house with the extremely difficult task of voting on those symbols, at a time in our history when tensions between the various ethnic groups which constitute the Canadian people are such as to jeopardize the very basis of our institutions.

It is generally admitted that confederation survived thanks to compromises accepted by Quebec and for which we, the people of Quebec, unfortunately had to pay day in and day out.

Judging from the various viewpoints expressed throughout Canada as well as in this house, one would tend to wonder if the time was well chosen to start the discussion on this legislation which more than any other one is likely to bring a discussion based only on emotions and unfortunately to give some demagogues free rein to show their true colours, if not their skill.

Personally, I feel that there is nothing to be gained by further delaying the choice of a flag and that, on the contrary, this shock treatment—since it is certainly a shock treatment—will perhaps compel all Canadians to pull themselves together and put more emphasis on the many reasons to look for a better understanding on all those matters that divide us.

Certainly I would have preferred that the resolutions which have been introduced would not mention any colonial symbols. But as I said, I feel that we will have to be patient and probably accept a compromise in the hope that within a few years from now the percentage of Canadians by birth will increase and that those relics will disappear by the will of the majority of the Canadian people themselves.

As for us, Canadians of French origin, who settled here more than 350 years ago, we have been 100 per cent Canadians for a long time. But we still feel interested and touched by everything concerning France. That is why, even if it may seem difficult, we must try to understand the present emotions of the seven million Canadians of British origin who are being asked today to discard another symbol of our past as a British colony, to take one more step forward on the road towards complete independence in fact and in right. I recognize that such progress is proceeding at a snail's pace, Mr. Speaker, but I would rather have it slow and well ordered than quick and the cause of chaos such as that experienced by the majority of former colonies, whether French, British or others, which, in recent years, gained their independence at the cost of bloodshed and great economic and social upheaval.

The evolution of Canada is the result of long years of struggle which must be continued. To a certain degree, the French Canadians have been the catalyst in that progress towards complete emancipation of our country. We are being accused today, as we were in the past and as, unfortunately, we will still be for a certain time to come, of trying to divide the country, although it is completely the opposite.

We want a strong Canada, strong with the strength of all its parts, Quebec being one of them.

We are crying out against foreign control of our economy, not only in Quebec, but throughout Canada.

As our ethnic group had to fight for the last 200 years for its survival as a nation with a French culture on this American continent, we realize more than any other group, more than our Anglo-Canadian fellow citizens, the danger which the ever-growing influence of the American way of life represents, and how much it may jeopardize the future life of Canada as a separate entity. That is why, Mr. Speaker, Canada needs distinctive symbols.

I would, at this point, if I may, quote from an article written some time ago in the

Montreal *Gazette*. I apologize to hon. members for my English pronunciation, which is unfortunately far from perfect though I wish it were. I quote:

[*Text*]

I am a "landed immigrant" from Britain who has lived in Canada for 12 years without bothering to take out Canadian citizenship (after all, I thought, this country flies a variation of the British emblem so obviously its citizenship must be merely a variation of British citizenship which I already had in full measure).

The day the new and distinctively Canadian flag is unfurled for the first time will be the same day I file my application papers. When I next visit England, it will be a proud moment when I can pass Canada house in London, see the Canadian flag rippling in the breeze and think: That's my flag.

I have waited 12 long years to become a Canadian with a flag, a national anthem and at least a modicum of national pride to call my own. Thanks Mr. Pearson, it looks as if I will shortly have my chance. The back of my (former English) hand to those who would deny me this chance.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the expression of view of a man who was born in England, and I feel he is not the only one to express this opinion. I hope that those who were born in Canada of English culture will be as much Canadian as this man intends to be, and support for Canada as much as possible the symbols we need so that we can be recognized as a really independent country.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, when reviewing the reasons which the Fathers of Confederation put forward to unite the various British colonies in America at the time, it is interesting to note that the first and foremost aim was to set up Canada as a distinctive country, which would be sufficiently strong to resist American assimilation. It is too bad that the matter of a truly Canadian flag was not settled then, as all those dissensions and discussions, and all those problems which we have to face today would not have come up at all. They probably expected that their successors would not delay in filling this gap, but they had not taken partisan politics into account, i.e. a state of mind which having been maintained and further developed, is now obstructing any decision on the flag.

Today, we are in a dilemma. The country seems to be hopelessly divided. But is this split really hopeless? Personally, I do not think so; I would hate to think so. No problem is hopeless when men of good will objectively decide to find a solution.

[Mr. Lessard (Lake St. John).]

Mr. Speaker and hon. members, if ever a matter, or circumstances called for a compromise, it is those which are now under consideration. Quebec is in no way committed to the design suggested by the Prime Minister. I am certain that the French Canadian people who are conscious of their responsibilities with regard to the preservation of harmony in this country, will, once again, as they did in the past, show sound common sense in this matter.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker—and I do not intend to take more than the necessary time—I would like to appeal to the right hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) and to his colleagues who support him in the house, to agree to reconsider their position, because, otherwise, they will plunge the country into a state of chaos as we have never seen before, and the result of this action could have unconceivable repercussions on the future.

Suggestions were made—one needs only to read in the Montreal *Gazette* the question "Do we want our flag?". And you have the former Ontario premier, Mr. Leslie Frost, who, I believe, is a good Conservative and wants to keep this unity we all want in this country. This man who is now well on in years and quite experienced in public administration, thinks that it is time for him to take a stand. He urges those who were and are still his supporters to reconsider their position and to accept a compromise.

I can appreciate the situation in which the Conservatives find themselves. They say: "This is the Liberal flag, the Pearson flag, and the rest of Canada will support him for 50 years". The Liberals, of course, have been paving the way by reminding people that conscription was passed by the Conservatives. One may expect the flag to be the cornerstone of the next election campaign, and that is why the Conservatives object to it as practical politics. On the other hand, if the Liberals expect to win the support of the province of Quebec with this flag, and if it is their only achievement, they have a very poor opinion of the Quebeckers and of their judgment, and it is high time they reconsider their position.

As far as I am concerned, I put my trust in the Quebec people, and in their judgment, and if the Liberal party comes to Quebec at the next federal election with only a Canadian flag as its achievement, let me tell you again, my dear friends, that it will be very much surprised because the Quebec people

are much more realistic and practical than they were in the past. Simultaneous translation, set up by the Leader of the Opposition, did not bring him the deep gratitude of the province of Quebec. And it is not by granting to Quebec unimportant things, which they wanted and were entitled to, that he received the support of that province. The real problem is far more complex than that.

We shall have this distinctive national flag, for the great majority of Canadian people want it. Considering that this flag may be the fruit of the longest period of gestation ever, and that, for many, great moral suffering might have accompanied its birth, I am convinced that, afterwards, all Canadians, whoever they be, will respect and cherish it. Besides, it will have been the result of many struggles and probably many concessions, valuable concessions indeed, no doubt important ones. Even if, for the good of the country, whatever party we may belong to, we have to make concessions—I am sure there will be several in the province of Quebec, and I hope as many in the other parts of Canada—I believe we shall have to make such concessions and that we should, especially we, Canadians, come to an understanding and vote unanimously in favour of what will be not the Liberal flag or the Pearson flag, but the flag of Canada.

Mr. Valade: Would the hon. member allow me a question?

Does the hon. member want to imply that due to the fact that he has decided to accept the three maple leaf flag, this flag should be accepted without allowing us to suggest other designs to the government?

Mr. Lessard (Lake St. John): Certainly not, since I spoke of compromise. This flag design is far from meeting my personal taste, which by the way is not the taste of the majority of the Quebec people. And this is quite normal. To say that this design is beautiful, far from it. But, if I were to let my personal taste prevent possibly the adoption of the flag, I think that it would be a great disservice to the Canadian people.

[*Text*]

Mr. G. L. Chatterton (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I have been waiting for many days for the chance to exercise my right and carry out my duty by speaking on this flag question, one of the most important issues, I believe, that has ever arisen in this country. Although I have very strong, personal feelings toward the Canadian red ensign, and probably there is no riding in Canada that feels more strongly toward the red ensign than mine, my position is not very popular. The stand I have taken has been one of moderation, and I shall try to make my remarks here today in the same key.

I was very disappointed yesterday to hear the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) and the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp) call this debate a filibuster, particularly when the Prime Minister himself invited all members to express their opinions on this question. Many of our members have not yet had this chance. As I have said, I have been waiting for many days for my turn to speak on this question.

I am speaking specifically to the subamendment moved by the hon. member for Regina City (Mr. More). I shall not read the subamendment, but the gist of it is that amongst the questions to be placed on the plebiscite are the following: Would you prefer the Canadian red ensign, or the Canadian red ensign with changes made thereon to show the main heritage of both founding races? Do you like the three maple leaf flag or the one maple leaf flag? I have five arguments I will put forward in support of this subamendment or rather in consideration of the subamendment.

My first argument, Mr. Speaker, is that this government has no mandate from the people of Canada to introduce the maple leaf flag or any such flag that they may have in mind. I have with me a full page advertisement which appeared in the Victoria *Colonist* dated March 31, 1963. It is headed, "Policies of the Liberal Party, General Election, 1963." In looking over this full page advertisement I see many things that the Liberals promised. Glancing through it, I see that they are going to reform taxes, which they have done by increasing them; municipal loans for schools and parks are to be provided; provide mortgages for existing homes—I will bet that got them many thousands of votes—improve rural housing; set up an economic council; assist in retraining courses for industry; provide ten thousand $1,000 scholarships; improve public financing for universities; pensions to make possible retirement on half pay at age 65 with a maximum pension of $296 per couple; $75 old age assistance for single women and widows; collective bargaining for civil servants; restore unemployment insurance fund; create a fisheries credit agency, and so on. I could take another half hour listing the things that they have promised which they have not yet done, many of which they have already decided to abandon. No matter how carefully you examine this full page advertisement which was used in many

newspapers across British Columbia, there is no reference whatever to a flag. How can the government, particularly when they were elected as a minority, presume that they have a mandate from the people to present this three maple leaf flag?

During the last election campaign I recall that the hon. member for Victoria (B.C.) (Mr. Groos), now sitting in support of the government, who opposed me in 1961 and 1962, was on the same platform with me in 1963. I think he will confirm that in our area this flag question was not raised at all. If it had been, I am quite sure the hon. member for Victoria (B.C.) would have said he was for the red ensign. This is my first reason for supporting the subamendment, that this government has no mandate from the people of Canada.

My next argument in favour of this subamendment is that if there is to be a vote on any portion of the flag question it will not be a free vote of the members of this house. At one time the Prime Minister promised a free vote. On May 12, in reply to a question by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Coates), he said, as reported at page 3164 of *Hansard*:

> 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 would be no question of confidence or non-confidence in a party sense.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, somebody prevailed upon the Prime Minister to change his position. I think by then he started to hear from the people across Canada. He has stated that this is a question of confidence in the government. I maintain therefore that any vote that may be taken here will not be a free vote in which every member on that side will vote according to his conscience or in accordance with the way the people of his riding feel. To prove this contention I will cite an individual case. Unfortunately, it happens to concern a very good friend of mine, the hon. member for Victoria (B.C.) (Mr. Groos). I will submit evidence to show how members on the Liberal side have changed their views, or rather how they have been brought into line—I do not say they have changed their views. I will first of all read a letter which a constituent wrote to the hon. member for Victoria (B.C.). It is a letter from a Mrs. E. E. Fox, and this is the relevant part of it:

> Regarding that there are many different and decided opinions regarding this matter which is of such vital interest to all Canadians, I would urge that the red ensign be adopted as Canada's national flag; and, furthermore, that a proclamation of that flag be made without delay.

[Mr. Chatterton.]

This was the letter addressed to Mr. David Groos, M.P. Now here is the reply dated February 10 from the hon. member for Victoria (B.C.) to Mrs. Fox:

> I thank you for your letter concerning the national flag of Canada, and for letting me know your views on this subject.
>
> Please let me assure you that I agree absolutely with everything in your letter and I intend to do everything I possibly can to see that our present flag keeps flying.

Maybe it was in a weak moment he wrote that one. That letter was dated February 20. Eleven days later the hon. member still had not changed his mind, because he wrote another letter, the relevant part of which reads—and I will quote it:

> I intend to do all within my power to retain the present Canadian flag.

Then on February 7 the hon. member for Victoria (B.C.) wrote another letter to one of his constituents, as follows:

> Thank you for your recent letter concerning Canada's national flag.
>
> Just let me say I am in complete agreement with you and the many others of my constituents who have written to me in this regard, and I intend to do my utmost to see that Canada's present flag keeps flying.

Again, I apologize for having to refer to a particular hon. member but I am using this case as an example of how the whip cracks and members are brought into line on the other side. On May 21 the hon. member for Victoria (B.C.) wrote a letter on the flag issue to the Victoria *Daily Times* and to the Victoria *Colonist* in which he said:

> The Prime Minister will be taking action on this matter within the next few days. I am free to vote as I wish and I will, naturally, be guided by the views of the residents in my constituency.

The letter went on:

> No flag will be acceptable to me unless it finds a large degree of favour right across the country—

With regard to the second part of the letter which I have read, I presume the hon. member has seen the result of the poll which shows that a majority of the people in nine out of ten of the provinces prefer the Canadian red ensign.

To revert to the first quotation I gave from the hon. member's letter, the part in which he said he would naturally be guided by the views of the residents of his constituency, I should like to ask: What are the feelings on this flag question of the constituents in the Victoria (B.C.) riding?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I should perhaps bring it to the attention of the hon. member that the Chair has some doubt about

the propriety of quoting letters exchanged between another member and a third person. This appears to be contrary to the spirit of debate, where an hon. member has to express his own opinions rather than the opinions of someone else, or of other members. I must say I have no authority before me on the point, but this is a matter which the hon. member might keep in mind in case he is considering reading other letters of the same type.

Mr. Nowlan: On the point of order, I do not think there is any authority for the proposition you have just put forward, Mr. Speaker. My understanding of the rules is the reverse and my impression at the moment is that the hon. member is perfectly within his rights in taking the attitude he has, and that he has proceeded in accordance with the rules which govern this house.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am afraid I have to reiterate I have no authority before me at the moment. I have simply expressed the understanding of the Chair of the rules which govern our debates generally—that it is not in the spirit of debate for hon. members to quote from private correspondence in which they themselves are not engaged.

Mr. Chatterton: I would accept your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I might just say that the person whose letter I read gave me authority to use the letter. She, of course, owns the letter once she receives it. However I have no more letters to quote. I wish to proceed with my speech. I was referring to the letter which the hon. member wrote to the Victoria *Daily Times* which was made public by being published in that newspaper.

What do the people of the riding of Victoria (B.C.) feel about this question. The Victoria *Daily Times* had a poll, and I will read from its issue of May 20, 1964, concerning this poll.

> Not in recent memory has a public opinion poll conducted by the *Times* drawn such an intense reaction as the flag ballot.
>
> *Times* readers are concerned enough it seems, that they wish to make it a sincere test of opinion.

What was the result of this poll taken by the Victoria *Daily Times*? On May 29, 1964 the poll was closed. By that time 3,860 ballots had been cast. Of these, 2,847 were in favour of the red ensign and 1,013 were in favour of the maple leaf flag, that is, almost 3 to 1 in favour of the ensign.

I may say I have warned the hon. member for Victoria (B.C.) that I intend to attack his position and I ask him to reply to the charges I have made. I see with satisfaction that he is making notes and I feel sure he would like to explain to his constituents the change in his position. I am using this case just as an example to show that if there is to be a vote on any part of this flag question it will not be a free vote.

It was interesting to note that yesterday the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp) said it would be a free vote. I think he was flying a balloon. But even if the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) were to tell us tomorrow that there would be a free vote it would be too late, because the whip has cracked and the members have been placed in position; they have made their stand clear and they cannot change, now. To say, now, that there will be a free vote, would be a hollow ruse.

The next argument I wish to advance in favour of the subamendment concerns the actions of this government in creating disunity and division within the country. My colleagues from Quebec know that I have always been sympathetic to their case and that I understand their problems. I myself come from a bi-racial country where my own people were in much the same position as the French speaking people consider themselves to be in Canada. I wish to make it clear that the statements I propose to read do not represent my own opinions. What I am attempting to do is to show how people in various parts of the country are reacting to the actions of this government. I am almost scared, sometimes, to see the reaction of the people to the government's proposal. I propose to quote excerpts from letters I have received, just to show how people feel, and how the government had divided the country. Here is a letter which says:

> Some member of the opposition should rise to remark that Mr. Pearson is taking a course of action which will result in his place in history being that of the man who divided Canada.

Here is part of another letter:

> If we are adopting this flag merely to placate a vociferous minority, we are doing a grave injustice to the rest of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I would earnestly ask the French speaking members from Quebec to listen to this to see how people in other parts of Canada feel toward them. Much of this feeling amongst these people has been created by the action of this government. I can tell the house that in 1962 I carried out a poll of my riding on this French question, and even I was surprised to learn how sympathetically the people of my riding considered the French problem. But this is not the case today.

The hon. member for York East (Mr. Otto)—who, incidentally, made a very thoughtful and thought provoking speech—said yesterday that it is only a minority of Quebeckers who are creating this trouble. He went on to say that people in the other parts of Canada do not know this. He is quite right. They read the press, and do not know this. The C.B.C. in particular is terrible in this respect. Instead of trying to place the whole question in perspective, they emphasize the actions of this extremist minority in Quebec, and the people in the rest of the country, particularly those in British Columbia, think this is the way the whole of Quebec feels. Because of the present action of this government with regard to the flag, these people are caused to say, "See, we told you so". I want to impress on my French colleagues that this is doing them harm. This letter says:

> It was kind of you to show an interest in my small effort to stop the vicious plan to force on us a national flag only wanted by the lousy peasoupers.

I am very regretful, Mr. Speaker, that I have to quote this, but I am trying to convey to the government how these people feel. It is terrible that the action of this government is causing this type of bitterness. As I say, Mr. Speaker, I would hate to quote some of the letters I have received, but I have quoted these extracts in order to convince the government that their action is causing these people to feel more bitter against French Canadians. I have dozens of letters along these lines, but I think those I have quoted will suffice to make my point that the action the government has taken and the manner in which they are dealing with this question is creating disunity and division. It is causing harm to the whole country, particularly to the people of Quebec, because other people say this is done to appease Quebec.

I want to emphasize again, Mr. Speaker, that I have used these quotations to try and impress upon the government that this is how people feel. I regret it. I have a whole file of letters here from which I could quote; they are all along those lines. The fourth argument—

Mr. Godin: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Chatterton: No. When I am through I will answer any questions.

Mr. MacInnis: You wouldn't recognize an answer if you got one.

Mr. Chatterton: I have a fourth argument I want to advance as to why the action of the government and the manner in which they are dealing with this question should be abandoned in favour of the subamendment. As the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Hamilton) has so eloquently described it, the English speaking people of British descent—most of them, at any rate—feel very, very strongly about the question of the flag. I can best demonstrate this by quoting some of the expressions used in their letters. First I should like to read an advertisement which was placed in the Victoria *Daily Times* of June 8. It is an advertisement for the sale of a property and it says:

> Our clients along with Lord and Lady Cholmondeley have decided that since the government of Canada has seen fit to remove the red ensign that they simply cannot live under the three maple leaves and therefore have bestowed on us the exclusive privilege of selling their lovely secluded country estate.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Chatterton: I will now quote from an editorial which appeared in *The Province* of December 16 last. It says:

> But many Canadians, including thousands of veterans who fought for their country and to whom the flag has a special meaning, want to retain Canada's red ensign.
>
> It was good enough to fight for and for some of our comrades to give their lives for, the veterans say. Leave the flag alone.

Here is another letter from one of my constituents—a former Liberal, incidentally, who has changed his political affiliations since the flag issue arose—and I quote in part:

> —a desire to cater, for purely political reasons, to Quebec with its large degree of political influences...Does Pearson, after all the good work he has done, want to be known as the "great disrupter"?

The writer of that letter referred to Mr. Mackenzie King going down in history as the "great appeaser" and then refers to the Prime Minister being known as the "great disrupter". Here is a letter from a chap for whom I have a very high regard; he is very active in the Legion:

> I enclose copy of my letter to the Prime Minister regarding the flag question, the implications of which, in my view, are far deeper and more sinister than many people realize...
>
> I think this vicious thing should be fought against with every fibre of our being.

I have a great many other letters. Here is one from a young Canadian 16 years old:

> I always felt that Canada had a flag. It is the red ensign that is recognized around the world as Canada's flag. Do we have a justifiable reason for changing this flag? There must be a reason, one might say.

And so on. The fourth argument I have used is that people feel very strongly on this question of the Canadian red ensign. I am not one of those that say it must be the Canadian red ensign or nothing. Mind you, Mr. Speaker, I have been severely criticized in my riding by some of my people for not taking that stand. But this is not the attitude we on this side of the chamber take. I think the hon. member for Qu'Appelle put forward a very reasonable proposal with great sincerity when he said that we on this side are anxious somehow to arrive at a consensus on the question of a flag that will be accepted by members on all sides of the house; not just by the people of Quebec but the people from the other parts of Canada.

My last argument in support of the subamendment is that if this flag went through on the present basis, a great many Canadians would not accept it. Again, Mr. Speaker, I have many letters from individuals and groups indicating this stand. How can you introduce a flag in a manner whereby a large number of people will not accept it? Surely the government must realize this is the way people feel in some parts of Canada, and surely this must be cause for reconsideration by the government of their position. I know they are in a difficult position. In my view, this plebiscite with the four questions to be asked is an alternative. In view of the whole situation at the moment, I believe it is an alternative that might get us out of the mess in which this government has put the country. It is one alternative. I personally tend to favour the proposal made by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle. I am not going so far as he went. He laid down four principles which could be contained in the terms of reference of the committee. I do not go so far as to say that those necessarily should be the terms of reference; I think they might be ones the committee could be asked to consider. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the flag which the committee might recommend need not necessarily conform in all respects to the four principles laid down by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle. However, I think his proposal indicates that we are prepared to get together and see if we can arrive at a consensus on this question.

Two of my French colleagues on this side of the house have approached me in regard to the flag. I know they have become concerned about the position in which we find ourselves. They came to me with two flags and asked how I would react to them, knowing that I come from red ensign country. One of these flags did not have the union jack on it, although it bore some resemblance to it. I told both these gentlemen that if there was any kind of reasonable unanimity for such a flag in, say, an all-party committee, or for either one of those two flags, I would go for it; I would sell it in my own riding. I would do this, provided there was reasonable unanimity in the committee that considered these designs. It will be hard for me to do this, but for the sake of unity I would accept such a decision of the committee and sell it to my people, although I would be strongly criticized by a certain group. That indicates that we are prepared to find some solution. We have considered the matter, and I am sure the government must now have realized that we on this side are serious about it. Every hon. member who has spoken—and this applies to both sides—has spoken with sincerity and conviction. But this is a serious question and the government must realize that they must change their position. If they do not accept the suggestion of holding a plebiscite they should consider the idea of a committee such as that suggested by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Hamilton). I am sure that even some of those on this side who have extreme feelings about the question will make an honest effort to find common ground so that this present divisive action of the government can be stopped and the people of Canada can get together and find a symbol acceptable to the majority of them. This would at least not create the strong feelings which have been aroused by the present action of this government.

Mr. D. W. Groos (Victoria (B.C.)): Mr. Speaker, I was not unaware that the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Chatterton) was going to speak on this subject. He wrote me a note yesterday and told me so. He said there was nothing personal in it but he was going to make some comments which would require some answers. I must say I am a little bit surprised at the turn his remarks took in the early part of his speech but I will answer his questions.

I think, Mr. Speaker, I am one of the less partisan politicians in this house, and I try to be so in my remarks both in this chamber and in committee. First of all, let me say that the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich is quite right when he says I have been a supporter of and believer in the red ensign, and I make no apologies for that. For many years I was under the impression that this was our flag, and I have so answered when I have been queried on the subject.

As I say, I acknowledge and take full responsibility for what I said in the letters which he so helpfully produced on the floor of this house. However, I must point out that when this matter of a national flag for Canada became a great national issue I very soon became aware, as did a great many other members of this house, of the need for looking far beyond my own personal feelings, and I became aware of the need for taking a long term, detached view of this whole matter. When I did this and I had reached my own conclusion I lost no time in placing my thoughts and my views before the public in every way possible.

The people who live in Victoria are certainly in no doubt whatever as to what are my views on this point, and I have been exceedingly heartened by their reaction to my statements. I am not pretending that in Victoria public reaction is not divided on this issue, but by and large the Victorians, as I would expect, are taking a tolerant, restrained and understanding approach to this whole matter. I feel that I am competent to speak for them in this regard because I too, apart from being their member, get a fair amount of correspondence from my constituents.

I believe that many people who live in Victoria and who live across this land, now that they understand what are the proposals and have thought about the matter for a while, have changed their minds on this issue. They, like myself, have no fixed, immovable views on this matter, and certainly the volume and the content of my mail on this subject of the flag shows this to be true. In this regard I would thank the people of Victoria very much for corresponding with me on this matter and for giving me their views.

The hon. member made some reference to the fact that we are servants of the public in trying to point out what the people in our ridings are thinking. I should like to comment on that, but I notice it is now five o'clock, so may I call it five o'clock and continue with my speech at eight o'clock.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: 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 (papers), private bills, public bills.

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

SECURITY PROCEDURES AND INVESTIGATIONS

On the order:

Resuming debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Orlikow: "That an order of the house do issue for a copy of all government statements and directives to government departments during the past year regarding security procedures and investigations".

[Mr. Groos.]

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, could this be allowed to stand?

Mr. MacNaught: With the unanimous consent of the house.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I can understand standing motions which have not been presented, as has been done on a number of occasions; but once a motion has been dealt with and is in the hands of the house, what is the rule or the custom? I understand that the rules committee determined that we would spend a limited amount of time on this type of thing. I see that there are 40 minutes remaining on this particular motion.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the hon. member referring to No. 123?

Mr. Churchill: Yes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: That is why the Chair asked for the unanimous consent of the house. That is the only basis on which we could stand it, and I understand there was unanimous agreement that it be stood.

Mr. Churchill: I am sorry; I thought it was at the request of the government.

Mr. MacNaught: No; I said "By unanimous consent".

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion stands.

PRIVATE BILLS

THE GUARANTEE COMPANY OF NORTH AMERICA

The house in committee on Bill No. S-37, respecting The Guarantee Company of North America—Mr. Watson (Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie)—Mr. Lamoureux in the chair.

On clause 1—*Name in French.*

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the hon. member for Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie (Mr. Watson) could give us a few explanations on this bill?

[*Text*]

Mr. Watson (Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie): Mr. Chairman, the sole purpose of this bill is to add a French version to the

name of The Guarantee Company of North America. The French version of the name is La Garantie, Compagnie d'Assurance de l'Amérique du Nord. That is the only reason for the bill.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Plourde: Mr. Chairman, in 1964, this company wants to obtain a French name. Why is that need felt today? Is it because they are aware of the awakening in Quebec since our group has been sitting in the House of Commons, as a separate group from the province of Quebec striving to have recognized the need for the French language as well as the English language? That may be one of the factors which has prompted this company to introduce this bill. That may also be the reason why this company wishes to have a French Canadian name.

There may be other factors which have some influence in that respect, namely that this North American insurance company is thinking about the possibility of developing in the province of Quebec—since they realize the existence of that nationalist trend in the province and all across Canada—in order to have rewarding operations. Maybe they think that if they print a French name on their letterhead, on statements of accounts and insurance policy forms, they will have more customers, because all that would indicate they are a Canadian company.

When there is money at stake, companies go to work. I am not against that change in name. We must even be happy to see that an English company wishes to have a French name.

We are the ones, the Créditistes, who said that we would block all bills coming from the Senate. I think we must adhere to that principle, because we say that the Senate has no right to block bills like the one concerning the bank of British Columbia, as requested by Premier Bennett, that is a bank which would enable the government of British Columbia to be master in its own house.

The Chairman: Order. I must interrupt the hon. member who will admit, I am sure, that the reference he is making to another bill has absolutely no relevancy with the matter now before us.

Mr. Plourde: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was saying that only to explain our objections to Bill No. S-37 now before us.

That is the reason why we object to the third reading of this bill. We are prepared to let it pass second reading today, in the hope that the Senate will soon decide to send us the bill we are expecting and which we want to discuss, namely the bill concerning the bank of British Columbia.

Now, if this company, established many years ago, feels that it needs a French name, we are delighted and we will permit this bill to be read a second time, but you may be sure that we shall oppose the motion for third reading. We shall oppose it, even though we are not against the bill itself, but we shall do this as a protest against the decision taken by the Senate respecting another bill.

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Chairman, prior to the passing of the first clause of this bill, I should like to say that I think the hon. member for Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie should give us more explanations. I understand that The Guarantee Company of North America wishes, by means of this bill, to add a French name to the one it already has.

I am wondering if it only wants to make a change so as to have a French name or if it also wants to have a management that would satisfy the needs of French Canadians?

Mr. Watson (Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie): Mr. Chairman, I can answer this question. The directors as well as the shareholders of this company are all Canadians. With regard to the company's employees, I believe the French Canadians are in the majority, accounting for 51 or 52 per cent of the personnel.

This company has always been a truly Canadian company. I have been informed that the greatest part of its business is done within the province of Quebec.

I agree with the hon. member for Chapleau and with the members of his party, that we should all be happy at this company's decision to add a French version to its name.

In reply to the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Plourde), I am pleased to say that the house has read the bill a second time and that it has been approved by the committee on miscellaneous private bills. I hope that the hon. member for Quebec West will realize that this bill was approved by the committee on miscellaneous private bills well before he made his statement on the bills coming from the Senate.

That is why I think that our friends could let this bill pass without going back on the principles which they set forth several days ago.

The Chairman: Shall clause 1 carry?

Mr. Laprise: I thank the hon. member for Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie

(Mr. Watson) for his explanations and I congratulate him for the effort he is making to speak French. I hope the company which is adding a French name to the one it has in English will make the same kind of effort, but I cannot help wondering a little why it had to wait until 1964 before considering that a French name might improve its image.

As the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Plourde) pointed out, it could be due to the fact that, for the past couple of years there has been a French Canadian upsurge in the province of Quebec, with people getting together to ask for more French, not only in the federal administration, but within Canadian companies that are doing business with us and offering us their services.

So, Mr. Chairman, I agree with what the hon. member for Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie and the hon. member for Quebec West have said and I congratulate the company for having thought of giving itself a French name. I hope it will show the same attitude in all its initiatives concerning French Canadians and that it will give them the opportunity of doing business with it in the language of their choice.

The Chairman: Shall clause 1 carry?

[*Text*]

Clause agreed to.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: When shall the bill be read the third time? Now?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Watson (Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie) moved the third reading of the bill.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Carried.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lucien Plourde (Quebec West): No, Mr. Speaker. On the same principle, we refuse to have the bill read today for the third time and we ask that it be referred to the committee for study.

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Those opposed will please say nay.

[Mr. Laprise.]

Mr. Plourde: Nay.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

CONGREGATION OF THE MARIST SISTERS

The house in committee on Bill No. S-38, to incorporate Congregation of the Marist Sisters—Mr. Dubé—Mr. Lamoureux in the chair.

On clause 1—*Incorporation.*

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dubé: Mr. Chairman, as you can see from the title, the purpose of Bill No. S-38 which I have the honour to sponsor is to incorporate the Congregation of the Marist Sisters.

The congregation was founded in France on December 8, 1824. Its present field of action covers 11 countries, including Canada and more particularly the county of Madawaska in New Brunswick.

That religious congregation has always done some fine work. The Marist Sisters look after the education of the young, the ailing, the orphans and the aged and they do social and mission work. In other words, they spend their whole lives serving humanity. As outlined in section 4, the purpose of the bill is to enable the congregation to continue its work which includes the provision of educational facilities, the establishment of orphanages, convents and hospitals and to provide the congregation with the proper legal powers in that connection.

I think the hon. members will be pleased to grant its request which has already been endorsed by the miscellaneous private bills committee.

Mr. Plourde: Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to approve the passage of this bill, namely the incorporation of the Congregation of the Marist Sisters.

As the sponsor of the bill said, that congregation was founded in France in 1824 and now it has members in 11 countries, which shows that it is in demand because of all the services it renders to society.

According to the provisions of section 4, one realizes that the community does its magnificent work at the request of various dioceses. According to the bill, it would have its headquarters in Hull. It is a central place and I think that the government will be able to give financial assistance to this community in order to establish an orphanage. There are too many youths and old people in Canada who lack the necessities of life and live in substandard housing. It would be a good thing

if a building for the aged were built on behalf of those nuns who devote all their lives to the service of others.

Under section 6, they will be authorized to purchase and own property. It is quite normal for a congregation to own the land and building where it is performing its good work. If the corporation is not authorized to own its land and its building, how can it be expected to develop.

Therefore, I congratulate that corporation for having submitted this request and we have no objection to third reading of this bill, since our group does not have five but only four members. We do not want to delay indefinitely the passing of this bill, even if it comes from the Senate, because it has priority over certain bills presented last week.

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Chairman, I simply wish to add a few words to the remarks just made by the hon. member for Quebec West, but I do not intend to kill this bill, far from it. I am in favour of the bill to incorporate the Congregation of the Marist Sisters. I am in favour of it, because such congregations are needed in the country and the province of Quebec and I also know that other similar congregations are needed throughout the world.

The sponsor of the bill told us that this congregation was founded in France in 1824. Since then, other congregations, for women or men, have been established with the purpose of assisting the sick and dispensing their services in the fields of education and others.

Even if there has been an evolution in the fields of education and hospital care, we still have a great need, in our country, for those people who dedicate themselves, day and night, to the welfare of their brothers and sisters, in short their fellow citizens.

Mr. Chairman, we do not want to kill the bill but rather have it passed, and we want to congratulate all those who, by any means whatsoever, have contributed to the setting up of that congregation.

The bill was examined by the Senate first and then referred to us. However, there is one thing we cannot accept: that the Senate of Canada, whose members are not elected but appointed, should take it upon itself to make a selection among the measures submitted to it, that is passing some and rejecting others. Mr. Speaker, we cannot tolerate such an attitude and that is why we ask all those who submitted private bills to the Senate and are waiting for them to be passed to exert pressure on the Senate so that it will pass them as soon as possible—

The Chairman: Order. Once again I am sure the hon. member will understand that he cannot go on as he is doing now because his remarks must deal only with the provisions of the bill under consideration.

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Chairman, I will conclude my remarks on Bill No. S-38 by saying that I agree with the sponsor of the bill and that I commend the persons mentioned in section 1, who will constitute the first board of directors of this corporation, for their initiative. I wish them every success and I hope they will get the co-operation they expect from everyone.

[*Text*]

Mr. Scott: I just want to place on the record an indication of the support of our party for this worth-while organization. We are impressed with what the sponsor has said and we are glad to lend our support.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 15 inclusive agreed to.

On clause 16—*Territorial powers.*

Mr. Olson: Before the last clause carries, Mr. Chairman, I may say that I notice the corporation is asking authority to pursue its objectives and exercise its rights and powers in any part of Canada. I note also that under clause 1, which we have passed, the directors are all residents of the city of Edmunston in the province of New Brunswick, and that the head office is to be in Hull, Quebec. I wonder if the sponsor of this bill could tell us why the head office is to be in Hull when all the directors seem to be from Edmundston, and I presume that is where this organization intends to carry out the functions set out in this bill.

Mr. Dubé: The head office is in Edmundston now. I believe the sisters intend to move the head office to Hull, Quebec, and that would be the purpose of the change.

Clause agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported and read the third time and passed.

MEOTA PIPE LINES LTD.

On the order:

Second reading of Bill No. S-39, an act to incorporate Meota Pipe Lines Ltd.—Mr. Nugent.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the hon. member for Acadia authorized by the hon. member who is sponsoring this bill to proceed with it?

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Yes.

Mr. J. H. Horner (Acadia) moved the second reading of Bill No. S-39, to incorporate Meota Pipe Lines Ltd.

Mr. Scott: Could we have a word of explanation?

Mr. Horner (Acadia): As has been customary, a group of Canadian citizens, all residents of Edmonton, Alberta, are coming before parliament to ask for the incorporation of Meota Pipe Lines Ltd. The purpose of this company is to build a pipe line from southeastern Saskatchewan to southwestern Manitoba. Since the pipe line crosses a provincial boundary, the company must take out a federal charter. They propose to build 22 miles of pipe line, something in the neighbourhood of four inches in diameter, depending upon the size of the market available for natural gas. The pipe line is to be constructed from Gainsborough, Saskatchewan, to Melita, Manitoba.

I might add also that in asking for second reading, Mr. Speaker, it is a well established practice that bills of this nature are referred to the standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines. The proposed president and general manager of the company, as well as other persons involved, are fully prepared to appear before that committee and give in greater detail the reasons for requesting this charter. If the company is fortunate enough to secure a charter, it will then have to appear before the national energy board as well as the conservation boards of the provincial governments involved. The rates to be charged, of course, are set by the provinces. The company will then have to secure a charter from Melita, Manitoba, in order to sell natural gas in that town.

The main object of this company is to transmit gas from Gainsborough to southwestern Manitoba in the hope that a market can be developed for this Canadian product. I might add that the people involved are all Canadian citizens and Canadian capital will be used to build the line and develop the market for this Canadian product for the greater convenience of southwestern Manitoba, which is not now served with natural gas.

If there are any further questions I shall do my best to answer them in the hope that we can proceed with this bill. I would say to those who feel they cannot pass bills of this nature in this house, that the bill will be referred to the committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines and the officials will be called to give detailed answers to any further questions hon. members might have. The bill will then come back to the house for third reading.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): I just want to say on behalf of our party that we have no objection to sending this bill to the standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines for further detailed study. It is well known that this procedure is followed. At that time the officers or petitioners, if I may call them that, for this charter will appear before the committee. Hon. members will have the opportunity of interrogating them and getting all the technical details with regard to what they propose to do with the charter.

I feel I should say one more thing. It is the practice for small oil and gas companies in western Canada to find the gas and then attempt to find markets for it. This is something that goes on all over Alberta and Saskatchewan. It would be fair to say we have dozens of pipe lines leading from the smaller gas fields to towns, villages and cities all over western Canada. This has been beneficial to the people who have developed gas wells and risked their capital to find those fields and develop them. It has always been beneficial to some of the smaller towns and villages which otherwise would never have had an opportunity to enjoy the use of natural gas. In this particular case it happens that between the gas fields and the town which will be using the gas will be a provincial boundary, and as the sponsor of the bill, or the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Horner) speaking for him, has indicated, it is necessary therefore that the company should receive a federal charter.

There is nothing unusual about setting down a four inch pipe line for 20, 30, or 50 miles so that people farming along the way may have the benefits of natural gas in their homes or in their farms and also to provide for the needs of a small town which otherwise would not have the benefits of natural gas. It is somewhat unusual that a company must come to parliament because the line crosses a provincial border, but on behalf of this party I would recommend that the bill be sent to committee for detailed study since the arrangement underlying it is a common practice all over the western provinces.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines.

BANK OF WESTERN CANADA

The house resumed from Thursday, August 6, consideration of the motion of Mrs. Konantz for the second reading of Bill No. S-6 to incorporate the Bank of Western Canada.

Mr. J. H. Horner (Acadia): Before this motion is passed I should like to say a word or two. We who come from western Canada naturally have a keen interest in the establishment of a bank which might bring a great deal of benefit to us.

I may say that the world of banking has been the subject of a great deal of interest over the years on the part of western farmers generally. The banks have had a long history of opening up their vast resources to farmers, only to foreclose their loans or call for their money at the worst possible times, to the detriment of their customers. This has been the history of banking in western Canada as far as farmers generally are concerned. In recent years, it is true, many farmers have been able to take advantage of loans guaranteed by the government and in these circumstances the banks have probably been more lenient.

As I say, the people of western Canada have taken a deep interest in the banking world. It may be of passing interest to note that banking and finance have been of particular interest to the province of Alberta, from which I come, for the past 30 years. This is probably why I picked up my ears when I heard some months ago that a bank called the Bank of Western Canada was to be established. In continuation of this interest I read the reports of the committee of the Senate with regard to this bank. I must say I was somewhat shocked to find that the only thing which was western about this bank was the name. Control, it seems, would rest in Toronto. The Senate banking and commerce committee was told that the purpose of the bank would be to help finance operations in western Canada and to aid small businessmen in western Canada. It was even suggested the company would build a couple of branch offices in Alberta and, I think, in one or two of the other western provinces.

This house is fully aware that many small businessmen are not able to do their banking in the larger cities. As one who represents a rural area outside Calgary I was particularly interested to learn whether this bank proposed to make any effort to aid the people I represent. I came to the conclusion after reading the report of the Senate committee, that the bank was simply masquerading under the name of "The Bank of Western Canada"—that control, and probably its interests, would lie in Toronto and in eastern Canada. It is for this reason I hesitate to see the bill pass readily this afternoon without anything further being said about it. I certainly hope it will be referred to the banking and commerce committee of the House of Commons so that we can take another close look at the distribution of shares. I am told that since this matter came before the Senate committee on banking and commerce there has been a reshuffling of the ownership of these shares.

The company is asking this parliament for a great privilege. It is asking for a charter to operate a bank in Canada. This is a monopoly given to only a few, and while I support the principle that there should be more banks operating in Canada under federal charter I am somewhat dubious concerning this particular bank because of the attempt to masquerade under the name of "The Bank of Western Canada". If they had called it "The Bank of Toronto" I might have been less suspicious. Perhaps that name would have involved duplication. But why did they not choose another name? Perhaps they could have called it the "Bank of Eastern Canada". It would I think have been more appropriate for this group, and I would see less reason for hesitating about granting this charter. A person who tries to masquerade under a false name is always the object of some suspicion, and perhaps that is why I am suspicious of this particular company asking us to grant them a charter to operate under the Bank Act, together with other banks.

As I say, they are asking us for a valuable monopoly and we have every right to inquire closely into the ownership of this company to find out whether it will be Canadian and whether it will remain in Canadian hands. I should like to see the ownership in as many hands as possible rather than in only a few hands. From the reports of the Senate committee it appears that by and large three people will have a controlling interest in this venture. I have no objection to ownership by three people, but I wish it were 300. We would then have more people able to share in the benefits of the monopoly. This house should always concern itself greatly about the granting of monopolies. Monopolies give tremendous power to the companies benefiting by them.

I will end by saying that I wish the mover of this bill would say that it is proposed to refer it to the standing committee of the House of Commons on banking and commerce for further examination.

Mrs. Konantz: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. Among the 100 names that have been submitted as petitioners is listed the name of W. G. Konantz. I would like the house to know that W. G. Konantz is my son; he is an independent businessman; I have no interests in his financial arrangements at all, and I have no pecuniary interest in this bank. In order to alleviate any fears of hon. members of this house, Mr. Speaker, I will not vote on this bill when a vote is taken in the house.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the house ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: No.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Henri Latulippe (Compton-Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on Bill No. S-6, to comment more particularly on some of the reasons why those large companies enjoy very special privileges which any other company is unable to get.

Mr. Speaker, at this stage of the debate on this bill, I would like to make a few observations on the Canadian banking system, especially on the control which financial interests can exercise on the economy of the country and also, directly, on the personal life of every Canadian citizen, depending on the good will of those gentlemen, the bank managers, who control our lives by the decisions they make.

It should be noted that those bank managers often meet and are quite in agreement when they attend board meetings of electric power, textile, paper, railways, tobacco or wheat trusts, to mention only those and, of course, they are all members of the ultra-secret Canadian bankers association. It is there that finance and the economy of trade and industry are controlled; it is there that low salaries and high prices are established.

There are eight banks in Canada and the four most powerful control 80 per cent of all Canadian business. All the branches, 5,600 of them, with ramifications throughout Canada, are the faithful and affiliated skimmers which reap everywhere, for the benefit of the central bank, the outcome of the people's labours.

The cause of every economic crisis, war and sudden change of capital is to be found there, rather than in the so-called deficiencies of international trade. If bankers are so powerful, it is because they have the exclusive power to create money as they need it, while all other citizens of the country must work to earn a living, and deprive themselves in order to save a little. They eventually get into debt with those institutions because even sovereign governments are under their yoke.

It is almost impossible for honest citizens to go up in the world of wealth because all millionaires made their money through flagrant and immoral injustices, company and bank acts which the governments use to give the directors of those institutions exclusive privileges, unmatched power to the disadvantage of the other institutions or individuals in the country, to the disadvantage of society and governments themselves.

The taxation system itself, as set up today by the governments and the municipalities, also favours the wealthy and the powerful to the disadvantage of the poor, the little fellow and the weak. Should not the governments, bodies of society to serve society, protect the weak as well as the strong?

Therefore, I ask all the very rich people, the small and big capitalists in 1964, to assess to what extent they have been, in some way, exceptionally favoured by those three major discriminatory institutions of modern society, the Bank Act, the company legislation and the fiscal legislation.

It will appear abundantly clear to the millionaires, the wealthy and the well-off people that their wealth was derived more or less from those three major injustices; it is their responsibility, therefore, to contribute, according to their means, to the readjustment of society, in order to restore a proper balance on the social, national, personal and family plan.

And you, the poor and underprivileged Canadians, do not think that this money will be given to you for nothing. Society will just allow you to take advantage, through a social readjustment, of the share you were unfairly deprived of in the past.

It is to be noted that banks are sound and good as well as useful and necessary institutions, but one must also recognize that one of the laws on bank credit constitutes one of the three great legal injustices of modern times. We do not have to demolish everything but to correct and better those institutions. Reforms are necessary if those institutions are to be adapted to the new conditions which they have themselves created, but until a competent authority puts the house in order, it is still better to respect the existing disorder than create complete disorder by revolt and anarchy.

For instance, an application for the setting up of a provincial bank has been rejected by the Senate.

The Senate has turned down a bill respecting a provincial bank and it wants to approve a bill sponsored by a few private individuals. The Senate is ready to give a charter to individuals, to private institutions, but it denies it to a province. A province deserves as much consideration as a few individuals—

Mr. Speaker: Order. May I draw the attention of the hon. member to the fact that he cannot refer, as he does at the present time, to procedures of the other house.

Mr. Latulippe: Far be it from me to make bitter criticism to appeal to the passions of the people. I merely wish to examine the facts of which the people are unaware and to explain what should be and what the people want. Studies improve one's mind, expands one's horizons and add to one's stature. To be practical, we will indicate a logical, social and legal way of carrying out such a reform in an orderly and peaceful fashion.

Consequently, I take the liberty of saying that the banks put out credit money and cheque money which are used by the people as instruments of exchange just as if they were legal tender. In other words, they are nothing but legalized bogus money. The banks have the power to increase the money supply by creating credit money.

They lend to themselves large amounts they create out of nothing and that is where they hold an advantage over those who must save to accumulate capital.

Pope Pius XI was clearsighted. Did he not say in an encyclical:

> What strikes us at the present time is the tremendous and discretionary power in the hands of a small number of individuals, this power is especially formidable among those who are the absolute masters of money, controlling credit according to their discretion.

They are infusing blood in the economic system which rests in their hands so that without their consent nobody could survive. The strongest alone still stand, that is the most aggressive and unscrupulous ones.

Therefore, we stated our reform proposals on many occasions and we repeat them: take away from the banks the issuance of credit money and the sovereign authority shall resume its role concerning the issuance of money, of all the money required for trade.

The real money based on the large production of Canada, plentiful, based on man, on his trading requirements and on his production capacities. We must therefore restore justice, make a distribution of ill-gotten gains and then set up an economic system to preserve justice and maintain a balance between social classes for the general welfare of mankind.

I am a member of the parliament of Canada in Ottawa. What does that mean?

In my riding of Compton-Frontenac, I am the representative of 22,000 voters, and of the 45,000 citizens who actually live in my riding.

To live, those 45,000 citizens need money every day, every month, every year.

That money that citizens of my riding need so badly is not manufactured in my riding, by any citizen of my riding nor in any other riding. In my riding the citizens produce all kinds of commodities for other citizens of the community; they make furniture, cheese, houses, churches, schools, roads, but no one manufactures money.

All across the land seven million citizens manufacture all kinds of things required by human people for their living in Canada, but no one can manufacture the money that all citizens need so badly to purchase the goods and services required for their subsistence.

The issuing of money is reserved to the Bank of Canada, as regards notes in circulation, which total approximately $2.2 billion, and since that amount cannot meet the circulation requirements and the need for exchange on the part of the people, private banks have been authorized to create some sort of credit money, script money, bookkeeping money, accounting money, money which cannot be seen with the naked eye, a permission which those private banks have used to the extent of over $17 billion, and that is eight times more money than the Bank of Canada supplies.

The result is that our eight private banks, taking advantage of this exclusive privilege to create money and all forms of capital, have seen their directors become board members of the 800 largest companies on the stock market.

That is why this kind of business may tempt newcomers, that is why we are being faced with applications for three new banks in Canada.

Must we accept or must we reject those three applications? Are we going to allow an increase in the number of companies and banks which are taking unfair advantage of the public through those money-making

privileges, in the form of credit of all kinds, money, capital shares and bond privileges?

Personally, I do not think so. At least not as long as there is no control on the circulation of money in the interest of the people, of all people, of all citizens, of the 19,200,000 citizens of Canada, who are suffering hardship on account of the money control and the scarcity of this money so useful in everyday life.

For a long time the top sociologists of the whole world have been talking of an exclusive control of money and credit by bankers and capitalists. For many years economists have been asking for a better distribution of wealth and revenue among all the citizens of each country, according to its productive capacity.

For a long time too, people have been talking about the rights of many, but those rights remain a dead letter in the statutes, and never to be reflected in figures in our economy.

It remains to be decided, here in Canada, in this very parliament and once for all, whether we should let the whole people work and suffer for the benefit of a few profiteers who exploit everyone's labour, or whether we should control the situation and, at last, authorize the government, or the Bank of Canada, to control all issuing of money, credit, shares and bonds, representing the true assets produced and exchanged by and among the people. We have to decide that we approve profits derived from capital invested in banks and companies, but in keeping with the welfare of human beings and families. This has to be realized and corrected before we go any further, in Canada, with the founding of new banks—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I am sorry to have to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired.

[*Text*]

The hour appointed for the consideration of private members' business has now expired.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED UNDER ADJOURNMENT MOTION

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to provisional standing order 39A, to inform the house that the question to be raised at 10.30 o'clock p.m. this day is as follows: The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Regan); air transport—provision of direct service from Nova Scotia to Bermuda.

[Mr. Latulippe.]

At six o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

CANADIAN FLAG

OFFICIAL ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW DESIGN

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Pearson:

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 the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Diefenbaker, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. More.

Mr. Groos: Mr. Speaker, we were discussing the remarks of the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Chatterton) who put some questions to me during his address. I wish he was here so he could hear my reply.

He was inferring in his remarks that in view of the various polls that he had seen printed in the newspapers, and as a result of various letters he had received from constituents in his riding, perhaps I was being guided by someone other than those in my riding, or by my own views. I should like to clarify this position at this time.

I have made my stand on the flag issue quite clear and have let everyone in my riding know my feeling. As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, when this issue comes to a vote it will be a free vote.

In reference to the matter of polls, so far as I recall there were three taken in my riding. I should like to make some explanation in this regard. One poll was conducted by the Victoria *Daily Times*. The figures my hon. friend used, almost three to one in favour of the red ensign, are absolutely correct. In fairness however to the people who marked their ballots in that poll and to the newspaper itself, I think I should point out that this poll started on the very day the new flag was made public. The poll began on May 20, lasting until May 29 and its results were published on May 30. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, during most of that time the actual proposals of the government were not

known. It was not until May 26 they were made public in this house and May 27 that they appeared in the newspapers in Victoria. In all fairness to those who marked their ballots I must say they were not aware of the exact proposals as no mention had been made of the second part of the government resolution, namely the adoption of the union jack as the commonwealth flag. There was only a very vague reference in the newspaper to what the new flag would look like.

The second poll was one which appeared in a newspaper published on Mondays, the Victoria *Observer*. On the front page of that newspaper there appeared a cutout clipping to be sent to the member of parliament, and it was addressed to me. That clipping suggested in the last line: Please use your influence to ensure the retention of the union jack in the new flag.

As a result of that clipping, Mr. Speaker, I had no more and no less than 24 sent to me in my office. That fact would indicate that this newspaper has either a low circulation or that the thought contained in the clipping did not appeal strongly to very many people. I suggest, sir, that this is not a newspaper which has a low circulation.

Referring again to the poll conducted by the Victoria *Daily Times*, it might be worth noting also that this is one of three new daily newspapers, with coverage over the entire island and part of the mainland. It covers four complete ridings which are populated by some 293,000 people. Less than 4,000 people turned in ballots. Although I find the result of this poll informative to a degree, I do not think it is an absolute poll on which complete reliance should be placed. I particularly say that because there has been a subsequent poll introduced in this debate which was carried out by Gruneau Research Limited. I presume this poll took place some time during the month of July. The results of this poll were published in the Victoria *Daily Colonist* on August 6 and indicated that this was a survey of some 2,000 people across the country. By rough and ready reckoning, Mr. Speaker, that would appear to be about 200 people per province. It indicates that in the province of British Columbia the red ensign is favoured by 32.1 per cent, that the maple leaf flag is favoured by 29.9 per cent and another flag by 15.8 per cent. There were 17.9 per cent who did not care and 4.3 per cent who did not know. I would suggest the comparison between 32 per cent in favour of the red ensign and approximately 30 per cent in favour of the maple leaf design is not bad when one considers the new proposed flag had only been known to the public for, if I may refer to it as a sailor, a dogwatch. I think the results of this poll indicate that this flag it catching on across the country and will grow in favour once people become aware of its symbolism.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to waste much time in this regard but before I leave this question of who is guiding me I should like to point out one further fact, and this is something that has had some effect upon me, I must say. I find that the man who represented the Conservative party in the last election and who ran against me has placed his views in respect of the flag on record in a Victoria newspaper. He did so shortly after the government's proposal was made public. Mr. Chairman said:

> Many thousands of flag designs have been suggested over the past years. If this design has been deemed best, it should be adopted.
>
> The red ensign has been accepted as the official flag for some time now, and for most of that time all political parties have been demanding a new one that would be distinctly Canadian.
>
> Those who insist on a plebiscite to decide the issue are showing irresponsibility. It has been a major election platform of all major Canadian political parties for some years to adopt a new Canadian flag—surely they must represent a majority of the Canadian people.
>
> There has never been a better time to finalize the issue than on the eve of Canada's centenary. And Mr. Pearson, heading a minority government, cannot be criticized for trying to push it through wantonly.

Mr. Speaker, that is all I have to say in respect of the poll question and now wish to make one or two remarks about letters that have been received. The letters I have received have not been very great in quantity and I find that to be somewhat surprising, coming as I do from Victoria where people have, as I have said before, very great affection for the union jack and for the red ensign. I would have thought that if anything would have aroused public reaction for or against, it would have been the last paragraph of my letter to the newspaper of June 10 which was referred to by the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Chatterton) this afternoon because, having explained what my own stand was to be on the flag, I said in that paragraph:

> Not all of these have been easy decisions to make, but I was sent to parliament to consider all aspects of proposed legislation and then to vote on behalf of all the people of Victoria. Bearing in mind both the present and the future of Canada, I firmly believe the moves I have outlined are both right and responsible, and I hope Victorians generally will agree.

That letter appeared in the weekly and daily newspapers in Victoria and as a result

I had something less than a flood of letters. Altogether since this issue came forward I have had considerably less than 200 letters or communications of one sort or another on the flag issue. Since June 10, when my letter was published in the newspaper, I do not think I have had more than 50 letters. These have by no means all been unfavourable, although I am not going to try to pretend they have all been favourable either. We know this is not an easy matter to decide. I am just pointing out the intensity of public interest and I am trying to show that as far as I can establish we have heard on this matter from considerably fewer than 5 per cent of the people who live in my riding, even if we assume that almost all of those who wrote to the newspaper and sent in their ballots come from Victoria—which they do not, of course, bearing in mind once again the wide distribution of this newspaper.

I should like to leave that point for a moment and go on to another matter which was brought up by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Hamilton) this afternoon when he claimed that the three maple leaves are a Liberal symbol. I just cannot accept that. I would like to pose these questions to the house. First of all, is it because it was a Liberal symbol that King George V in 1921 at the time of the government of Sir Robert Borden had the three maple leaves designated as the national emblem of Canada and incorporated these same three conjoined maple leaves in the coat of arms of Canada? I do not think so. Is it because it was a Liberal symbol that the former prime minister, now Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker), had three maple leaves placed on the bumper of his official car? Is it because it is a Liberal symbol that Her Majesty the Queen had the three maple leaves conjoined placed in a position of honour on her royal standard as Queen of Canada? I just do not believe so.

All these uses were made of this symbol because three conjoined maple leaves on a white background mean Canada. In my view, Mr. Speaker, it is because these three maple leaves are above politics, because they are highly respected and, I may dare to say, because they are a noble symbol that I personally find it very easy to support the flag motion, remembering all the time that the second part of the resolution calls for the retention of the union jack as the commonwealth flag. I remind hon. members that the red maple leaf, sometimes one and sometimes three, was used on the funnels of Canadian ships during world war II to distinguish them from British and Australian warships. I remember that in my own experience. I am told that today on Cyprus the three maple leaves are being painted and appear on the rocks anywhere near where Canadian soldiers are stationed. I am also told that when the defence committee visited the Atlantic coast the other day these symbols were appearing, perhaps unobtrusively but nevertheless appearing, in various spots down below in the engine rooms and boiler rooms and so forth of the ships in the Atlantic fleet.

Mr. Winch: A single maple leaf.

Mr. Groos: So I think it can be said without any fear of contradiction that the three red maple leaves also have a very firm place in the affections of our countrymen.

I want to skip over very quickly the matter of a plebiscite. My views on the plebiscite are somewhat the same as those of the mother of parliaments, where in the whole of the life of the parliament of the United Kingdom there has never been a plebiscite. We have had our own rather dismal experience here in Canada where we have had two plebiscites, I believe, neither of which was acted upon and neither of which seemed to solve anything. So this only confirms my attitude toward a plebiscite.

Deciding on a flag is a tough decision. If it were not, I suggest it is a decision which would have been made many years ago. But surely making tough decisions is our job in parliament. That is surely what we were sent here for. We cannot duck our duty by referring this matter to a committee or to the forum of public opinion in a plebiscite. I suggest that we are the biggest, most powerful and most expensive committee there is and if we cannot solve this matter I venture to say that certainly no committee can.

I should like to say something about another reason why I think this matter cannot be referred to a committee. Having regard to the length of time that this matter has been discussed in the house and with all the various ramifications and the stories we have heard about one flag or another, I believe that we ourselves are becoming somewhat confused, but we must think of how confused the public must be on this issue. I should like to point out some aspects of this confusion that have become apparent to me in my investigations, but as I will not have time to finish my address if I give them all I will confine my remarks merely to one. We have been told a lot about the red ensign and told in all sincerity, I know, of how it has been the flag

under which Canadians have fought and died for a number of years, but particularly in the second world war. In my own experience I know that as far as the navy is concerned we saw little of the red ensign, unless a sailor happened to be serving in the merchant navy on a defensively equipped merchant ship. We flew the white ensign. We all know the air force flag which, incidentally, has the R.C.A.F. roundel with a maple leaf in the centre.

When it comes to the army I am on rather dangerous ground, so I took the trouble the other day to visit the national war museum. There I found some relics of Dieppe. I know there are hon. members in this house who were present on that occasion and I suppose that of all the Canadian feats of arms this is one that is remembered best as being a part of Canada. I saw hanging in our Canadian national war museum a flag. Under that flag there was this inscription:

This flag was captured by the enemy during the second Canadian division raid on Dieppe, August 19, 1942.

For nearly two years it hung, a prized trophy on the wall in the office of a German colonel there, and was then packed for shipment to Germany.

The fine loyalty of a French woman prevented this, however,

Madame Jovene, 8 rue Guerrier, Dieppe, extracted it from its packing case and concealed it until, a month later on September 1, 1944, the same second Canadian division recaptured Dieppe, when she proudly returned it to its rightful owners.

This flag, Mr. Speaker, was the union jack. I see my time is running out, but I am almost finished. Our job in this house is to legislate for Canada. Our particular problem at the moment is Canadian unity. I am looking, myself, for the kind of unity we have never had in this country. I hope that this flag will help. As I said before, we can resolve this issue and I, for one, am not unhopeful of the future. If we do not solve the difficulties of our time in our generation, then perhaps if we prepare the ground properly our young people will do so.

I do want to say one more thing, Mr. Speaker. Some reference was made by the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Chatterton) to the fact that he was worried about the division this flag debate is causing within the country. He is frightened by the reaction. He put on the record a letter containing some reference to our fellow Canadians of French speaking origin. I will not dignify it by repeating it and having it placed in *Hansard* twice. He mentioned the fact a great number of Canadians are not going to accept this flag. Well, if he gets that reaction, it is not the one I get.

I should like to say that this brings up the question of who speaks for Victoria. In answer to that question I have just asked myself, I should like to read a short editorial contained in a weekly newspaper in the particular portion of my riding where I live called Oak Bay. Perhaps this indicates something of the reaction to the flag debate of the 95 per cent of the Canadians who have not been heard from so far. This editorial is written by Lance Whittaker, and it is entitled, "Who has The Right to Decide Flag Question?" I quote:

"No editorial comment from *The Leader*—

This is the name of this newspaper.

—on the flag?

This question has been repeated in many forms in the past two or three weeks.

The answer is simple but somehow difficult to make people believe: The editor is inhibited because he is not a Canadian.

Oh yes, he has lived in Canada for 40 years, and he was born in Britain and is a British subject...but he has never bothered to write to Ottawa to ask for that piece of paper which would make him a Canadian citizen.

Oh, I know it's only a technicality, but technicalities can be mighty important when one is arguing something as personal and close to the heart as our national flag.

All this came home rather forcibly when I sat down to write an editorial on the first announcement of Mr. Pearson's flag plans. The editorial "we" came rather lamely. When it comes to deciding a flag for a country, who is "we"? Obviously, it is those who were fortunate enough to be born in Canada, and those conscientious enough to request citizenship when citizenship was offered. The editor and publisher of *The Leader* is in neither of these groups. What right, then, to pontificate (under false colours) on the matter of the flag?

Oddly, when I inquired of those who have spoken to me strongly on the subject, (and there are a great many among our readers), it became clear that many making the greatest clamour are in my boat, but they do not seem to think it matters.

It matters to me.

Something else has become clear: Among those who can rightfully claim to be Canadians, by birth or citizenship, a new Canadian flag outweighs the red ensign—

These are his figures, not mine.

—about nine to one. (If you don't believe that, ask people; first ascertaining that they are Canadians.)

The desire for a distinctive flag by a large majority of the Canadians I have spoken to has nothing whatever to do with the Quebec problem. They could care less about Quebec; they are Canadians and they want a Canadian flag.

This is stupid? This is unnatural? I don't think so, and if I did think so, I have no right, as a non-Canadian, to say so.

That is why there has been no *Leader* editorial on the flag...but a letter has gone to Ottawa, to ask citizenship, belatedly, for a man who wants very much to become a Canadian.

Canadian Flag

Mr. Hamilton: I wonder if the hon. member would permit a question?

Mr. Groos: Certainly.

Mr. Hamilton: I understood the hon. member to say that this would be the most expensive committee that there has been. Do I understand from that the hon. member thinks our indemnity stops if we stop this debate, that the staff of the house would be dismissed and we would save money?

Mr. Groos: No, Mr. Speaker, of course that is not so. There are other things that this house might be doing.

Mr. Dinsdale: How right you are.

An hon. Member: You had better talk to your leader.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Théogène Ricard (St. Hyacinthe-Bagot): Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in this discussion for two reasons. First of all to avail myself of a privilege of the house, and also to discharge my responsibility.

At the start of my remarks, I would be remiss not to commend my hon. friends and fellow members who described the aspirations and claims of their fellow citizens with due restraint. I shall follow in their footsteps and show as much restraint as possible, myself, in order not to change the tone of this discussion.

I would like to say, incidentally, that I agree with the views which my fellow member, the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Chatterton) expressed this afternoon, when he said that our discussions in this house do not always find their true explanation over the mass media.

I agree still more with him when he says that the C.B.C., in order to speak only of one of those mass media, does not serve the people well.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Ricard: I think that the manner in which the news and commentaries are given on the air frequently misrepresents what occurs in this house. I shall prove it by quoting some remarks made yesterday by a young man to whom I regularly send *Hansard*. This is what he said. He told me quite simply in the course of our talk: Do you know, Mr. Ricard, that I regularly read *Hansard* and the papers; and I hardly recognize the news as reported in the newspapers—at least in some papers, I should say—or as broadcast by the C.B.C.

That young man told me that what he read in *Hansard* was entirely different from what he heard on the C.B.C. newscasts and read in some newspapers.

At the beginning of my remarks, I congratulated my colleagues on this side of the house for the moderate terms they use to air their views. Most of my Anglo-Saxon colleagues in the house did not hide the fact that their constituents support the red ensign and that they feel it is their duty to speak as they do.

I must say that I have a lot of admiration and respect for them, for the courage they have shown in giving to the house the views and aspirations of their constituents, which unfortunately is not the case for the hon. member for Northumberland (Miss Jewett) who said that although she represents a riding which favours the Canadian red ensign, she will not take her constituents' aspirations and views into account when she casts her vote.

I would also like to be fair towards the hon. member for York East (Mr. Otto) and offer him a few words of congratulations for the remarks he made yesterday. I think we must thank him for a drop in the number of interruptions which came until today from the people on the government benches who were trying to get untimely statements from us in order to keep up that campaign designed to get the public to believe, if possible, that the people on this side of the house are obstinate and will never give in.

On the contrary, all the members who have spoken on this side of the house displayed a great understanding and also stated their willingness to accept a compromise that would be reasonable for all parties concerned, so as to settle the ticklish problem concerning the national flag issue or rather the national flags, since we are talking about adopting two flags.

I said a while ago that I was rising in order to do my duty towards my constituents. I wish at the outset to state clearly the stand I must take as regards the Canadian flag, while basing myself on my constituents' aspirations and desires.

I must say that the freedom we are enjoying in our party also enables me to state that I am in favour of a national distinctive flag.

On this side of the house, our hands are not already tied by party discipline. We can voice our opinions as we please. We have the right and are free to vote as we see fit, and we also have the right to make our views known in whatever way we choose.

I regret that our hon. friends opposite do not enjoy that same freedom. If I am not mistaken, that should explain why the hon. members from the province of Quebec are not taking part in this debate. On those occasions when they did speak, they limited themselves to bitter remarks—

Mr. Plourde: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I should like to remind the hon. member that the reason we, on this side of the house, are not saying anything on the flag issue is that our position is quite clear. We are definitely in favour of a distinctive flag and against a second flag.

That is why we refrain from speaking. We neither want to waste the time of the house nor bore the Canadian people.

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Speaker, we heard the same comment last week from the hon. member who has just spoken, and yet, just this afternoon, one of his colleagues rose to speak.

Remembering a certain Good Friday, to be more specific that of 1963, I understand why some members have maintained a stubborn silence in this house. But this is not the case with us; and we are making a point of speaking as we wish in the house.

Mr. Plourde: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I want to remind the hon. member that not one of my colleagues has taken part in the flag debate today. Consequently, I suggest that he should come to the house to see who is present and who is speaking.

Moreover, the hon. member made derogatory remarks concerning an event which took place in 1963, and I ask him to withdraw those remarks.

[*Text*]

Mr. Smallwood: On that point of order, the hon. member said none of his colleagues had spoken. His leader said Quebec had a flag and did not want one.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure all three members feel much better. Let us get on with this debate.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Plourde: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I asked that the hon. member withdraw the derogatory remarks he uttered when he referred to an event that happened during 1963.

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Speaker, I would be willing to withdraw certain remarks if the hon. member would indicate what I implied.

Mr. Plourde: When you mentioned a certain Good Friday, and all you have said thereafter.

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Speaker, I regret that some particular events that happened on a certain Good Friday should bring sadness to the hon. member, but I should not be taxed with influencing his feelings. Naturally, I cannot withdraw remarks that are related to events which are not my responsibility.

A few moments ago, I said I was in favour of a distinctive flag. I have been careful not to say that I have taken a fancy to the three maple leaf flag but I am even more revolted with the way this flag was submitted to us.

Taking neither the house nor his cabinet into his confidence, the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) went to Winnipeg to make his well known proposal. Even worse, when he came back from western Canada he walked into the house and said: "I have chosen a flag and I ask you to endorse it. A refusal on your part will be considered as a vote of non-confidence." Afterwards, he ordered his followers to toe the party line.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that is a dictatorial way of introducing such an important resolution which has raised such a controversy that the country is now on the verge of splitting up over the issue.

If, at least, we had been warned one way or the other, in the speech from the throne, that we would be called upon to choose a national flag this session, we would have no reason to complain since we would have known what was coming. However, there was nothing in the speech from the throne to indicate that this topic would be discussed in the course of this session.

Members on the government side claim that this legislation is being introduced to fulfil an electoral pledge. What about the other promises concerning issues just as important if not more so than the national flag?

For instance, I remember that during the last election campaign the Liberals promised full employment.

But, has any action been taken to find jobs for the 105,000 unemployed in the province of Quebec?

Among other election promises, there was the appointment of a minister of agriculture for eastern Canada in order to help eastern farmers. There was also the adoption of a labour code and the establishment of a minimum salary of $1.25 per hour. There was also the institution of a portable pension

plan. All those promises have yet to be fulfilled. I could mention many other promises, but I will refrain from doing so.

For what purpose, then, was this project of a Canadian flag brought out of the blue? For a very simple purpose, Mr. Speaker. Conscious of its inertia, the government wanted to hide behind this resolution its weaknesses, its indecision and its inability to face up to its responsibilities.

This could have been overlooked if the Prime Minister had not raised the question of non-confidence. But after having done so is it at all conceivable that hon. members opposite would not fulfil their obligations toward their party? I cannot see it at all.

Mr. Speaker, it must be recognized that we are faced with a problem threatening national unity, and to substantiate my allegation, I wish to quote from a few newspaper articles which clearly prove that this legislation has given rise to serious concerns in various quarters.

I have here an article signed by Mr. Guy Cormier and published in *La Presse* on May 19, 1964 and entitled:

A flag or an expedient?

Having promised a flag to Canadians, Mr. Pearson is unfurling it today before an astonished or indifferent Canada.

Confused and irritated, judging by the noisy reactions to his speech delivered before the Canadian Legion in Winnipeg. Those who are unconcerned refrain from showing their feelings, as is only natural when anything is obtained after an unreasonable waiting period. A distinctive Canadian flag has been requested for a long time in the province of Quebec—

A little further on, the editor says:

The government leader proposes the maple leaf in the name of unity. One can hardly find another great virtue in the name of which he could push his proposal forward. Such unity is a wish, it is not a reality. It is less than ever a reality. Things first come into existence, then the symbols they represent are created. Mr. Pearson is proceeding by means of artificial insemination.

In its issue of May 21, 1964, the newspaper *La Presse* published the following article under the byline of Gérard Pelletier.

A symbol, yes, but of what?

Nobody will be led to believe that the flag issue is a major problem in Canadian politics. It is a matter which was left to deteriorate instead of being settled; it is only a matter of symbols and, whatever the solution which is adopted, this action by itself will have but little effect on our Canadian life.

That is a further proof, Mr. Speaker, that there are other and more urgent problems which have been tackled this session.

[Mr. Ricard.]

Further on, Mr. Pelletier says:

In fact, claim his supporters, it is not so much a flag that Mr. Pearson is seeking; it is a majority.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt whatsoever in my mind that this flag question was brought forward merely for electoral purposes. According to the various polls carried out in the name of the government, if the results had been as anticipated, you and I, Mr. Speaker, would not be here today, we would be in the midst of an election campaign. But after a while, it was found that the pill was not as good as it had been hoped for and for that reason it is intended to have only the three-leaved flag passed. However, according to the information we have, the people who sit on the government benches will refuse to change their original stand.

To give you a better idea of my village, I would like to quote from a couple of articles written by Mr. Harry Bernard, of St. Hyacinthe, in *Le Courrier de Saint-Hyacinthe* of May 28, 1964. Mr. Bernard wrote, under the title

Mr. Pearson and his Canadian flag proposal

as follows:

Now, Mr. Pearson, the Prime Minister of this country, wants to give his flag to Canada, and he even claims that it is urgent.

In fact, it has been urgent for a long time, and Mr. Pearson never seemed to be too much concerned with that problem in the past.

So he has just discovered the necessity of a flag, and he insists that it should be distinctive.

And Mr. Bernard concluded:

Concerning Mr. Pearson's proposed flag which is seemingly an enlarged copy of the latest postage stamp issued in the country, it does not seem to have been well received.

It is too heavy, too decorative, too old-fashioned, not simple enough, not neat enough.

The maple leaf is acceptable as a symbol, but why should there be three leaves, and why should they be red rather than green?

And in another newspaper from St. Hyacinthe, in an article signed by Mr. Brodeur, one can read:

The Pearson versus Canadian Legion confrontation, last Sunday, in Winnipeg, reassures more or less the French speaking people entertaining some apprehensions, since the Prime Minister declared himself openly in favour of a distinctive flag. However, despite this courageous stand, the French Canadian people still feel some anxiety in connection with this symbolic emblem. They know, indeed, that the red ensign creates much unanimity in the English speaking circles and that the influence exerted by this majority may oblige the government to change its views.

And in conclusion:

To summarize, if the French speaking population cannot get satisfaction with a standard likely to inspire its patriotism, it will approach with more

fervour the possibility of blowing up the bridges between the two nations.

All this to say, Mr. Speaker, that the motion has created in the general public worry and apprehension. I could quote many other editorials, but I shall limit myself to recalling an editorial which appeared in a Liberal newspaper, the Edmonton *Journal*, and reads in part as follows:

[*Text*]

This highly interesting editorial then goes on to say—and I should point out I am quoting from the *Gazette*, which reproduces the editorial which appeared in the Edmonton *Journal*—

Mr. Byrne: What date, please?

Mr. Ricard: It was June 19, 1963. Do you know when that was? No, I mean 1964.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Ricard: This editorial in the Edmonton *Journal* says this:

It should be pointed out that Quebec can expect no more concessions of this magnitude.

This is a Liberal paper saying this. The other day in one of the French language newspapers those words were attributed to one of my hon. friends, because he has quoted them. That is why we say that some of the publicity given this debate is not correct. Those words were not the words of my hon. friend from Edmonton East (Mr. Skoreyko); they were the words of the Edmonton *Journal*.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Boulanger: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Ricard: With pleasure when I am through. However, I still have many things to say.

We are accused, Mr. Speaker, of filibustering.

[*Text*]

Mr. Byrne: Can you do anything else?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ricard: I think that this systematic campaign of whispering with a view to discouraging speakers from talking, is starting over again and that these people will have to be called to order.

I would ask particularly to the hon. member for Kootenay East who has just interrupted me—

[*Text*]

If the hon. member for Kootenay East (Mr. Byrne) has so much to say, why does he not stand up and tell us what is his position with regard to the proposal which is before us? How is he going to vote on the first part of the resolution? How is he going to vote on the second part of the resolution? I should like to ask the same question of the members from the province of Quebec. Let them stand up and tell us how they are going to vote, because we are anxious to know. I see two ministers here from the province of Quebec. We are very much interested in knowing what is going to be their stand. Let them stand up and say something, because we would be interested to hear them.

Mr. Byrne: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has asked me how I am going to vote. I have not spoken on this matter but I would be very interested to know how the hon. member is going to vote and what he stands for. Is he going to support a distinctive flag for Canada? If he is, then why does he not sit down? He is saying nothing.

Mr. Ricard: Is it any wonder that no one else but the hon. gentleman can say something here, because he thinks he has a monopoly on intelligence.

[*Translation*]

Since the beginning of this debate, Mr. Speaker, we have been accused of filibustering—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Ricard: Who made those accusations? Those who do not have the courage to rise in this house and indicate their position. Their consciences bother them and they do not have enough courage to rise and express their feelings.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I want to remind you that you have only 10 minutes left for your speech.

Mr. Sauvé: Would the hon. member allow me a question?

Mr. Ricard: I will pay in his own coin my hon. friend who has been so kind to me when I asked a question recently. When I am finished with my speech, I will answer his question, but not now.

Mr. Sauvé: I cannot understand the statement of the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Bagot. I think I answered his question concerning feed grain.

Mr. Ricard: The minister should at least understand that he should wait until the end of my speech.

Mr. Sauvé: I rose three or four times to answer your questions.

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I had remarked in French a few minutes ago that the hon. member had only ten more minutes under our rules, and I think he should have full and ample opportunity to finish his speech.

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Speaker, I have been interrupted a good many times, and I trust you will deduct the time which has been taken as a result.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Speaker, we are being accused of wanting to divide this nation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Ricard: We are being accused of delaying the proceedings of this house.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Speaker, we must always be a little patient with our hon. friends opposite. Since they cannot speak, they have to do something and I think we should let them make a bit of noise. Let us be patient and allow them to make noise with their hands, which is just as good as if they were using their mouths.

Who conducts the business of parliament in this house, if not the government?

The whole responsibility for the march of events in the house rests upon the government. If the government, and I am not the only one to say so, brought forward this measure at an inauspicious moment, it must take the responsibility for it and not try to shift upon the opposition the odium of its blunder. The members of the government are the only responsible—

Mr. Rochon: The flag is our responsibility, yes it is true.

Mr. Ricard: It is the government which has the responsibility—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

An hon. Member: Carried.

Mr. Ricard: Take all the time you need. I see the hon. member for Laval; like the others, the only thing he can do is interject from his seat. Stand up. How are you going to vote on the second resolution?

Mr. Rochon: The first resolution not the second one is being discussed now.

[Mr. Ricard.]

Mr. Sauvé: Mr. Speaker, could I direct a question to the hon. member who has asked me the same question twice? I would like to answer his first question—

Mr. Ricard: Later, Mr. Speaker. We saw that as soon as the flag issue was introduced, all the newspapers in the pay of the Liberal party started their campaign and right away we, in the Conservative party, were accused of indulging in a filibuster.

And yet, we had not expressed our views in the house.

These are the Liberal tactics which consist of setting the east against the west as that party has always done.

I will give you, Mr. Speaker,—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Ricard: I will give you evidence of what I am saying—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Mercier is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Boulanger: Mr. Speaker, since the member who has the floor is speaking in French, I know that it is difficult for you at times to follow the debate closely and every point of his speech, but would you kindly call the hon. member to order, because his comments have nothing to do with the subamendment.

Mr. Ricard: If the hon. member had been in the house yesterday, he would have heard the Minister of Trade and Commerce deliver a speech which was completely irrelevant to the subamendment.

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order. The Chair must take its own responsibility in respect of whether a member, in its opinion, is in order or not. I admit that the hon. member has been making some very general statements. Nevertheless, from time to time it seems to me his main thesis has been and is in respect of the design of the flag.

Mr. MacInnis: On the point of order raised by the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, I am wondering whether the hon. member is casting a reflection on the Chair's ability to understand in both languages.

Mr. Boulanger: Mr. Speaker, I do possess the ability to understand speeches in both languages. I am sure I understand English better than that hon. member understands

French. I am able to follow what hon. members are saying in both languages, and I am proud to say so. The remark made by the hon. member just points out his ignorance.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Well, bully for you.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Speaker, I said a moment ago that hon. members opposite advocate a policy of disunity. I am going to prove it, because I have here a sheet from the newspaper *Le Clairon* of St. Hyacinthe, in which the Liberal party published on April 4, 1963, that is, during the election campaign, the following advertisement:

Let us prepare the future of our children.

This ad read as follows:

The right to education is a fundamental right, but the Conservatives would only grant it to the English people.

That is how the Liberal party has always tried to divide the country.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Ricard: That is the question.

Mr. Speaker: Order. This debate is on the subamendment, but as it is now ten minutes after nine, I regret to say to the hon. member that his time is up.

Mr. Sauvé: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Bagot allow me a question?

Mr. Ricard: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that I have been cut off before my time was up.

Mr. Speaker: Is the house willing to allow the hon. member to continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Sauvé: Mr. Speaker, as I note that the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Bagot does not intend to go on with his speech, could I ask him a question now?

[*Text*]

Mr. Ricard: My time is up.

Mr. A. C. Cadieu (Meadow Lake): Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to rise in the house on this occasion. I should first like to congratulate the many fine speakers who have spoken in this house in respect of the subamendment. I certainly do not agree with the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp) when he refers to these speeches as part of a filibuster. I do agree with the hon. member for York East (Mr. Otto) when he said that he believed, rightly or wrongly, that everyone who has taken part in this debate has done so with sincerity and integrity. I believe these people represent the constituents for whom they have spoken. I do not agree with the unreasonable statement made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I have sat throughout this debate and listened to some very fine and educational remarks in reference to this subamendment.

Mr. Speaker, last week I was invited to participate in a very wonderful ceremony in my constituency. This ceremony was in fact the official opening of a powwow on the Thunderchild Indian reservation. I was amazed at what took place during this ceremony, and a great deal went through my mind when I saw the R.C.M.P. officers dressed in their scarlet tunics standing at attention, along with these native Canadians, during the raising of the red ensign. I remembered at that time that here in parliament we were trying to destroy that symbol which these people have accepted so graciously. This fact caused me to do a lot of thinking. I have thought since I arrived back in the House of Commons that it was too bad that some of those members on the opposite side were not able to take part in that ceremony and witness how these people prize the red ensign. When I stood there and heard the national anthem sung in the Cree language I could not help but think of what was going on in parliament.

In the subamendment the first question set forth is: "Are you in favour of the Canadian red ensign"? We have many reasons to be in favour of the Canadian red ensign when we look back and think of what it has meant to us down through the years. However, one thing I have noted in the debate and which I have admired is that every speaker who has taken part on this side has said he is quite in agreement with some modifications being made to the red ensign if necessary to create unity in this great country. I have been very happy to see this attitude and I was also pleased with the proposal that the former minister of agriculture, the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Hamilton), placed before the house and the government. I fail to see how the government could not accept such a proposal. There was no mention of the flag question in the speech from the throne

at the commencement of this session of parliament and I cannot understand why the flag resolution could not be withdrawn at this time in favour of the proposal put forward by the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) and the hon. member for Qu'Appelle.

Since the government took office it has withdrawn much of the legislation it has put before the house, and I think it would not hurt the government to accept the fact once again that they have made a blunder and to withdraw the resolution they have placed on the order paper, which is so unnecessary at this time having in mind all the disunity that the government has already created with the B and B gang. Without a doubt I think they should withdraw the resolution, admit that once again they have taken off in the wrong direction and come forward with a proposal for a committee as suggested by the two members to whom I have referred. The hon. member for York East (Mr. Otto) admitted as much yesterday and more Liberals should have been in the house to listen to the very fine speech he made. As found on page 7033 of *Hansard* he said:

> We on this side have wondered how it is that so many people in Canada are staunchly entrenched behind the red ensign, a fact we did not expect—

He admits this is so, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure that as time goes on it will be found that there are a great many more people who are behind the red ensign. I recall that when I went home to my constituency on week ends at the time this matter first came up for debate people were very lukewarm and not much concerned about the flag debate or a change in the flag. In many cases they said to me: Have you fellows got nothing else to do down there but debate the flag? However, I have noticed lately that it is a different story. They come and pat me on the back and say: "Don't you fellows give in with respect to this very rude thing that the government is trying to do to this country". In my constituency I have people from every ethnic group in Europe. I might say I am proud of the French blood in my veins and the Irish blood also, but I am sure if my late mother and father were here they would be happy with the stand I am taking. My father was reared in Quebec before going to western Canada, and we were very happy to live under the red ensign. As I have said, however, we would be perfectly willing to accept some modification to show the great traditions of the founding races of this nation.

In my constituency there are many people who came from the province of Quebec and I have not received one letter opposing the red ensign as our national flag. I have people from every ethnic group in Europe in my constituency and I have not received one letter or heard one word from them opposing the red ensign. I have not received a single letter supporting the three maple leaves flag. I think it is a shame that this flag should be forced on the people at this time. I disagree with many who talk about the great expense this debate and a plebiscite would be to the country and all the tommyrot they utter in an attempt to force the opposition to give up trying to discharge its responsibility. Members of parliament are paid by the year as are the staff. The only additional cost is the stenographic staff. I say that we have our democratic rights and that if we want to stand up for the people we represent we have no other alternative but to oppose this ridiculous proposal, and we must do so.

Not having referred to the flag question in the speech from the throne I think that the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) acted very unjustly when he appeared as guest speaker before that great body, the Canadian Legion and told them that this flag would be the flag whether they liked it or not. He was invited there as the guest speaker but he took advantage of the time and the opportunity to make a political speech and to tell them that this would be the flag whether they liked it or not. I think the Legion had no alternative but to boo and jeer him. He was invited there as a guest speaker but he took the opportunity to make a political speech and to try to unfurl his flag before that great organization whose members have done so much in two world wars and who are solidly behind the Canadian red ensign. I think this was a disgrace.

Many have seen the cartoons discrediting this great organization, the Canadian Legion, by implying that only the drunks in the Legion were supporting the red ensign. I think this is a shame. Many people in my constituency have not written letters but have come to me and said: If there is a majority in favour of this flag why do you fellows not go along with it? I say that these are people who would give up their flag and country for a political party, and in my opinion that is a shame. I do not rate very highly any group of people who will give up their flag, their country and their traditions for a political party.

The second question in the subamendment is: "Are you in favour of the Canadian red ensign with changes made thereon to show the main heritages of both founding races?"

I think I have covered that point. It has been definitely shown that we in this party are willing to go along with certain changes in the red ensign to show distinctly the heritages of the two founding races. I think this is very important. I for one would hate to see the union jack removed from any distinctive Canadian flag. I believe it has a place there and I think we have every right to ask that it be left there. But I would not oppose adding the fleur-de-lis or any other symbol. There are many ways in which this could be done.

I support strongly the proposal made by the hon. member for Oxford and the hon. member for Qu'Appelle but I also have a proposal I should like the government to consider. I suggest that the provinces should be brought into the picture. Let their representatives have a say as to what should be the Canadian flag. I think this is very important, Mr. Speaker, because when I go from one province to another across this country I do not want to find each one with a different symbol. I think this would be a shame. I would go along with the proposal for a committee to be set up on which each province would have representation and have an opportunity to voice its opinion. I am sure we have men and women who are qualified to be members of such a committee. I am sure this committee would come out with a flag of which we could all be proud, and I am sure that the heritage of the two founding races would be represented on such a flag. Then we could go from one province to another saying, this is our Canadian flag.

You go across the border to the south and go from one state to another and you will not find a different flag. We should have our own, distinctive Canadian flag. I think we should be broadminded enough to take this question out of politics by setting up a committee upon which all provinces would be represented. This committee would come out with a flag of which we could all be proud. We will never arrive at a decision in the House of Commons. We are, I suppose, trying to bring politics into this question of arriving at a distinctive Canadian flag. This reminds me of a cartoon I saw recently in one of the weekly newspapers. A tourist was standing looking up at two flags, one was the Esso sign and the other was the three maple leaf design. He said, "Just which one is your distinctive Canadian flag?" This is the predicament in which we find ourselves. We are well aware of the fact that very few provinces are going to accept the three maple leaf design.

When I return to western Canada and go through the cities I find that people realize something is going to be taken away from them which they have held dear and you can see more ensigns flying than ever in the history of our country. We should pull ourselves together. The leaders should reach agreement to take this resolution out of the Commons at this stage, set up a committee jointly with the provinces and bring in a flag of which we can all be proud. We were told in the early stages of this flag controversy that there was going to be a free vote. How quickly that wilted away. There will be no free vote.

We recall that there were not supposed to be two flags at the start. However, Joey Smallwood was not satisfied and said he was going to fly the union jack in Newfoundland. Then they introduced the union jack as a second flag. This is ridiculous. Surely, we can get down to business here and bring in a truly Canadian flag of which we can all be proud, and give all the provinces a chance to say that they were able to express their views on this flag. I do not know why the flag question was introduced at this time because there was no mention of it in the speech from the throne.

One of the questions referred to in the subamendment is: Are you in favour of the three maple leaves? I think I have made it very clear where I stand on the three maple leaves. We already have them on the red ensign. I have always respected the maple leaf, even though it does not grow in my constituency. I have always respected it because it has been our symbol as long as I can remember. However, I go along with the statement made by her worship the mayor of Ottawa, that this flag looks like three dead maple leaves on a field of surrender. This is what it looked like to me. I am sure a great many members sitting across the way feel the same way because I have heard some of them express their opinions on this flag.

Then, the fourth question in the subamendment is: Are you in favour of a one maple leaf flag? The one maple leaf flag does not mean any more to me than the three maple leaf flag. If something were added in the flag such as a beaver, a sheaf of wheat, a buffalo or even a good Hereford bull, that would mean more to me. These are some of my views on this subject. As I pointed out, the maple leaf does not grow in my constituency. I am sure, as many members of parliament

will agree, we have many designers in this country and if we had a committee on which all the provinces of Canada were represented, we would have no difficulty in arriving at a distinctive flag.

I do not go along with those people, Mr. Speaker, who are saying how terrible it is that we are holding up parliament. We are not holding up parliament. We are representing constituencies and we have to exercise our democratic rights. We are well aware of the fact that if this three maple leaf flag is adopted we will have it for a long time. This is the reason people here are fighting this issue. They want justice and that is all these people want. They are not filibustering. They are speaking up for their democratic rights and they have a right to be heard.

I do not blame the Prime Minister alone for this situation. I blame hon. members sitting opposite for allowing this flag question to be introduced. What were they doing in caucus when they allowed this measure to be brought forward? They talk about a free vote, but they have no free vote. I blame those who are sitting on the benches opposite for not voicing their opinions, and allowing this matter to come before parliament. They should have spoken up instead of acting like a bunch of trained seals. I hope the Prime Minister of this country, that great Nobel prize winner, will take hold of this thing and remove it from the House of Commons. He would be making another retreat but he has made so many now that one more will not hurt. He should set up a committee and let us get on with some of the other business this government promised the people of Canada.

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in this debate this evening for two reasons. I feel I have an obligation, on behalf of the people I represent in the House of Commons, to place before this house some of the views that have been indicated to me by letter and otherwise. The second reason is that I think we have reached a stage in this debate when some of us at least should be discussing ways and means or possibilities of reaching an agreement on this resolution and the amendments to it.

I appreciate the remarks of the hon. member for Victoria, (B.C.) (Mr. Groos) earlier this evening because I am faced with a situation similar to that which he described. I have received letters, telegrams and petitions from the people I represent expressing a wide variety of viewpoints on this issue. I wish to say, also, that I am in sympathy to some extent with the hon. member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Cadieu) who has just resumed his seat when he says we should take political partisanship out of the debate on a flag for Canada.

[Mr. Cadieu (Meadow Lake.]

Before this can be done, however, there are one or two essential concessions which must be made. One of these, in my opinion, is that there should be a declaration by the leaders of all parties in this house on behalf of their followers that there will be a completely free vote. As I said, I think I have an obligation to present to this house some of the expressions of opinion I have received. I have gone over these communications very carefully—there are dozens, perhaps hundreds of them— and I think the five or six from which I intend to quote are representative of the whole of the correspondence I have received. First, I have a letter from Taber from which I wish to read an extract. It says:

> I hope you will be able to support the government with your vote on the flag issue. I am not particularly concerned about the design chosen but I am, like most of those with whom I have talked, in favour of a distinctive flag for Canada free of British or French symbols.
>
> I am a British ex-serviceman of the second world war and a member of the Canadian Legion. The official attitude of the Legion I consider ill-founded.
>
> My Legion branch will be informed of the contents of this letter.

Well, here is an ex-serviceman and a member of the Legion who has clearly stated his position. He is in favour of a flag for Canada which does not carry the symbols of any other country. Here is another letter:

> Please be advised that a telegram has been sent to the Prime Minister of Canada which reads as follows—that the Medicine Hat junior chamber of commerce has gone on record as favouring the flag chosen by the government of Canada as the national flag of Canada.

I was not at this meeting when the resolution was passed by the junior chamber of commerce, but I understand there was a sharp division of opinion during the course of the debate and that the motion barely passed by a very small majority.

Here is another letter:

> As one of your constituents I would like to register a strong protest on the design of the projected flag as proposed by Prime Minister Pearson.
>
> While personally I would prefer the red ensign because it is the flag for which our boys fought and died, however, I would not mind a flag with one maple leaf (green or multicoloured on a red background).

This is a letter which indicates that the writer is not in favour of the design suggested in the motion. The writer is not particularly adamant about retaining the red ensign, either. So here we have another point of view. Here is a further letter:

I hope I am not too late to let you know of my very strong feelings on the red ensign.

As far as my family, relatives and friends are concerned, we believe we have a distinctive Canadian flag and want no tampering with it in any way, shape or form.

I plead with you to vote against Lester Pearson's pennant and if it means another election that is a small matter in comparison.

I think this represents a somewhat extreme position. Nevertheless, it is an opinion held by some of my constituents.

I also have a letter here from the I.O.D.E. of Medicine Hat saying:

We wish to inform you that, we of the municipal chapter I.O.D.E., are in favour of the red ensign being upheld as the national flag of Canada.

So it goes. Here is another:

Dear Mr. Olson,

In your work as our representative in parliament, it may help you to know how some of us feel and think on certain issues.

The ensign with its union jack, and the Canadian coat of arms on a red background holds a great deal of meaning to me.

Having worked with girl guides of Canada for many years, I have learned the legends of the patron saints. These men were not national heroes but dedicated Christians. It is this spiritual value that is uplifting and inspiring.

When I see the maple leaf, there is no special feeling involved except that we used to do a drill and sing the fine song in school; and a special folk dance I know ends with "The Maple Leaf Forever". The leaf itself holds no spiritual inspiration.

And, finally:

As a resident of your constituency, I wish to express my opinion on the Canadian flag issue.

I feel it is very important to the future of our country that we have a flag which is truly a Canadian flag. I am in favour of a maple leaf design or whatever symbol, that is a "Canadian" one, is adopted.

Both the fleur-de-lis and the union jack have flown over our soil in the past. The red ensign I feel is also a flag of the past. It is an adaptation of the flag of another country. It cannot any longer be a true symbol of a country that is populated by peoples of such varied and diverse cultural backgrounds. New Canadians arrive daily in our country. Let them be able to identify with a symbol that is truly Canadian. Canada certainly lacks national unity and sometimes I think a strong national feeling. Our feelings are either too "British" or too "American". Let us hope that a new Canadian flag will set us going as a strong united people with a strong national feeling for our great and wonderful country.

I may say, also, that all the Royal Canadian Legion branches in my constituency, sent me letters or telegrams expressing their desire that Canada should retain the red ensign. But the point I am trying to make in reading these examples of correspondence is that in my constituency there is support for the retention of the red ensign, support for a flag with the three maple leaves combined on one stem and an expression of support for a single maple leaf design. This places a member in a position in which it is impossible for him to vote on the subamendment, or on the amendment, or on the main motion, and represent all his people. I think one has to consider some of the alternatives. I wish to quote an editorial which appeared in the Medicine Hat *News* of May 14. It says this:

There should be no nonsense about voting along party lines in parliament when the government brings in its design for a national flag.

This was written prior to the introduction of the resolution.

This is not a matter which should be decided along party lines.

Prime Minister Pearson hinted that this may be the case when he remarked in the Commons Tuesday that "when the time comes to subject the decision of the government to the House of Commons, I would hope that every member of the house would vote as his conscience dictates and that there would be no question of confidence or non-confidence in a party sense."

Mr. Pearson is quite right, but he should go further and declare this a "free vote". Partisan politics have no place in an issue such as this. Certainly not the type of politicking demonstrated by Mr. John Diefenbaker, Tuesday who, after hearing the Prime Minister's remarks, said "another retreat".

It is precisely this kind of petty politicking which should be avoided when the question of a national flag comes before the house.

Mr. Pearson is right, too, when he says the issue should not become one of confidence or non-confidence in the government.

This is a matter for each member to vote on as an individual; a vote to be dictated by his constituents' wishes in so far as he knows them and his own conscience.

Let the issue be faced squarely and honestly with no taint of party politics.

Even tonight we heard the hon. member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Cadieu), a member of the Progressive Conservative party, suggest that partisan politics ought to be taken out of the decision with respect to this flag. I submit to you, sir, that there are three essential courses that must be followed if we are to avoid the difficulty that I can see down the road in this connection. First of all we must have a firm statement from the Prime Minister that when the vote comes on the subamendment, the amendment and the resolution, it will be a completely free vote. This vote should not be tied to anything except the choosing of a national flag for Canada.

By that I mean it should not be tied to the threat of an election; it should not be tied to some kind of compromise or concession with regard to anything else.

There has been a great deal of talk during this debate about the divisions in the country. This is beginning to sound a little hollow, because it seems to me that the longer this debate goes on, the more we are agitating those divisions rather than healing them, if they do exist. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, as I have said, the first consideration must be a free vote without any consideration other than selecting a national flag for this country. I should like to quote from a special letter to the Prime Minister of Canada from the Canadian corps association. This letter is dated August 5, and the last paragraph says:

> The flag issue as it stands now, is destroying the members of parliaments' democratic right as elected representatives to render a just decision, and similarly, if this subject is not settled by a plebiscite, the people of this country will be forced to vote for the candidate in their constituency who shares their flag views.

This is the important part, Mr. Speaker:

> What a sorry group of M.P.s we might have if candidates' over-all ability is pushed out of focus by only their opinion on Canada's flag.

I think we have come to the stage in this debate when we must seek some kind of compromise, if you want to call it that. When two immovable positions are taken, you may ask yourself, compromise in regards to what? If the reasons for taking those positions are not quite comprehensible, then it is difficult to decide how you can compromise. I hope the introduction of this particular design for a distinctive flag for Canada was predicated only on the desire to have a national flag adopted by parliament, and nothing else. I say that, Mr. Speaker, because we hear rumours that some of the Liberal members may add to their stature or enhance their position, particularly in the province of Quebec, if they can go back to the people with this pennant and say, "We of a Liberal government introduced into parliament and passed a distinctive flag for Canada". But the other side of the two positions has also to be considered. If the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) and his followers are continuing this debate solely because they do not want this particular design and they want the red ensign to remain as Canada's national flag, that is also an honest position. But we hear rumours that there may be some enhancement of their political position in parts of the country as long as they keep this filibuster going. I read one letter that indicates there is one person at least in my constituency who would welcome a general election on the flag issue. I want to say that I do not accept that position, Mr. Speaker. As I said, there are two sides to this question and I think we have to try honestly to find a compromise that will be accepted by both sides of the house. To do that, one thing is essential; that is, that every member or, if this is not possible, at least the spokesmen for every political party shall assume the responsibility of trying to obtain the acceptance of the design after it is passed, whatever it is, and will not attempt to use it as a political wrench in an election.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Olson: One other thing that I think is important, Mr. Speaker, now the debate has gone this far and we have found a hardening of positions on both sides of the issue, is that when the flag is adopted, it ought to be a flag of parliament. At the present time I think many members of this house, and most of the Canadian people, feel that the design explained in the resolution—that is, three red maple leaves conjoined, on a white background with blue borders—is in fact a Liberal design or that it is, as it has been referred to, Pearson's pennant. I believe that the government, in order to reach some kind of compromise, ought to accept an amendment to the design and that amendment should come from somewhere in the opposition, be it from the Conservatives or any one of the other parties. Then when the decision has been taken, it will not have been a Liberal design or a Pearson pennant railroaded through parliament by sheer weight of numbers in the vote.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the three suggestions I have made—they are not new suggestions; I am not suggesting they are—ought to be seriously considered by both sides and both sides should try to come together on this question; otherwise I can see that this debate is going to go on and on. I believe that the positions, while they have hardened considerably, will become even worse. Then, when the decision has been taken, there will be wide division in the country in regard to accepting that flag, if it is the one described on the order paper at the present time.

Our party has stated over and over again that we will have a free vote in so far as our members are concerned. We are free to vote as our conscience directs and dictates on all the amendments and the resolution itself. This is what the Prime Minister asked the members of the house to do back in

May; I think it was early in May but I am not sure of the exact date. It was approximately May 10. I think the time has come when he should give an undertaking on behalf of the government that they recognize that this is the way out. I would not be particularly concerned if the flag debate went on for another week or ten days, in spite of the fact that it is interfering with some of the other business to which parliament could be attending. It is not an unimportant matter to me, however. I do not know what the count is now, but something like 70 to 75 members must have spoken. I think that the rest of the members of this house, the other 190 or so, should also have the opportunity to speak on this flag debate before it terminates. Of course, what is happening is that hon. members do not speak just once. Amendments and subamendments are moved which provide an opportunity for each member to speak more than once, and this certainly carries the suspicion of a filibuster.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I say that we have to reach some kind of agreement, whether it be called a compromise or anything else, so that we can in fact get on with this matter. As I have said, I think we must have a declaration that there is going to be a free vote for the members of all parties in this house. Second, there should be an indication that the government will be willing to accept an amendment from the opposition so that the flag chosen will be the flag of parliament. That matter can be worked out at a leaders' meeting so that a suitable amendment can be proposed and accepted. Following that, Mr. Speaker, the matter could come to a vote and every hon. member of this house should assume the responsibility of obtaining or trying to obtain the acceptance of his constituents of the design, whatever it is and whenever it passes.

Mr. MacEwan: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Olson: Certainly.

Mr. Crouse: Throughout the hon. gentleman's remarks he constantly described a filibuster the sincere and honest efforts made by the Conservative opposition. Would he indicate to the house his opinion of what constitutes a filibuster?

Mr. Olson: Well, Mr. Speaker, the definition of a filibuster is available to any hon. member who cares to look in one of the good dictionaries on the table. My impression of a filibuster is that it is a deliberate attempt to continue a debate for the sake of having time lapse, regardless of whether or not there is anything new to say on the subject.

Mr. Crouse: One further question, if I may. Would the hon. member not agree that the word "filibuster" has no place in the Canadian parliament because it is an American process whereby a man can speak for unlimited time and read into the record any amount of material, which can come from Sears-Roebuck or even a telephone directory. In this house, as I understand it, we can speak for only 40 minutes and our remarks must be relevant to the topic on hand. Would he not agree that this debate is far removed from a filibuster?

Mr. Olson: Well, Mr. Speaker, as I have said, I do not have a dictionary before me so I can only give the hon. member a vivid, literal definition of the word. Perhaps the manner in which a filibuster is carried on in Canada is somewhat different from the United States, but I would suggest that the connotation put on the word "filibuster" by most hon. members in this house, as well as most Canadians, is completely in accord with the definition which I tried to give a few minutes ago.

Mr. Skoreyko: Would the hon. member—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the hon. member rising to ask a question?

Mr. Skoreyko: Would the hon. member permit another question. I wonder whether I could ask him exactly where he stands with respect to the resolution as it is, as opposed to the red ensign. He has read into the record letters both for and against the red ensign, but it appeared to me that he slithered along in the middle, a tactic for which his leader is well known. I do not want to imply that I have known the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Olson) for this particular habit, but where does he stand?

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, at the outset of my speech I made it abundantly clear that I felt it was my obligation and my duty to put before this parliament a reasonably accurate expression of opinion on the part of the people I represent in the constituency of Medicine Hat. I have done that. Now, if immediately after having done so I am going to have to say, before I have listened to the balance of the debate, what position I am going to take in this matter, it seems to me that this precludes my having an open mind on the suggestions which may be put forward within the next few days.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the hon. member for Battle River-Camrose (Mr. Smallwood)

rising to ask a question of the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Olson)?

Mr. Smallwood: Yes, Mr. Speaker. For the last 20 minutes he straddled the fence and, like most Social Crediters, spoke out of both sides of his mouth at the same time. Would he now tell us whether or not he supports the red ensign?

Mr. Olson: The hon. member for Battle River-Camrose (Mr. Smallwood) wanted to ask me a question. I do not think we should accept the preamble to his question, which was really a speech and he has already had an opportunity to make his speech. He asked me point blank whether or not I am in favour of the red ensign. I want to say to him and to all other members of this house that when I was elected to represent the people of Medicine Hat I did not have a firm opinion on every single issue which was going to come before this parliament.

Mr. Smallwood: All right, sit down.

Mr. Olson: But I did give an undertaking to them that I would consider matters in the light of the arguments presented to me and the expressions of opinion voiced by my constituents, and then I would reach a decision. I would say to the hon. member that if he will allow this subamendment, the amendment and the resolution come to a vote he will very soon find out how the hon. member for Medicine Hat feels about this issue.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Kootenay East (Mr. Byrne).

Mr. Byrne: Mr. Speaker, this will only be a small participation in the debate, but since the hon. member asked for the definition of a filibuster, I should like to point out that I have been unable to find a definition. However, I understand that it is a prolonged debate in order to prevent a vote. Nevertheless, there is—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Is the hon. member for Kootenay East asking for the floor to make a speech or does he wish to ask a question?

Mr. Byrne: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member will have an opportunity to make a speech and to participate in this debate later. The Chair would like to recognize the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. MacInnis) at this time.

Mr. Byrne: Surely, Mr. Speaker, I can have—

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The Chair has recognized the hon. member for Cape Breton South.

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, might I say at the outset that quite often I have to compete with others who wish to represent my constituency. To begin with I should like, through you, Mr. Speaker, to direct a remark to the hon. member for Mercier (Mr. Boulanger), who I thought cast certain reflections on the Chair a while ago when he inferred that the Speaker himself was not following the debate because of his inability to follow the French language. On my point of order the hon. member for Mercier, of course, got to his feet in order to give me a lecture on biculturalism. I should like to say to him, through you, sir, "Dūin do bhèal" I have no intention of translating that remark, although I am sure the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough (Mr. Stewart) understands it. The hon. member for Mercier is not aware that that is Gaelic, the native tongue of my ancestors, and I assure him I have no intention of translating it for his benefit. However, it is a commonly used phrase which could not be interpreted as complimentary.

In taking part in this debate I hope the Chair will see fit to grant me the same privileges enjoyed by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp), by the member for York East (Mr. Otto) and others.

Mr. Byrne: Do not worry, you have never been restrained by a word.

Mr. MacInnis: A moment ago the hon. member for Kootenay East rose and attempted to read again from a book. That seems to be his only ability, because so far he has not taken part in the debate. I suggest he refer to *Hansard* of yesterday where he will find that he is on record no less than 16 times, yet said nothing.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, it is my hope that I will enjoy the same privileges accorded to the Minister of Trade and Commerce and others. I am sorry the Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau) is not present, but in the event he does come and raise a point of order I should like to recommend some reading for him. I suggest that he read the second column on page 2892 of *Hansard* where the following words, uttered by you, sir, are recorded:

> My understanding of the practice in these debates is to consider both the amendment and the subamendment at the same time and not be too restrictive so as to eliminate all discussion—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Perhaps the hon. member will wait until a point of order is raised before replying to it. I do not want to interrupt the hon. member, but I would invite him to come to the point at issue. I think what he read a moment ago would be relevant if a point of order was raised.

Mr. MacInnis: I will abide by your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I expected a point of order to be raised and could see no harm in quoting from a ruling by yourself made in this house. I certainly agree that no better individuals could be quoted in this house than Sir Winston Churchill, and some others, and suggest that perhaps I should be given the opportunity of quoting matters which concern this debate in order to substantiate the argument I intend to put forward. In any case, Mr. Speaker, I have recommended that reading material for the Minister of Justice.

I should now like to quote the words of the Minister of Trade and Commerce as they are recorded at page 6957 of *Hansard* of August 18, 1964. I feel these words are relevant to my argument that I should be given the same privilege accorded to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. In the last column on page 6957 the minister is reported as having stated:

> This subamendment is prolonging the debate, in my view quite unnecessarily. Anything that is being said on the subamendment could have been said on the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, those words were uttered by the Minister of Trade and Commerce within a day of the time he supported a vote on a ruling contrary to that statement. He did so to suit his own purposes. Many other members on that side of the house saw fit to reverse their feelings within a 24-hour period to further their own aims.

The Prime Minister when introducing this resolution, and this has been repeated time and time again, made it quite clear at the outset that he hoped each and every member of parliament would take the opportunity of speaking on this issue. The same Prime Minister in this house criticized members for doing what he invited them to do and used the word "filibuster" in reference to our speeches made in acceptance of that invitation.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure everyone has an interpretation of the word "filibuster". Without becoming involved in the United States meaning of that word, or its meaning in other countries, I should like to state that a filibuster in this house would be defined as an attempt by one party, left to its own devices, to continue a debate as long as possible and, to use the words of the last speaker, use up as much time as possible. That in my opinion is what a filibuster might be.

The Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) appearing on the T.V. network described a filibuster as something that denied him three minutes in this house.

Mr. MacEwan: It was a policy.

Mr. MacInnis: It was not a policy, as suggested by the hon. member for Pictou, but a progress report. I wonder whether we might expect the minister to give the C.B.C. another progress report at 10.30 tonight?

In reply to the suggestion that we are conducting a filibuster I should like each and every member to read *Hansard* of yesterday. Yesterday was a short day but the debate took less than 29 pages in *Hansard*. On those 29 pages are recorded 61 interruptions. Of the 29 pages, two full pages were required by rulings from the Chair. Surely no one can accuse us of carrying on a filibuster in view of the fact there were 61 recorded interruptions in those few pages. There were 61 identified interruptions. I am sure there were a great many more that were not identified.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order—

[*Text*]

Mr. MacEwan: The republican wants to know about the flag.

Mr. MacInnis: Is the republican talking over there again? Mr. Speaker, I must apologize for my inability to understand that language in which the hon. member speaks. I have been scolded before for this inability. I am quite willing to sit down and put on my earpiece and listen to that hon. member, who does not seem to have the guts to stand up in his place and put what he has to say on record. Perhaps it is his intention to hide what he is saying from me by using his native tongue. Please get up on your feet and say what you have to say so that I can put on my earpiece and listen to the translation.

Mr. Choquette: I should like to speak to a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, and I will do so in the hon. member's native tongue. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member wishes to know if I have guts enough to express my views. I am in favour of the three maple leaves flag. Is that clear enough? I will vote for that design instead of carrying on a

stupid filibuster. If my friend wishes, I will repeat that in French.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I do not think there is a question of privilege there.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, I am sure a review of tomorrow's *Hansard* will indicate that great assistance has been given toward the prolonging of this debate by hon. members on the other side of the house. In my own interpretation of a filibuster you could hardly say there is one going on here.

An hon. Member: Nothing like the truth.

Mr. MacInnis: During the debate charges have been made. We run into charges every day that the Conservative party is delaying the business of the nation. This is a most ridiculous charge and nobody is more aware of how ridiculous it is than the government. Every member in this house, both on this side and the other side, knows that if the government so wishes, the legislation to face us at the beginning of the week can be anything but the flag resolution. They could bring forward the pension legislation, provided it was ready or they could bring forward any other legislation they wished. Nobody on this side of the house has any control at all over the legislation that the government wishes to present to the house. Any inference that the discussion of the flag is holding up the nation's business is only an excuse on the part of the goverment for their inability to prepare the business of the nation and place it before the house.

In this respect I might also refer to further words of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp) as found on page 6958 of *Hansard*:

> May I say this to my hon. friend, that if a party is determined to prolong the debate there is very little that can be done by any group, regardless of whether it is in the minority or majority.

I point out to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the house that the Minister of Trade and Commerce is trying to deny the responsibility of the government in presenting legislation to the house. I would also point out that he has referred to the government and his own party as a group. He calls them a group. There is no mention of the leadership of the party. Here I might draw a parallel with what the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) once said about the party. You will recall his famous statement. The Liberal party has the platform and the program, and we think we have a leader. The Minister of Trade and Commerce has not even gone as far as to recognize the fact there is a party or a leader. He now refers to them as a group.

An hon. Member: He wants the leader's job.

Mr. MacInnis: That is true. We all suspect he has his own ambitions.

An hon. Member: Get back on the track.

Mr. MacInnis: With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that order be called. If the member insists on hollering "get back on the track" I simply say that in my opening remarks I asked for the same privilege that was granted the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who was permitted to wander in any direction he chose without one word being uttered on that side of the house, without one word from the Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau) who consistently rises in his place and tries to impose regulation on members on this side while members of his own party wander free and easy wherever they choose. The member who sits in his seat and hollers "get back on the track" should have been here to see the example set by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, an example which, if the Chair permits, I will follow. I would appreciate it very much if members on that side would not sit in their seats and insist on hollering and trying to direct speakers on this side in the direction they would like to see them go rather than allowing them to follow the example set by their own minister.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, this debate was thrown wide open by the complete disregard of the Minister of Trade and Commerce for the ruling of the house as to what form the debate should follow. You say "get back on the track". That is a very difficult thing for this government to do because they have not found a track to travel on.

With respect to the presentation of this resolution to the house, it is my opinion that prior knowledge was given to members on that side so as to permit them to make what they considered bold statements back in their own ridings. I refer now to the members from the Halifax constituency in particular. Prior to the resolution being presented to the house these members made big, bold statements as to what their stand was going to be on the flag and under what conditions they would vote for the three maple leaves flag. I say that in my opinion they had prior knowledge. I am also going to say something factual about one of the cabinet ministers. I must say there are not too many of them here, but among those present—

Mr. Monteith: More than usual.

Mr. MacInnis: The Minister of Trade and Commerce indicates there are six. When you consider that the present cabinet is the largest and most expensive the country has ever had, six is not a great number. He should signal behind his back, not in front of himself.

Mr. Monteith: There is the seventh.

Mr. MacInnis: If there are six present I am going to make a statement for you gentlemen, and each one of you if you wish can get up and deny having anything to do with this. Nevertheless this statement is being made by me as a factual one. The house will recall the answers that opposition members received prior to the very secretive introduction of the flag resolution. Nobody was allowed to know what the flag resolution was going to contain. Nobody was allowed to know what the design was. It was a deep, dark secret which, as I said before, in my opinion was revealed to the Halifax members at least so that they could make these bold statements.

I say to the ministers of the crown who are present now that from the mouth of one of the ministers I heard him take exception to the choice of the three maple leaves and in taking exception to the three maple leaves flag, which was presented by the government a couple of days later, he also indicated what his personal choice was. In my opinion this was tantamount to a leak because the opposition was denied any indication of what the design of the flag would be before the resolution came before the house.

An hon. Member: Start bailing your boat.

Mr. MacInnis: I hear an interjection from a member representing Halifax. I hope that as a member of parliament he will declare his stand. At least the member for Colchester-Hants (Mr. Kennedy) has a very good indication of where one of his constituents stands. I say that prior knowledge was made available to members of the Liberal party. I say that this knowledge was made available by a member of the government prior to the presentation of the resolution and in my opinion he revealed something that the Prime Minister was trying to hide.

Mr. Byrne: What is the point?

Mr. MacInnis: Oh, you want to know what the point is.

Mr. Byrne: Let us get to it.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Charlie McCarthy is at it again.

Mr. MacInnis: I would have to put the point in writing before the hon. member could understand it. He does not hear, he does not speak, he only reads. He has suddenly become the Liberal oracle on matters of order in the house. The day I see him stand up and make a speech in the house that has not been put down in writing either by himself or by somebody else, I will be greatly surprised. The hon. member took part in the debate 16 times yesterday and said nothing, and again on a number of occasions tonight and has still said nothing.

An hon. Member: Still sitting on his brains.

Mr. Byrne: If he would make a point I would sit on it.

Mr. MacEwan: We cannot do without you. You are the best straight man in the house.

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is an exchange of conversation occurring between members on both sides of the house. I do not believe this is a conducive to good order. I ask hon. members to co-operate with the member who has the floor and give him a chance to complete his remarks without interruption.

Mr. MacInnis: Your request has been denied already by members on that side of the house, Mr. Speaker. It is very difficult to keep order on that side of the house. You say there is a chain of conversation. There may be a chain elsewhere, but there are only broken links on that side.

A few minutes ago the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) took great delight in trying to imply something other than what was meant by my remarks. I point out to him that it is my opinion also that the Minister of Transport played a great part—it may have taken upwards of two weeks—in introducing the resolution in this form. He thought it would satisfy the premier of Newfoundland. However, the request of the premier of Newfoundland has been denied, whether or not he liked it. Again I say that in my opinion the Minister of Transport played no small part in bringing about this situation. It may have taken longer than two weeks, and he can correct me if I am wrong.

I should like to point out that this flag question was not outlined in the legislative program in the speech from the throne. However, the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) introduced this flag question before the national convention of the Royal Canadian Legion on a Sunday evening. This organization has endeavoured at all times to keep politics out

of its deliberations. Nevertheless the Prime Minister took before this convention a very definite and very delicate political question. There was a great deal of criticism with regard to this action. On another occasion I raised a question of privilege concerning a cartoon appearing in the Ottawa *Citizen* with regard to this particular convention, in which the Liberal members took a great deal of delight although it depicted all legionnaires as a group of alcoholics with the exception of the Prime Minister. A few days following that this same newspaper was referred to on another question of privilege. With the support of this kind of yellow journalism, the Liberal party has been putting across its proposed flag design. I cannot recall the date, and I stand to be corrected, but I believe this same Prime Minister said he would not turn his back on the red ensign. Today the red ensign has been deliberately torn down in favour of the three maple leaf flag. The red ensign does not even appear as the second choice.

The convention at Winnipeg indicated quite clearly to the Liberal party and the Prime Minister that there was a great deal of dissatisfaction amongst the veterans of this country with his choice of a flag. Who are the members of the Liberal party? I noticed that the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Sauvé) was somewhat irritated by certain remarks in this debate, and I put the question to him directly: Does he feel he is more qualified to decide on a Canadian flag than some of the veterans who have served under this flag or some of the families who have lost loved ones in the service of this country? Does he think he is qualified to stand in this House of Commons and pass judgment on what these people should recognize as the Canadian flag? Is he more qualified than a private, corporal, sergeant or officer in the Canadian services who fought under this flag? Does he consider he should have a choice in this matter while Canadian citizens, many of whom are veterans, are denied an opportunity to express their opinion on what the Canadian flag should be? Does the minister honestly feel he should deny this opportunity to citizens of this country while he stands in this house and follows the dictates of his Prime Minister? I almost said "his party", but that would have been a mistake because it has been indicated to me already by a highly placed cabinet minister of the government that he is not in favour of the three maple leaf flag. While expressing his opposition to the three maple leaf flag, he indicated to me what his choice would be.

Now, here we have a highly placed minister of the crown who has clearly indicated his opposition to this maple leaf design. If the minister is present and wishes to deny it or if he sees these remarks in *Hansard* tomorrow and wishes to deny it, or if each minister wishes to get up I will take each and every minister off the hook in turn and then I will face the responsible minister with it. I will make the accusation in the house and tell him where and when he said it. I will tell the house what his alternative choice would be. I will remind the Prime Minister, then, that his cabinet is still divided on the choice of a flag. This information came to me from a highly placed cabinet minister. I say to the Minister of Forestry again, does he feel he is qualified to stand up in this house and vote on this issue when he denies the citizens across this country who are rightfully concerned the opportunity to express an opinion as to what the flag of this country should be?

Mr. Sauvé: Mr. Speaker—

An hon. Member: Don't dignify him with an answer.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the hon. member rising on some point of privilege?

Mr. Sauvé: I thought we had been elected in this parliament to take decisions. This is what the people who voted for us in our constituencies want us to do. The only thing we want is to vote, as members of parliament, and decide on this issue as soon as possible.

An hon. Member: A free vote?

Mr. Sauvé: A free vote, yes.

Mr. Monteith: You have a bureaucratic approach.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is 10.30.

Mr. Favreau: I would suggest the hon. member be allowed to complete his speech, unless he has quite a bit more to say.

Mr. Monteith: I suggest we call it 10.30.

An hon. Member: Closure.

Mr. MacInnis: Perhaps I could take this opportunity to raise a question of privilege and ask for the withdrawal of the last remark made by the interjector. He has said that the Minister of Forestry should not dignify me with an answer. I think that member should withdraw that particular

remark, considering the fact that I still have ten minutes to go.

Mr. Byrne: I ask that—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order; would the hon. member kindly resume his seat? I am afraid there is no opportunity at this time to consider questions of privilege or points of order. It is 10.30, and unless there is unanimous agreement amongst the members that we should continue after 10.30 I would suggest that the hon. member who has the floor, and who still has some time left, continue his remarks whenever this debate is resumed. If he wants to raise a point of privilege at that time, I think that would be the proper time.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under provisional standing order 39A deemed to have been moved:

AIR TRANSPORT—PROVISION OF DIRECT SERVICE FROM NOVA SCOTIA TO BERMUDA

Mr. Gerald A. Regan (Halifax): It is with a feeling of true humility that I attempt to follow the previous speaker but I will try to show in the course of my remarks the same fine spirit of moderation and co-operation as he displayed.

My question to the Minister of Transport this afternoon dealt with the provision of a direct air service between Nova Scotia and Bermuda, with connecting flights to the rest of the Caribbean and other parts of the commonwealth in that hemisphere.

An hon. Member: Don't forget the Virgins.

Mr. Regan: My question had reference to the fact that in Nova Scotia in particular, and indeed in the other Atlantic provinces, there has been a long and historic trade relationship and much intercourse with these areas. The volume of trade over the years has been impressive and as a consequence, my people have had occasion to go back and forth quite frequently. It is most unjust, therefore, that maritimers wishing to fly to Bermuda and on to the Bahamas and other points in the Caribbean should have to travel by way of Montreal and Toronto. Not only have we had this close relationship for many years but we have a geographic proximity to this area which is not enjoyed by the rest of Canada.

We know Air Canada has been considering the introduction of a service from the Halifax international airport to Bermuda and I also know that when consideration is being given to this matter much is made of the volume of business which could be expected from such a service in the early years. I wish to suggest that when the officials of Air Canada are considering this matter they should bear in mind that the amount of traffic which they estimated for the Toronto-Nassau route turned out to be way below what was actually realized and that it has grown year by year. I think the service from Halifax would pay its way almost from the start, particularly if aircraft such as the Vanguard, which can also carry freight, were used. Such a service would enable lobsters from Nova Scotia, and possibly from other maritime provinces, to find a ready market in Bermuda or elsewhere in the West Indies.

We are told that one of the obstacles to the integration of such a service is that the British would demand reciprocity. In other words, they would have the right to put in a flight to some other part of Canada. I think the disadvantages of this are overestimated. Even if the British were to be given a flight to some other part of this country, the route from Halifax to Bermuda would soon become a popular and profitable route for Air Canada. If Air Canada is not interested in such a proposition, I suggest that Canadian Pacific Airlines or Eastern Provincial Airlines or B.O.A.C. might well be interested. It is not good enough that the people of the maritime provinces who wish to travel to Bermuda or to the Bahamas should have to go by way of Montreal or Toronto.

We will listen with great interest to the answer which the minister gives on this subject. The time has come when this service should be inaugurated. Indeed, it is long past. As a matter of fact we hope the minister will be able to announce that it will be brought into being in time for people from Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island to use it during the coming winter, instead of being obliged to travel extra miles and spend extra dollars routing around Montreal.

An hon. Member: Rooting around Montreal?

Mr. Regan: I can assure the minister that if this service is provided in the immediate future it will prove more remunerative to Air Canada or to whichever carrier undertakes it than could possibly be envisaged.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): I am glad the hon. gentleman was not allowed to receive the somewhat laconic answer I would have been obliged to have given him, under our rules, earlier today. It is hard for many people to understand why a service which would obviously be so beneficial should not be provided.

I agree with the hon. gentleman that the service would pay almost from the outset, particularly if, as he suggested, an aircraft such as the Vanguard were used which could carry a considerable quantity of freight. In that case there might be a great deal of two-way traffic.

There is, however, one problem, and it is a problem which is under active consideration by the air transport board at the present time. That is the problem of the bilateral agreement we have with the United Kingdom. Bermuda is a dependency of the United Kingdom, and we would have to renegotiate our arrangements with the United Kingdom; and they, not unlike us in this respect, are anxious to make as good a bargain for themselves as they can. There is not any doubt that they would ask for, and would be justified in asking for, some concession from us in regard to their services to Canada.

I do not set this up as an insuperable obstacle, but it is the kind of consideration that has to be taken into account in matters of this kind. I know that T.C.A.—in fact I know it very well, because I asked them to do it—are at the present time giving active consideration to the amount of traffic they can reasonably expect on this service, and they have not reached any final view about this; at least, they had not reached any final view the last time I inquired, which was two or three weeks ago. But I would think, Mr. Speaker, there would not be any doubt that before very long this service would be a very profitable one.

I would hope, of course, it would not be just from Halifax but would be a continuous flight from St. John's—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pickersgill: —where in fact they could get at least as many passengers as they could from Halifax. The service would of course only be satisfactory if it were well integrated with the service from Canada to the Caribbean. That would possibly result in some of the traffic, instead of going direct from Montreal or Toronto being diverted via Halifax, which would give some of these people in central Canada a broader conception of their country than some of us feel they have at the present time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I regret that I have to interrupt the minister, but his time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Unanimous consent.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The minister's time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Unanimous consent.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to special order of the house of August 17 last, this house stands adjourned until two o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, August 21, 1964

The house met at 2 p.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. CAOUETTE—RECEIPT OF FRENCH TRANSLATION OF BEAUCHESNE

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege which, in my opinion, should be of the greatest interest to all members.

I should like to call everyone's attention to the fact that we have finally received the French version of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms.

The Ralliement Créditiste group, of which I am the leader, has been asking for the translation of that manual ever since we came here, in this house, in 1962.

The Conservative government, then headed by the Leader of the Opposition, initiated talks which finally resulted, under the present administration, in the translation and distribution of this work on parliamentary procedure.

Therefore, on behalf of my party, I should like to express our gratitude to those who have finally understood that, in matters such as this, the French Canadian element ought to be on an equal footing with the others. We do hope that in another field, especially as regards publications distributed by the printing bureau, the same principles of justice and equality will apply, so that Canada may be strong as well as united.

[*Text*]

CANADIAN FLAG

STATEMENT ON MEETING OF PARTY LEADERS

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, as hon. members know, three meetings of the party leaders have been held this week to discuss the parliamentary situation arising out of what is now known as the flag debate. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, to report that no agreement was possible on the subsequent parliamentary procedure for dealing with this matter. As leader of the government I felt that whatever procedure was to be followed, there should be accepted time limits on discussion to ensure that a decision would be reached at a reasonably early date. The principle of such limitation did not find unanimous acceptance.

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. Parliament will make its decision by individual vote of all its members. This position of the government is not tied to any other conditions or proposals.

The flag debate will continue next week, but I want to assure the house that no doors have been closed for any subsequent meeting on the party leader or house leader level to discuss the situation as it develops.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, so there will be no misunderstanding or misconception of the position taken by the members of the New Democratic party I should like to say, very briefly, two things. First, we are appreciative of the statement made by the Prime Minister with regard to a free vote on the flag issue. We do not think this will make any difference in so far as we as individuals are concerned; if I were opposed to the maple leaf design I would vote against it even if the government were to call an election the next morning, and I think most hon. members would feel exactly the same way. Nevertheless it does remove from the members of parliament any imputation that their vote is coloured by the fact that a vote on the main resolution might involve an election. For that reason we welcome this statement by the Prime Minister.

The second thing I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, is that we are most anxious that if at all possible some compromise be found by which we can break the present deadlock which holds the House of Commons in its grip.

We have been favourable to the idea of setting up a small committee of the House

of Commons to look into this matter to see whether there is some common ground that can be found. My colleague the hon. member for Greenwood put forth a suggestion the other day which, among other suggestions, might be considered. Members of this party feel that such a committee would be useful, and there is a strong possibility that it might find some unanimous basis upon which we could launch a flag. Certainly if this could be done it would be highly desirable; because in our opinion, if Canada is going to adopt a flag, it would be much better that it be launched with almost unanimous support of this house rather than on a divided basis.

The members of this group want to make it abundantly clear that we would only support the idea of setting up such a committee if there were some prior agreement that the debate on the report of that committee would be for a limited period of time. If that cannot be agreed upon we could quite easily find ourselves, when the committee returned at the end of its six or eight weeks of consideration, exactly where we are now and then proceed to have a protracted and interminable debate at a time when much more important legislative matters should be receiving the attention of the House of Commons. Therefore the members of this party feel that if we are going to spend a lot of time in prolonged discussion of this matter it is better to do so at a time when we would normally be enjoying a recess than to use up time which will be required to deal with the heavy legislative program which is on the order paper.

Mr. Speaker, I have merely stated the position of this party, and it is up to the other parties to state their positions. I would urge that members in every part of the house give serious consideration to the possibility of establishing a small committee of the House of Commons with the proviso that there be a limit on the debate regarding the report of that committee. It seems to us that if the government should make a concession in agreeing to such a committee rather than proceeding with the debate, as it originally intended, the other parties in the house ought to be prepared to consider a matching concession of limiting the debate on the report of that committee.

As the Prime Minister has said, and as was agreed this morning at the meeting of the party leaders, this matter is not closed, and I would urge most strongly that members in every part of the house give serious consideration to accepting this kind of compromise; because I am convinced that a long and tedious debate when the committee reports back will do nothing to enhance the prestige and effectiveness of parliament.

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to comment briefly on the statement the Prime Minister has just made, and likewise to make the position of our party very clear, not only for the sake of the record but also for the information of each of us.

We welcome very much this statement which the Prime Minister has made, which brings us to a non-partisan position in the house as far as our vote is concerned on any subamendment, amendment or main motion. It is unfortunate, I believe, that this policy was not maintained from the very beginning of the flag issue. Nevertheless it is indeed encouraging that the Prime Minister has seen fit to make this statement now. It is encouraging to our group and I would think it is also encouraging to members on the government side. I believe this decision places again on the shoulders of each of us the responsibility which I believe the electors regard is ours of making a decision on this important issue.

We have had three leaders' meetings, and the fact that these meetings have taken place and that there has been sincere and keen discussion on every aspect of the issue that came before us is something that should also encourage us. However, it is not encouraging, indeed it is disappointing as far as I am concerned, that we were not able to arrive at a unanimous decision on some alternative course that would bring about the conclusion of this matter reasonably soon. I had hoped originally that some compromise alternative could have been agreed upon which would have meant amending the two resolutions on the order paper in such a way that we could all agree. Personally, and I think this is the unanimous position of the members of our party, that it would have been much better if parliament could have brought forth a flag that could have been known as Canada's flag because it had been decided upon as a result of the corporate opinion and action of parliament rather than just the government. Therefore I had hoped we could agree on some amendment to the design that would provide an honourable solution for those who favour the red ensign. A partial compromise has been accepted by the Prime Minister in his announcement of a free vote.

Our discussions also concerned the setting up of a committee, and I must say I agree

completely with the statement the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam has just made in this regard. If a committee could have brought us together in such a way that a recommendation would have come before the house with the assurance that debate would be limited to a reasonable time, and if the committee could have come forward with a decision on the basis of a reasonable majority, it would have done a great deal to improve the situation in which we now find ourselves and would have brought us to some satisfactory conclusion. However, if it is not possible to limit the debate on the recommendation of such a committee, and if its terms of reference cannot be such as to offer it some hope of bringing back a recommendation to the house, then mere postponment of the issue is certainly not going to assist in solving the problem.

I am convinced that a prolonged debate on the flag issue will produce irreparable damage as far as national unity is concerned. I should think every member of the house would agree with me when I say that, regardless of whether we are dealing with the flag issue or something else, it is our responsibility to carry on the proceedings of the house in a way that contributes to the over-all improvement and strengthening of the unity of our nation. I appeal not only to the other parties in the house but to every individual member that we should welcome unitedly the announcement the Prime Minister has made. In addition, we should not close the door to further discussions or to a future coming together that would end this issue in a way satisfactory to all Canadians and which will foster national unity.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the group I represent, I wish to say that I am very pleased with the decision taken by the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) that a free vote will be called on the flag issue. The longer we discuss that matter, the more ticklish it becomes, and I feel that calling for a free vote will enable all representatives of the people to take a stand on that matter, because, after all, we are elected by the people. That procedure will enable a majority to choose a national flag for Canada, and the Prime Minister is certainly entitled to congratulations for his decision to give the whole house and each member individually the occasion to vote freely on the flag design.

However, unfortunate statements were made, especially in western Canada, to the effect that the purpose of the proposed flag was only to please the French Canadians of the province of Quebec. Mr. Speaker it is unfortunate that some hon. members, of whatever political affiliation, have made statements likely to stir up strife among various groups in the country.

As for me, I have found nothing in the action taken by the government or in the choice of the flag submitted to parliament that might please French Canadians in particular. I said in committee this morning, especially to the Prime Minister and to other party leaders present, that we wanted a distinctive national flag. Whether it includes three maple leaves or only one, whether the maple leaf is replaced by a beaver or a wheatsheaf, in short, as long as it will be a distinctive Canadian flag we shall support the government.

Mr. Speaker, in the third committee meeting we discussed it again and again. Before going to the meeting I said: "Behind closed doors or not, the leader of the Ralliement Créditiste will not attend any more meetings of political leaders on the flag issue." Our position is clear and I think a free vote would clarify the matter.

In my opinion, the best way to select a flag would be to stop this filibustering. We must put an end to the division which is shaping up in this country; let us stop setting one group against the other and, above all, a whole country or seven or eight provinces against six million French Canadians who are only seeking true unity in their country.

We are not requesting anything special, we are not set on having a Quebec symbol, but a symbol which is completely and genuinely Canadian. We are, of course, insisting on Canadian symbols in our national emblem, but no foreign symbols, not from France any more than from England. We want, of course, to belong to the commonwealth of nations, but with our own symbols, our nation's symbols. Thus, Canadian unity will be safeguarded.

[*Text*]

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I refrained from saying anything following the statement by the Prime Minister because, as I understood it, the agreement, while not explicit in terms, was that the Prime Minister would state the facts in an entirely unprovocative and objective manner. However,

some members of the committee or the group that met have seen fit to make observations on that statement. My failure to do so, therefore, would be misinterpreted.

I am going to make one or two observations, while refraining from participating in the kind of argument advanced by the last hon. gentleman who, if I were to answer him in kind, has in some of the policies he has advocated done a great deal to harm the unity of our country. I am not going into that, but the gratuitous observations impel me to maintain myself within the most circumscribed limits in replying to the statements he made.

The Prime Minister has stated that he has decided on a free vote. It is too bad that decision was not made earlier. It is too bad the statement having been made originally by him that a free vote would be declared, that on reflection, he later decided to refine the meaning of that term, and state that a free vote would be one in which all would be free to vote but if members voted against the government's stand it would be tantamount to a vote of non-confidence and ensure the calling of an election.

The decision announced today should have been made long ago. Indeed, in the intervening weeks there has been a freezing of attitudes; and while entirely approving of the need of such a declaration being made, the decision to do so today appears to be too late to permit the carrying into full effect of the meaning of that term.

Second, there has been a suggestion that we should get on with the important business facing Canada. Hon. members of Her Majesty's loyal opposition have strongly advocated the need of getting on with that business, but we are placed in a position where these important matters cannot be dealt with—matters of pensions, matters of agricultural economy, particularly in eastern Canada, and other questions of paramount importance which are being kept in cold storage pending the completion of the flag debate.

I think there would be widespread appreciation of the government—though I know it won't be achieved—if this debate were adjourned now and we proceeded with matters of importance to the economy of the country. Then if an adjournment took place the flag question could be considered fully after each of us had the opportunity of visiting our constituencies and being made fully aware and cognizant of public opinion. After all, Mr. Speaker, one of the great difficulties for those of us who have constituencies far removed from Ottawa is that we find ourselves cut off, as it were, from public opinion by inability to meet with our constituents and understand their views.

Mention was made of a committee of the house, and I take a very strong stand in that connection. I think a committee of the house, following the models of 1945 and 1946, would have been the proper way to start this question; in other words, not have the government introduce it and take the stand, "Either you take this or you find yourself challenged by an election." If we had had a committee where members could sit down together, as they sat down in 1945 and 1946, and they had come up with a virtually unanimous agreement, that would be the way to determine a flag for our country rather than introducing a model or design and then, because of pressure of public opinion and events, having to change the original.

If the original is changed now from the three maple leaves I feel for the embarrassment of many of those who have supported the government and who have been flying the tremendous numbers of these flags that have been imported into Canada from abroad. It is going to be very embarrassing to have to pull down the three maple leaf design if parliament decides otherwise.

My suggestion, and I advanced it tentatively, was that a committee of 15 would be an effective committee; not a large committee but one of 15 composed of seven members supporting the government, five of Her Majesty's loyal opposition and one each from the other parties. I feel that if at this time we were to adjourn the debate on this question and allow such a committee to get to work—and I would play my part in that connection; the committee members appointed by this party would go into the committee free and untrampelled in any way—a decision could be reached; for the choice of a flag is above and beyond political considerations.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Let the committee meet; give it a couple of months. During that time members could get together, realize the importance to the unity of Canada of arriving at a basis acceptable to Canadians as a whole—I think they would do it—and if, as I would hope there would be, in consequence of full discussion removed from the limelight of parliament, a recommendation was made that, as I said a moment ago, would be virtually unanimous, the matter would be concluded there and then; for I think the house

would certainly, in general, willingly accept such a recommendation.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, if there was not a high degree of unanimity, then I suggest—and again I come back to this—that whatever recommendations came from the committee could be submitted to the Canadian people at the next election.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I am trying to keep away from any partisan discussion—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: —but the groans from over there indicate that they are trying to push a flag down the throats of the Canadian people.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: This is why they are objecting. This is why we hear these unintelligible groans translating the thoughts of hon. gentlemen who have just interrupted. I believe in that way this matter would be taken out of the realm of partisan considerations. That is the reason I made the suggestion.

I join with the Prime Minister, who was fair and reasonable in every way in his presentation today, in saying that while we have not come to agreement in these meetings, our assembly together has been characterized by extreme frankness, candour and a fine spirit. That has been the theme throughout. I am glad the Prime Minister said that the door will not be closed, for the door must never be closed by members of parliament—for, after all, they are Canadians first—on any action that may result in the assurance of unity in our country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

Mr. Valade: Mr. Speaker, I wish to—

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Are hon. members rising on a question of privilege or a point of order?

Mr. Valade: I rise on a point of order—

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Speaker, I should like—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for St. Mary.

Mr. Valade: —because I was the originator of these suggestions. I do not say that in personal homage; I am just saying I would like to say something on this subject because I submitted the suggestions to the conference.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The customs and precedents which we follow in this chamber decree, if I may use that word, that only the leaders of the different parties shall speak on this matter. This is not the time for general comments.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether I am in order, but I did not make any statement except on the facts of what occurred at the meetings. The right hon. Leader of the Opposition—and I am not complaining at all about it—referred to the suggestion that a committee should be established to look into this question. I think I ought to put on record that we on this side are not opposed to such a committee, but we do not think such a committee should meet for an indefinite period of time and thereby unduly delay this matter. In addition, we believe that the report of this committee should be subject to a time limitation of debate when it is received by the house.

LABOUR RELATIONS

MARITIME UNION TRUSTEES—APPEARANCE BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE—ELECTION OF UNION OFFICERS

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Justice I would direct one or two questions to the Minister of Labour regarding Mr. Banks. The first is this. Is the minister now in a position to advise the house when the members of the maritime unions board of trustees or a representative thereof will appear before a committee of parliament? This should certainly take place before adjournment.

Second, in connection with Mr. McLaughlin, who is a vice president of the S.I.U., I would ask the minister this question. Is Mr. McLaughlin, who is a candidate for the presidency of the S.I.U., one of those who await trial on September 15 on a charge of conspiracy? What did the maritime trustees do; did they pass as proper his candidature, with such an outstanding charge against him? Who are the members of the credentials committee; and did they give approval to Mr. McLaughlin being a candidate under these circumstances?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make further inquiries about the details of the questions

asked by the Leader of the Opposition. My understanding is that an election will be held this fall or later this year in the S.I.U. for a president and other officers. To my knowledge the board of trustees have not disqualified Mr. McLaughlin from standing for election although, as the right hon. gentleman knows, there is an opposition slate of candidates running in this election, which is a very desirable development in this organization. The board of trustees are, I think, making a very determined effort to see that these elections are conducted in a democratic way. There is a committee composed of a representative of the Canadian Labour Congress, of the Department of Labour, of the board of trustees and of the S.I.U. which would oversee the election to see that it is democratically conducted, and I am hopeful that this will be possible.

In connection with the question with respect to appearance of the board of trustees before a parliamentary committee, the hon. member for Port Arthur asked the house leader this question recently and it was taken as notice. I would prefer the house leader to deal with it, except that I will say that in his letter to me Mr. Justice Dryer stated his wish that the appearance be later in the session, and I interpreted that to mean some time this fall. I would prefer the leader of the house to deal with this particular matter.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am most grateful to the minister for his very detailed answer but I would ask him, in view of the fact that the charge facing Mr. Banks is one arising out of his labour activities, whether he is in a position to give the house today a progress report, or a lack of progress report or whatever it might be called, regarding Mr. Banks and his whereabouts.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to say where Mr. Banks is. If he is outside the country then I am sure this is a situation which would be congenial to the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, it is the circumstances under which he got himself out of the country, after long delay from the time the present government when previously in office gave him a welcoming hand; but is there any ground for believing, and does the answer suggest, that it has at last been determined that he is out of Canada?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I will be quite frank with the Leader of the Opposition. I have no definite knowledge as to the whereabouts of Mr. Banks. It has been suggested that he is in the United States, but there is no firm indication as to his whereabouts.

INQUIRY AS TO FEDERAL LABOUR CODE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Labour. Is the minister now in a position to tell us when the legislation respecting the national labour code will be placed on the order paper? In April we were going to get it as quickly as possible; in July we were going to get it soon, and three weeks ago we were going to get it as soon as possible and the minister hoped that would be soon. Will we get it next week?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I doubt very much whether it will be on the order paper next week. I cannot give my hon. friend a definite indication when it will be on the order paper, but it will be soon.

Mr. Knowles: Will it be on the order paper during this session?

Mr. MacEachen: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

PUBLIC SERVICE

PROTESTS RESPECTING RECENT SALARY INCREASES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister and ask whether he has received any protests from any of the civil service organizations regarding the increases in salaries which were announced yesterday for those in group B; and are these protests particularly centred upon grade 1 stenographers, typists and clerks owing to the fact that their increases are only some $90 a year and it is some years since they have had an increase, there being no immediate prospect of another one?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker, this morning I did receive a telegram, which I have not yet had a chance to study, protesting the inadequacy of the increases in respect to certain classes of civil servants. This and other protests, if they are received, will certainly be considered by the government.

Mr. Douglas: A supplementary question. I understand those protesting have asked the Prime Minister or the government whether

they would agree to having treasury board review these increases. May I ask the Prime Minister whether it is his intention to have treasury board do this?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to discuss the matter at once with the President of the Privy Council as head of treasury board.

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, Is it the intention of the government to recommend similar increases for the House of Commons staff?

Mr. Pearson: I will have to look into that, Mr. Speaker.

COMMONWEALTH RELATIONS

SUGGESTED FORMATION OF PEACE CORPS—PROCEEDINGS OF THIRD EDUCATION CONFERENCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. Can the Prime Minister tell us whether the Canadian government will support the idea of a commonwealth peace corps, the creation of which is to be discussed at the third commonwealth education conference which opened in this chamber this morning? Also, does the government have any specific plans to present to the conference in regard to this commonwealth peace corps?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the idea is, of course, a very imaginative one and certainly commands not only the attention but the sympathy of all hon. members of the house as well as of the government. I think I should reserve any further expression of opinion until I have had a chance to discuss the matter with the delegation to the conference. Perhaps I will be able to make a statement on the matter shortly.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question, or perhaps it is a related question, which I would address to the Prime Minister. In view of the importance and the worth of the statements which were made at the opening of the commonwealth education conference here in this chamber this morning, and in view of the fact that they were made in this chamber, I wonder whether copies of the statements by the Prime Minister, Mr. Massey and Mr. Gérin-Lajoie could be obtained and perhaps made an appendix to today's *Hansard*.

Mr. Pearson: It will certainly be possible, Mr. Speaker, to circulate what I thought was Mr. Massey's very important statement to all members, because it has been reproduced and I received a copy of it myself. If members would like to have it appear in *Hansard* as an appendix I am sure it can be arranged.

Mr. Knowles: From my observation I believe a stenographic report was being made of all three statements, and I do think it would be worth while to have all three appended to *Hansard*.

Mr. Pearson: I am sure that can be arranged.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed that the three statements be made an appendix to *Hansard*?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Editor's note: For text of statements referred to above, see appendix.*]

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Georges Valade (St. Mary): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transport. Can the Minister of Transport confirm or deny a rumour to the effect that he and the Secretary of State for External Affairs intend to oust the Prime Minister from his position and replace him with the hon. member for Essex East in a short while?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): I wonder how silly some hon. members can be, sir.

Mr. Valade: The only silly member is the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate.

GRAIN

SASKATCHEWAN—INQUIRY AS TO FROST DAMAGE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reynold Rapp (Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale): Mr. Speaker, I have a question I should like to ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Could he inform the house on the frost damage to grain in the province of Saskatchewan and in the west? This is a very urgent matter.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I can tell the hon. member that the latest information I have received about the wheat crop in Saskatchewan indicates that there was more extensive frost damage than had originally been

thought. On August 11, 12 and 13 there appears to have been fairly extensive frost damage which is now showing up in the inspections which are being made of harvested grain.

[*Later:*]

Mr. R. R. Southam (Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I have a question I should like to direct to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the answer given by the Minister of Trade and Commerce to my colleague the hon. member for Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale regarding the serious frost damage in Saskatchewan, is the minister considering applying the same policy the former government applied in 1961 in respect of the benefits of P.F.A.A.? I make specific reference to the fact that in that year we allowed the farmers who suffered damage to crops due to drought to cut them for forage for the maintenance of livestock rather than hoping they would reach maturity.

Mr. B. S. Beer (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I think the answer to this question would involve government policy. This will be announced by the Minister of Agriculture in due course.

AGRICULTURE

MEETING OF MARITIME FEDERATION WITH FORESTRY MINISTER

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Queens): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Forestry whether he has met with the delegation from the maritime federation of agriculture today, or whether the meeting has been arranged for tonight.

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): Mr. Speaker, the meeting with the delegation from the Canadian federation of agriculture will take place this evening at nine o'clock in my office.

OMISSION FROM TRADE REPORT OF DETAILS RESPECTING LAMB AND MUTTON

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. R. Gundlock (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture, and in view of his absence perhaps the acting minister or parliamentary secretary could answer. My question arises from the fact that the weekly livestock and meat trade report of August 6 no longer lists details pertaining to lamb and mutton, in particular. In view of the fact that this is a very highly competitive part of the agricultural economy would the minister not see fit to reinstate or at least supply these figures in this report, so this trade can be aware of the competition that it faces?

Mr. B. S. Beer (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the hon. member for his question about this important matter. I will bring it to the attention of the minister on his return.

AIR TRANSPORT

PROVISION OF DIRECT SERVICE FROM NOVA SCOTIA TO BERMUDA

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 which is related to the reply he gave the house last evening relative to the possibility of providing service between the Atlantic provinces and Bermuda and the Caribbean. In view of the fact that the minister stated it may not be economically possible to establish this service on a regular basis, has he given any thought to recommending to Air Canada officials that a service be established either once a week or twice a month between the Atlantic provinces and Bermuda and the Caribbean area?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I would hope that it could be established on a more frequent basis than that. I think the real obstacle is not the frequency of the service but the revision of the bilateral arrangements with the United Kingdom. Incidentally, I might add that I spoke to the president of Air Canada about this matter this morning and told him I had announced that T.C.A. was going to start the service immediately. He was a little surprised.

MEDICINE HAT—REQUEST FOR PROVISION OF SERVICE BY AIR CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): A supplementary question. When the minister was speaking to the president of T.C.A. did he suggest to him that it was time they instituted an air line service in to and out of Medicine Hat?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): In fact, sir, I invited him to dinner so I could talk to him about it at length on Monday.

PUBLIC WORKS

OTTAWA—ABSENCE OF QUEBEC FLAG IN GARDEN OF THE PROVINCES

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Girouard (Labelle): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Public Works.

Could the minister answer the following question which is often put to me. Why is the province of Quebec not represented at the garden of the provinces by its official fleur-de-lis flag?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, this is a question which I would like to take as notice.

[*Text*]

DEFENCE PRODUCTION

CORRESPONDENCE IN ENGLISH WITH QUEBEC RESIDENTS

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. C. A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Minister of Defence Production?

I should like to ask the minister whether he gave orders to Mr. J. J. Simoneau, officer of the Quebec office of the defence production department, to correspond only in English with his countrymen of the province of Quebec who do not know that language? I have several proofs to that effect.

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, I never gave such orders and I would never think of doing so. Moreover, I am certain that nobody in my department gave such orders.

[*Text*]

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 occasioned by the written representations which I think came to all members, including the Prime Minister, from Mr. Cooke of *Liberty* magazine, in which Mr. Cooke alleged that *Liberty* ceased publication because of the lack of advertising revenue occasioned by pressure from *Time* and *Reader's Digest*. I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether the government has changed its position, or whether it is going to continue to let *Time* and *Reader's Digest* enjoy the same status as Canadian magazines.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this matter is still on our list for legislative action in the autumn. I hope we will be able to deal with it before the end of this session.

Mr. Fisher: I have a supplementary question. The Prime Minister will remember that when it was put on the order paper indications were given that there was no intention of doing anything that would affect *Time* and *Reader's Digest*. The purport of my question was to ask whether the government's intentions had changed.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will not mind waiting for a few weeks longer when I hope to satisfy his very legitimate curiosity in a way which I hope will be satisfactory to him.

NATIONAL FILM BOARD

REDUCTION OF ACTIVITIES TO ASSIST PRIVATE INDUSTRY

On the orders of the day:

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State. In connection with the recent announcement in respect of assistance to the film industry in Canada, can the minister inform the house whether the government plans a gradual withdrawal of the film making activities of government corporations, particularly in the commercial and theatrical fields, in order to further assist our private film industry?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Georges Valade (St. Mary): I have a related question, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a supplementary question to the Secretary of State.

Since the C.B.C. refuses to let the public see the "Mr. Pearson" film, could the minister say whether it would be possible to hold a public auction for its sale so that at least part of the production costs may be reimbursed by private enterprise?

Mr. Lamontagne: Mr. Speaker, it has been said many times that the film is the exclusive property of the C.B.C.

Mr. Valade: Does the Secretary of State refuse to let the public see it?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Lamontagne: Mr. Speaker, that question has been answered several times in the course of this session.

Mr. Valade: So, the answer is "no".

[*Text*]

TRANSPORT

P.E.I. CAUSEWAY—REPORT ON FEASIBILITY STUDY

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Queens): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Public Works. I am sorry I have not been able to give him notice, but I do not think he will need it. Can the minister say whether the report of the feasibility study made to his department in respect of the Prince Edward Island causeway recommends against the inclusion of a railway, as unofficial reports of the last few days seem to indicate?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, the second interim report was received a few weeks ago and we are in the process of examining it. Actually I do not think it would be proper at this time to enter into a discussion in this regard. Perhaps it would be a good idea for me to make a short statement one of these days covering the actual studies in respect of this project. It is my intention to do that.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the minister's statement. If he would be good enough to make such a statement on motions, when he is in a position to do so, I know it will meet with the approval of people in the maritimes vitally interested in this matter.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS

KINGSTON—RENOVATION OF NAVAL BUILDING FOR ARMY USE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Alkenbrack: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: I had already called orders of the day, but if the question is short and urgent perhaps we can hear it now.

Mr. A. D. Alkenbrack (Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Public Works. Is the minister aware that a national defence building at Kingston, Ontario, formerly used for navy stores and now occupied by the army, is being restored by the army at a cost of $250,000, and that Indiana limestone is being imported from the United States for refacing a building intended for military functions?

Mr. Speaker: Order. That is a question for the order paper.

SUPPLY

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

DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY

1. Departmental administration, including grants as detailed in the estimates, $1,381,000.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): Mr. Chairman—

[*Text*]

Mr. Hamilton: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, before the minister makes his statement could we have clarification of just what items are to be before the committee this afternoon. The Chair will recall that when we were considering the estimates of the Department of Agriculture we debated and discussed briefly that portion of the minister's responsibilities dealing with ARDA, but our discussion was curtailed because of the lateness of the hour in reaching that item and because the minister had to leave before the end of the day.

My first question is, is ARDA up for discussion under these estimates today, and under what item? My second question has to do with feed grains. Under what item will this subject be discussed? If the minister could answer these questions of order in his statement we on this side of the house would know when we are to raise these matters.

Mr. Sauvé: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I want to make a statement about this problem at the conclusion of my opening remarks on the forestry estimates.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chairman, today I have the privilege of introducing the estimates of the Department of Forestry for the year ending March 31, 1965.

Hon. members know that I took over the Department of Forestry in February 1964. I am, therefore, submitting my first estimates to the house and would ask hon. members to bear with me if I am not quite up to the mark in giving the explanations they will ask of me.

May I at the outset pay tribute to the first two ministers who were responsible for the Department of Forestry which was created in

August 1960 by the government led by the right hon. gentleman who is now Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker).

The first incumbent of the Department of Forestry, who is now the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton (Mr. Flemming), has left an indelible memory in his department and he was succeeded in the discharge of his responsibilities by the present Postmaster General (Mr. Nicholson). Those two ministers gave to the department leadership which I find very difficult to pursue with the same energy, for having always been linked with the forest industry they were both particularly qualified in this field.

I do not propose to make a lengthy statement at this time when introducing the estimates of my department for the fiscal year 1964-65, as it will officially change its name and significance when the house is called to consider the resolution introduced by the government on July 2 last, which can be found on the order paper under No. 60. When that resolution and the ensuing bill are passed, the Minister of Forestry will be the minister of forestry and of rural development, and I will then have the opportunity of explaining to hon. members in what way the department of forestry and rural development will discharge its new official responsibilities.

[*Text*]

The hon. member for Qu'Appelle brought up the problem of the estimates covering ARDA, feed grains and the Maritime Marshland Rehabilitation Act. All these estimates were adopted by the house on July 10. I recognize quite well that although the discussion lasted for 70 to 80 minutes it was short, and I am quite prepared on vote No. 1 of the Department of Forestry this afternoon to entertain discussion of problems relating to these three items although they were carried on July 10 under the estimates of the Department of Agriculture.

May I be allowed to pay homage, Mr. Chairman, to the highly qualified personnel of the Department of Forestry and to the deputy minister, Dr. Rousseau, a well known scientist, who accepted the direction of a large and highly qualified team of researchers in the recently created Department of Forestry. Last year several special developments of considerable moment made history for my department. Outstanding among these was the convening of the first federal-provincial forest ministers' conference in Ottawa under the chairmanship of the then minister of forestry, now Postmaster General. The department also acted as official host to a meeting of the North American forestry commission sponsored by the food and agriculture organization of the United Nations. Dr. Rousseau, our deputy minister, acted as chairman of this important meeting. Leading foresters and forestry scientists from many countries attended this conference. My colleague the former minister of forestry, now Postmaster General, headed the Canadian delegation to the twelfth biennial conference of the food and agriculture organization of the United Nations held in Rome.

A first step toward the development of a departmental organization orientated toward our function of responsibilities to the Canadian forest community was also undertaken. A draft report of the reorganization survey team is nearing completion. The main problems facing the Department of Forestry are the following:

[*Translation*]

Because the jurisdiction of the federal Department of Forestry is limited, since the administration of forests is the exclusive responsibility of the provinces, we feel that the department ought to make a special effort to direct its research work in order to meet the requirements of industry and the lumber business.

Consequently, I feel that it is extremely important to help in organizing, in co-operation with the provinces, the universities and the industry, the direction of the departmental research work, which is carried out in the field of the basic sciences or applied sciences related to forestry.

We feel that up to the present the efforts of the department were probably too limited and an extensive development in this field will be required.

On the other hand, the Department of Forestry has been urged for a long time to give more thought to forest fire prevention, a problem which, even though coming under exclusive provincial jurisdiction, could be solved to some extent through co-operation between the provinces and the federal government.

It is therefore our intention to try to promote more co-operation between the provinces in this respect, so as to eliminate the evil of forest fires in Canada.

Moreover, the federal government has a very definite responsibility in the economic field. We feel that the Department of Forestry,

which is the result, as I said earlier, of the merger of two branches of the Department of Agriculture and of the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources, has not paid enough attention to the economic problem.

I feel that it will be absolutely necessary, in the coming year, to organize the economic section of the department to give it the importance it deserves and, especially, to give direction to the forest policy of Canada both on the national and international levels.

[*Text*]

The 1964-65 main estimates total $19,469,700. This figure represents an increase of $1,482,800 over 1963-64, or about 7½ per cent. The increase is accounted for mainly in three objects of expenditure. The first, salaries and wages, shows an increase of approximately $460,000. The department has received treasury board authority to recruit up to 100 per cent of its establishment. This change from the earlier 92 per cent authorization has its effect on the salary total. The change is mainly due to the lifting of the freeze that was imposed on the department when it was established in 1960. In part, also, the increase is accounted for by reclassifications and statutory salary increases.

The second object of expenditure, "construction or acquisition of buildings, works and land" shows an increase of approximately $550,000, or about 37 per cent of the total increase. We have several substantial projects included in this category. One is a further amount of $1 million in vote 25 toward completion of a forest research laboratory in British Columbia. There is also a $600,000 item in vote 3 toward construction of an extension to the pulp and paper research institute of Canada laboratory at Pointe Claire, Quebec. On a somewhat smaller scale, we have provided $120,000 in vote 35 to build an extension to our Vancouver forest products research laboratory, and $92,000 in the same vote to erect a research saw mill at Petawawa, Ontario.

An over-all increase of approximately $300,000, about 20 per cent of the total increase, is shown for the construction or acquisition of equipment. Of this amount approximately $100,000 in vote 35 is provided to equip the research saw mill mentioned above at Petawawa. About $50,000 in votes 25 and 35 is intended for the purchase of heavy scientific equipment. Another $50,000 in vote 15 is provided to purchase heavy motorized equipment. A $30,000 item in vote 1 will equip the art and graphic section to work in support of our research elements.

[Mr. Sauvé.]

The balance of the increase is intended for various objects of expenditure. In a number of instances the dollar amounts are insignificant, but none account for more than about 5 per cent of the total increase. In some instances increases have been offset by decreases in other areas.

The department's supplementary estimates total approximately $800,000. Of this total by far the largest amount is a $500,000 item to permit continuation of New Brunswick's spruce budworm spraying program. This program, conducted in previous years, is a project sponsored jointly by the federal government, the New Brunswick government and the New Brunswick forest industries. Each participant contributes one third of the cost. There is also an item of $150,000 in vote 25A as an additional amount required for our new laboratory at Victoria. The $97,000 item in vote 15A is intended for the purchase of field equipment to support additional survey parties being sent into the field this year. Finally there is an item of approximately $50,000 in vote 10A to provide operating funds for our increased establishment.

Before I conclude my very short remarks on the estimates, Mr. Chairman, may I be allowed to give some explanation of an answer to a question which appeared in *Hansard* concerning the number of employees recruited by this department from May 1, 1963 to May 31, 1964. The total number was given as 299, and some members were wondering why there had been such an increase. There is a very simple explanation. Of these 299 people who were recruited in that period, 225 were seasonal employees, graduates and students employed during last summer. Of the remainder there are 22 professionals, 26 technicians and 26 clerical and administrative staff who have been hired to replace members of our staff who left, or to comply with our establishment.

These are the very brief remarks which I intended to make this afternoon, Mr. Chairman. If we do not have time to conclude the estimates this afternoon I will be pleased to answer all the questions that I do not have time to answer in the house by writing to each member. I will do what I can to satisfy the members fully.

Mr. Hamilton: May I ask the minister a question on procedure? I wonder if the minister would find it acceptable, and the Chair would find it easier, if we were to agree that our discussion in the early stages this afternoon should be concentrated on the Department of Forestry, and then reserve the right

under item 1, when all the forestry items are completed, to come back and discuss ARDA, the feed grain policy and such other related items? This would avoid mixing up forestry with a partial discussion of ARDA, feed grains, and so on.

Mr. Sauvé: I have no objection.

The Chairman: Is that agreeable to the committee?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Gundlock: I thank the minister for his statement, and particularly his complimentary remarks with regard to the former minister. It has come to my attention that there has been a great need for this department. As we all know, it was established by the former government and I greatly appreciate the minister's remarks, particularly the complimentary way in which he spoke of the former minister. We all feel much the same. I say sincerely to the minister that I hope he will enjoy a similar association with this department.

I want to bring to the minister's attention this afternoon some aspects of forestry management, particularly as they relate to what is known as the eastern Rockies watershed. This area is important not only to my constituency but to the prairie provinces as a whole. I find some difficulty, Mr. Chairman, in separating the actual management and conservation of forests from water and soil conservation and the production that is so closely related thereto. However, in discussing forest conservation and production I have to bear in mind, as I said before, the relationship of the conservation of our water supply.

I have in mind an example or two to which I should like to call the minister's attention as well as the attention of the members of the department. The need is very urgent at the moment, and the sooner something can be done about this the better it will be for the whole country. I am referring to the recent floods we have had in this area. Practically everyone in this house has had his attention drawn to the floods that occurred on the eastern watershed of the Rockies, particularly in the southern area where most of the damage was done. Those floods were not entirely the result of an act of God but resulted from what I might almost term mismanagement. I do not choose to use that word at this stage, but there are one or two things that should be brought to the attention of the department and of people in general. It is something we have to be aware of and, as a matter of fact, should be aware of before it happens. That is the way real conservation and production are reached, to recognize the needs before things like this happen.

I may be just a little bit out of order, Mr. Chairman, but I wish to point out two examples, one of them being something that happened in a national park and the other adjacent to it on the eastern slopes of the Rockies. I believe it would be well for the minister and his officials to consider closer co-operation with the parks department because the first example I mention deals with an area of mature timber. A strong wind went through it and levelled this timber which, a few years previously, had been in its prime and, if handled properly, would not only have benefited the park and the people who visit it, but the country as a whole. Now, however, this watershed is completely waste.

With proper co-operation between the departments this could have been avoided, thus aiding the beautification of the park, the utilization of valuable forest products and the preservation of the watershed to maintain supplies of water for the adjacent areas.

I mention this example because the minister said he wanted advice. I do not purport to present this as advice. I do not pretend to be advising the minister, but things like this require urgent action and they are happening all over the country. The other day I visited in Ontario and a few weeks before that in Quebec, and in both places I saw the results of forest mismanagement in depletion of the soil and water supplies. If I may digress for a moment, there is one very real example of this in the reduced water levels of the great lakes and in the St. Lawrence seaway. The low levels in the St. Lawrence seaway have actually affected the delivery of western grain and other products. Boats are not able to load to their full capacities, which results in higher freight costs and stiffer competition for export trade.

The other example I want to mention is related very closely to forest management. I believe the departmental officials should co-operate with provincial authorities on the practice of allowing livestock to be pastured in forest areas. Some areas have been badly damaged by over-grazing in the summer months. They are very valuable sources of pasture for livestock producers and could become much more valuable, but the sorry fact is that some of them have been abused and neglected. This is something which is closely related to forest conservation and

Canadian production as a whole, and if matters like this are neglected or ignored they can tend to deplete our water supplies.

In my area some people think we will never run short of water, which is used in three main ways, namely for irrigation—we have half a million acres under irrigation—for commercial demands, and for domestic uses. Other people however are beginning to wonder which use has a prior right. A few years of drought and, through neglect, a forest fire, would result in a reduction of the water supply. What would happen then when the three prime users would begin to vie and compete with each other for the existing supply?

The very fact that this department was created a few years ago has brought home more than ever to the Canadian people the great need for conservation, and I like to relate this to production, because through proper management we can aid the production of forest products and agricultural products and at the same time conserve our water supplies. I would like to relate this need for conservation to the ARDA program but I understand we will be doing this a little later and that other speakers will mention it. I think the ARDA program is a good one but I believe it has not been applied as rapidly and as usefully as it should. Related to forest production and conservation, it is a wonderful program. I complimented the minister earlier. I am quite sure he will take a very active interest in this matter, and before long I hope these two programs will dovetail and not only increase our production but our potential in this connection.

I also wanted to say something with regard to ARDA, soil and water conservation and the management and production thereof. I also have a word or two to say about feed grains. I will not say very much about these matters at this time except to mention that I am extremely interested in them and will be looking forward to hearing other hon. members putting forward their points of view this afternoon. This all ties in, Mr. Chairman; it is so hard to separate conservation from production. Forest conservation and production, water conservation, land conservation and their production are all tied together.

I shall conclude my remarks now, Mr. Chairman, and urge the minister very sincerely to keep these few suggestions in mind. I would also say that we on this side of the house, in spite of some of the things that take place now and then, are very sincerely interested in these matters and would be glad to co-operate with the minister and his department on any and every opportunity.

Mr. Fisher: Mr. Chairman, I cannot dissemble my disappointment at the introductory remarks of the minister. I will not say he was beating around the bush, but he reminded me very much of a former minister of this house, Henri Courtemanche, when he presented his first estimates. There was that diffident approach of, "I have only been here a few months", sort of thing, "and I haven't really got a grip on things. But you just wait. One of these days I am going to be there". I would like to point out to the minister that he entered upon his portfolio with a considerable reputation, a reputation that I think a great many of us respect; that of a man of energy, education and imagination. He has been given the responsibility of a portfolio that has a great opportunity. Yet here, when he introduces his estimates, we get in effect the old, traditional lead-off speech by a minister who is in charge of nothing more than a bureaucracy, tossing off a few statistics, a few remarks and a brief outline of the organization that has been prepared for him by his deputy.

I suggest to the minister that this kind of introduction is not what we expected from him and I do not think it is up to his capacities and abilities. I suggest he has a magnificent opportunity with this department, and so far he has not given any indication that he is going to seize it. I am not talking about feed grains and eastern agriculture; I am talking about forestry. I want to give credit to members who are no longer with us, having been defeated in elections. I refer to the then members for Nanaimo, for Comox-Alberni, Mr. McQuillan, and for Coast-Capilano, who are no longer with us. They shared with me the task of writing a committee report several years ago following many meetings of the committee on mines, forests and waters, which in many ways led to the creation of the Department of Forestry. I would also like to compliment the hon. member for Qu'Appelle, who it seems to me was the man in the cabinet at the time who had the perspective as to what this department might be.

Mr. Dinsdale: The vision.

Mr. Fisher: I was bitterly disappointed—and I have expressed it in this house before—over the fact that the first minister and the one who followed him were in a sense carrying on what were nothing more than the traditions that had been established by rather

effective but limited branches dealing with forestry; I am thinking particularly of the forestry branch and the forest products research organization. I have nothing critical to say, but if the minister would go back and look at the recommendations that came out of that committee he would realize we had a much wider and greater dream, or vision, if you want, for a federal Department of Forestry. He has not given any indication that he has anything of that sort in mind.

I suggest to the minister that he may be confounded over the fact that he is an ambitious person within the political framework and may be seeing his role more as a politician than as the imaginative leader of a department. I suggest that the way for him to move to a really senior place in our political situation is to really do something with this department. I believe that nothing has really been achieved yet by the Department of Forestry. As a matter of fact, if I could make the recommendation now or have any influence on it, after taking a continued interest in forestry and being one of those who wanted the department set up, I would say we might as well go back to the old situation, stick the forest products branch and the forestry branch back in the department from which they came, and look to the Department of Industry for the kind of imaginative development in forestry on the economic and industrial side that we would want.

As hon. members may be aware, I represent the largest constituency in Ontario. Its whole base is in the forest industry. It is perhaps the most productive part of Ontario, in dollar terms, where forestry is concerned. The regional, Port Arthur branch of the provincial department of lands and forests is probably the most important one in Ontario. In other words, the lakehead plays somewhat the same part and holds the same position in the pulp and paper and forestry industry in Ontario as the community of Three Rivers traditionally plays in the province of Quebec. Because of this basic economic factor, anyone who represents the area has to be concerned with and involved in forestry matters.

As a result of this I have spent a considerable time looking at American installations in the lake states; I have paid a visit to Finland and Russia to look at some of their forestry methods and the way they do things; I have had contact, as someone who established a forestry research library, at least with the literature on the subject; and I am very much aware—at least, this is my opinion —that we desperately need some kind of breakthrough in leadership on the federal scene in order to achieve the kind of solutions to our forestry problems which have not yet been forthcoming.

I would like to suggest to the minister some of the ways in which he should move and some of the reasons for the difficulties. I think one of the prime reasons for the difficulties in forestry relates to the very success of the forest industry itself; I am thinking particularly of the pulp and paper industry. I think the position was put in a nutshell by perhaps the most famous of all Canadian foresters, certainly the wealthiest, namely H. R. MacMillan. In 1957 H. R. MacMillan, with 50 years of professional experience behind him, said:

> It is doubtful whether Canada, with its present attention to forest management, can sustain today's annual cut in perpetuity, even by going farther north each decade into virgin forest (at greater cost for logs) or by using a higher proportion of inferior species (thus reducing our competitive ability in the foreign markets on which we depend).

I know of very little since 1957 which has changed that basic situation which H. R. MacMillan pointed out. One of the real tragedies is this. When I raised this matter in the house once before, one of the senior people in the forestry field in Ontario belaboured me in the forestry newsletter; but I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that one of the prime difficulties is the very success of the forest industry, which in its pulp and paper aspect has given the actual foresters as a profession really no choice at all. I think forestry is more than a science; to a considerable extent it is an art. But a forester has to take a very long view because he is dealing with something that moves in cycles. A decade means nothing when you are managing a forest. The very approach of the forester, with his long range view and concern for the whole climate and the ecology of materials, and the large corporation with its annual report and quarterly dividends, tends to pull things asunder.

One of the unfortunate things is that foresters, as persons professionally trained and dedicated to an ideal, have not made their way with great speed up the ladder in the country's industries. It is much more often the chartered accountant who becomes the big wheel, or the logging superintendent with an engineering background, and one of the consequences is that all too rarely in our forest industry do we have that kind of idealistic conception. A forester, I would put to you, does deal with an ideal. It is the ideal of the perfect forest with the best possible use being made of it. You cannot live in a Utopia

and you cannot create a Utopia, but it seems to me that it should always be an ideal; and it should always be the ideal in forestry to have the kind of conservation in silviculture which is always considering the forest at its best and optimum use, and getting the most commercial use from it.

In Finland I was impressed with the way both private and public forestry has entered the country and enabled it to get a fantastic return from its forests. I would point out to hon. members that Finland is a country approximately the same area as my constituency with approximately the same amount of forest cover. In many ways we have a better soil and climate than Finland has. Perhaps we do not have quite as long a growing season but there is quite a similarity. Yet Finland, a country with four to five million people, is able to accomplish a tremendous amount in paying back reparation, in supporting one of the best and most attractive small countries in Europe largely on its forests. Those forests represent an area no more than what we have in my riding of Port Arthur in terms of square miles. Dr. Piha, head of Finnish forestry, when I told him I was so impressed with their practices in Finland, said to me: "I am afraid you do not get good forestry practices till there is a desperate shortage of wood; till people begin to realize that there is no alternative to good forest management. We had to wait for it in Finland". He said the same thing followed from his Swedish experience.

Then I asked him what the Russians were doing, and he said that they have so much forest land they are just biting into it and really do not know where they are going. I had the pleasure of going to Leningrad and talking to forestry specialists there, and I think his judgment was correct. The Russians do have so much by way of forested land that they really have not got a good preliminary survey under way yet and they are not sure as to their future. But they have a logging and management concept which I think is tremendously advanced. They have plans for their cut-over areas which are much ahead of anything I know or which has been conceived of in this country, particularly by the provinces.

I make these points, Mr. Chairman, about what I saw in Finland and Russia really to come to my conclusion, that I do not think the experience of any other countries can be at all translated. I did not come back from there with the feeling that there were great lessons to be learned from either Finland or Russia on the part of Canadian foresters. I am sure that some of our logging people could get ideas in the way of mass producing and whole tree logging, but I do not think you can apply experience of other countries to the kind of traditions and experiences which we have. However, I do think it is worth while going to see what other people such as the Finns and the Swedes can achieve by way of greater use of forest resources which are much greater than we have, and this is all tied in with a total use concept, which includes recreation, boating, camping, and living in the forest, things we have not even thought of or reached for yet.

Our problems in this country really come down to the fact that we have 11 different forest policies. Given 11 different forest policies, what role has the federal government in forestry? I can only put it in simple terms, Mr. Chairman: We have no role at all. I think it has been something of a charlatan here with regard to what we have been allowed to develop in terms of federal forest agencies, because these agencies really cannot play a positive role at the present time. They go through the motions, and they are rather good motions, of the forest roads program, the reforestation program, support for forest fire protection, a bit of general collusion on information, and some good research in forest products. But there is a tremendous limitation on it because of the variety of jurisdictions of operation, because of the jealousies which are in existence and because the forestry profession in Canada itself is not sure where it is going or what it needs to be doing.

I suggest to the minister that there are at least three places where he can look for and find opportunities to enlarge the scope of the Department of Forestry and to enable it not only to give leadership but begin to wipe out some of the varieties of standards which we possess. I want to start with what is the simplest one, and in a sense the least far-reaching. This is a suggestion I put to the former minister of forestry, who is sitting in the house now, but I never heard any more from him. I told him that he should be the first minister of forestry to realize that the best way to solve our Indian problem in this country is to tie in a real forestry development program with the Indians, who in most parts of the country live in forested areas, so that the Indian has some kind of economic confidence and is able to work in the forest. At the present time there is hardly a reserve in the country with a decent forest stand. I

suggest that a lot of things could be renegotiated with the provincial governments. At least, they are now paying lipservice through their departments of lands and forests to doing something for the Indians.

Forestry work, whether it is planting trees for a couple of weeks in the spring or fall or whether it is actually doing logging work, is something which the Indians can get on to. It is a natural for the kind of community in which they are used to living. But there must be much more leadership coming from the Indian affairs branch in this particular regard. Several years ago I tried to set up a project on forestry work for Indians in a reserve near lake Nipigon and I wound up with an involvement of four different private organizations which held leases from the provincial department, and also the trade unions became involved. So this is the complicating factor: The forests of Canada are being exploited at the present time within the private management framework and the trade union framework. It is going to take a tremendous amount of development work and initiative, and the sort of expenditure that the federal government might provide, before we are able to make a breakthrough and employ Indians to work as trained technicians, or loggers, or people carrying out the most routine and simple kind of silviculture improvement work.

It is my suggestion that this is one of the things which the Minister of Forestry can do in the country, but it will not be done by sitting in an office in Ottawa listening to officials who are used to a bureaucratic approach for all their generation. It will not be any good going to the Indian affairs branch and talking to their officials, who think in terms of rations and some kind of handout program, of $500 here or $1,000 there, or letting them cut cordwood for the winter to keep their houses warm. It must be something which both the government and the minister throw themselves into. I suggest that this is one field which would take the Department of Forestry into almost every province in the country and give it and its officials and the professional people a much greater understanding of some of the problems met by the local communities.

I mention this because so often when I talk with foresters and loggers in the industry I encounter a kind of pleasant contempt which they have for the federal Department of Forestry. I do not go along with their contempt, but their attitude is usually based in dollars and cents terms. They feel if something pays, it is worth while, but that these fellows spend too much of their time in Ottawa and Petawawa, and forestry stations, frigging around with experiments. This department has sample plots all over the country, and what good are they? I understand if one could put the sample plots that have been established in this country end to end, in order to visit them all a man would have to go across Canada and back. As a matter of fact, I imagine a good deal of the foresters spend much of their time trying to make sure they have not lost track of all the records in respect of the sample plots. Perhaps I am exaggerating somewhat, but in many ways that is the situation.

I believe that if some of our professional foresters in the federal service were really at work bringing the Indians into a program associated with forestry, lumbering and logging, which was practical and really trained them, we would really begin to move the Indians off the reservations and provide the type of income that would do something for them. I should like to point out to the minister that I have on occasion witnessed an Indian who got out and worked for a pulp and paper company and eventually earned $6,000 or $7,000 per year. If one really wishes to consider the materialism aspect of this situation, he has only to look at that kind of Indian who is earning a good income, which captures him, so that he begins to move up in social class terms. This may sound crude, but this is the kind of thing we need for the Indians in order to give them the kind of income and economic future that will enable them to share in the material things we have and provide educational opportunities for their children. The Indian is not going to do this as long as he is sequestered on a reserve, living on the rations, handouts and paternalism that he now receives from the Indian affairs branch.

The Indian affairs branch was very pleased last year because in my area they found the opportunity of appointing an officer to look after the educational and employment opportunities for Indians in northwestern Ontario. He is looking after the employment and educational opportunities for about 16,000 Indians scattered 800 miles east and west and 500 miles north and south. What kind of an impact do you expect to make in respect of creating employment opportunities for Indians with that point of view?

I suggest to the minister that the first step he must take as the Minister of Forestry to really achieve the kind of reputation he would

like for his department is in the direction of using the forestry industry as a means of making the Indians in our country full time citizens with economic opportunities. I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, the minister will not have an easy job in this regard. The situation will vary from place to place in the country, and a successful approach will require a tremendous amount of diplomacy, having regard to trade unions in particular, and provincial departments. I think the people in Canada have good will and intentions in this respect.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to deal now with the second point I wish to draw to the minister's attention. When I was rather young I travelled a good deal in northern Minnesota and was rather impressed by the example set by the United States civilian conservation corps. During the depression years the civilian conservation corps employed 3,000 boys and young men during the first year it was organized and 5,000 in its second year. This is the kind of undertaking we need to deal with the growing problems with which we are faced. We would be required to follow this example on a smaller scale, of course, but through such an organization I certainly can see the possibility of both a meaningful conservation program developing, about which so many foresters love to talk at conventions—and that is about all—as well as some useful conservation being carried out by young people. This program could also include the planning and developing of parks.

It seems to me we have built a raft of schools all over this country under the vocational and technical assistance act. We have spent an astronomical amount, approximately $500 million. I think within two or three years this program will cost the federal government almost $1 billion. This is a good program, and certainly provides training schools in many parts of the country, but the basic industry relies upon forests, which in many ways have been disappearing. One can talk a good deal about sustained yield, but approximately 35 per cent of the cut-overs in the pulp and paper country of Ontario and Quebec are really not regenerated to any degree of quality. Considering the kind of personnel we have, water pollution, low water levels, the demand and response in respect of the parks we have created, I feel a civilian conservation corps could play a tremendous role in this country. Such a program would tie in perfectly with the kind of practical education opportunities we wish to provide a great many people.

In Ontario there is a junior forest rangers scheme in operation. Young lads are put to work during their summer holidays, but there are almost ten times as many boys who want this opportunity as there are opportunities provided by the department of lands and forests. The greatest demand for this kind of opportunity exists in the larger urban areas where the population is concentrated. Such a program would tie in magnificently with forest management and would help in respect of thinning, planting and a return of our forests to the magnificence they possessed in their natural state.

I realize that the question which must be in the minister's mind in this regard, in view of the fact he is from the province of Quebec, concerns provincial jurisdiction. I suggest this kind of program would have to be a shared program, and that it could not be just one allowing a national group of individuals to run around in uniforms and work in the bush. I think the minister should approach this problem by working with one provincial forestry department which might be co-operative, such as the department of forestry of British Columbia or Ontario, and find out whether after a trial run of perhaps two years it would be possible to take a number of these people, who are looking for work and training under schedule 5, and are carried by the Department of Labour, in an attempt to develop a team of men who would receive training and perform useful work in our forests.

I can visualize a number of ways that this program could be tied in with ARDA. The minister will acknowledge that ARDA does allow a training program on a regional basis as far as financing is concerned. It seems to me that ARDA could be used in this way to provide the framework of a program to carry out this kind of thing.

Mr. Chairman, we need a minister of forestry who has sufficient imagination and drive to take advantage of this opportunity and move with it. I believe my suggestion is practical, although I realize one of the difficulties that was encountered in the United States in respect of the civilian conservation corps developed because it became a political football. Both the civilian conservation corps and the W.P.A. became political footballs. I remember the signs which hung in United States bars and which said: "Don't shoot it; it is not a bear, it is a W.P.A. worker having a sleep." That was the suggestion on the sign.

I agree that a program of this kind cannot be developed on a sound basis of the people who are to participate in it are a select group. Mr. Chairman, I can visualize the potentialities of such a program. Many good things could be done in this way and I recommend this idea to the minister as the second thing he should do as the Minister of Forestry.

The third thing I should like the minister to do is tackle the problems which face the forestry production industry in Canada. Surely the federal Department of Forestry, which is the senior department, should have some idea of the future need and demand for foresters in this country. There is considerable confusion in this regard. Recently in the lakehead area we have had discussions about attempts to establish a degree course in forestry. We have had a tremendous variety of prognostications in respect of the need for foresters, the required level of training for men who now know this industry in its entirety. We have also considered how far we must train individuals required in the different technical sections of this industry.

It seems to me that the forestry industry will continue to be the basic and most important element of our economy, and it is for that reason I suggest the minister could best become informed and enthusiastic about forestry in Canada by carrying out a study in respect of future needs in the field of forestry personnel. He should make this a very wide ranging project, because the situation is continually changing.

People have the conception that a forester is someone who wears a boy scout hat, high boots and travels around marking or blazing trees. It is a much more complicated field than that and it has much more variety. I think we need to know more about what our needs are in this field at the present time. Again, there is no central agency that really knows these things. Certainly the Canadian institute of forestry, which is the foresters' national organization, has really not come up with anything like this. I suggest to the minister it is with this organization he should co-operate and work in getting a draft of our future needs in terms of foresters and technicians. I think this would fit into the other two proposals I have put before the minister and I would hope they would at least interest him.

The one thing I would ask of the minister is that he would at least consider my suggestion seriously. I do not expect him to give the usual defence, what I might call the Henri Courtemanche defence, which would be to get up and read something prepared in rebuttal by his officials, pointing out all the worth-while little things that the Department of Forestry does or has done or plans to do. I have seen that in the department's annual report and in the publications that are listed here. I should like to suggest to the minister that we need something much bolder and more creative. He in particular more than anyone who is likely to fill that post has the opportunity, because for some reason he has the reputation. If the minister has been good enough to create the reputation, I think it is about time that, given the job he has, he began to come through and back it up with something solid.

Mr. Patterson: Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to make a few brief observations in a general way with regard to the estimates of the department now before us. Others of my colleagues will be dealing with various aspects of the estimates and also with ARDA and the various programs to which reference has been made this afternoon. I should like to extend my congratulations to the minister on his appointment to this portfolio but in doing so I express some disappointment that the hon. member for Vancouver Centre was transferred from the Department of Forestry to the Post Office Department. I believe he is a man of experience who was prepared to give definite and positive leadership in the department. I do not say that, however, with any intention of downgrading the present minister. I feel he will build upon the foundation laid by his predecessor, as his predecessor built upon the initial work of the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton in setting up the department.

As I have indicated, Mr. Chairman, I want to make some general remarks in regard to the Department of Forestry. I think we all recognize the fact that forestry is one of Canada's greatest industries. I suppose there are those in various parts of the country who will sometimes question that statement because of the fact that in their areas forestry does not particularly concern them. In fact, we were talking in a jocular fashion a little while ago and one of my colleagues said he did not have a tree in his constituency and therefore he would not presume to speak on forestry. Nevertheless I believe all of us in the house today recognize the tremendous importance of the forests and the forest industries to the Canadian economy.

Like one of the other speakers today I was somewhat disappointed that the minister did

not take this opportunity to present a challenging program to us and outline some of the things he is contemplating as far as the development of the department is concerned. However, a very interesting pamphlet came to hand just recently from the Department of Forestry. It is publication No. 1002 titled "Canada, A Forest Nation". I think this is basically true. I should like to refer to several sections. It begins with the statement that Canada is a forest nation and the second paragraph reads as follows:

> The total forested area of Canada is more than 1,700,000 square miles. Productive forests—those capable of producing usable timber—cover one million square miles. About 80 per cent of this forest land is publicly owned and administered by the ten provincial governments which make the forest crop available to the forest industries through a variety of systems. The remaining 20 per cent is made up of farm woodlots, forest land owned by companies and individuals, and of areas for which the federal government is responsible.

With respect to the annual forest harvest it states:

> The annual harvest from the forest averages 3,200 million cubic feet.

Further on it states:

> The forest industries employ over 300,000 and pay out $1,200 million in salaries and wages each year. Woods operations account for about $400 million in salaries and wages and provide employment in the neighbourhood of 80,000 man years, or the equivalent of 80,000 year round jobs.

Then it goes on to refer to the pulp and paper industry and to the fact that over a period of 50 years it has grown to become Canada's leading manufacturing industry. The pamphlet goes on to set out some of the important facts with relation to Canada as a forest nation. I think this information should be of real interest to many who come from sections of the country that are not forested. I give this information once again to indicate the fact that the minister has jurisdiction at least to a certain degree over one of Canada's greatest industries. I also wish to point out in this connection that even as forestry is one of Canada's great industries, so in my own province of British Columbia it occupies a very important place. The hon. member for Vancouver East interjects that British Columbia has 60 million acres of forest. I have here a pamphlet headed "British Columbia, Facts and Statistics, 1963". It contains some very interesting information with regard to British Columbia and I should like to put a few of these facts on the record. With regard to forestry it states:

> The forests form the backbone of the British Columbia economy and contribute most to provincial income and employment. The estimated net value of production of all forest industries amounted to $850 million in 1963, or approximately 36 per cent of total production.

The report goes on to state:

> Of all manufacturing industries in British Columbia, lumber ranks first, pulp and paper ranks second, while plywood constitutes the fourth largest industry in the province. At present the British Columbia forest industries produce nearly 70 per cent of all the lumber manufactured in Canada—

I think this is something for us to appreciate.

> —20 per cent of all the pulp, almost 15 per cent of all the paper, and approximately 85 per cent of all the plywood. The forest industries are an important source of employment. In 1963 they directly employed approximately 78,000 persons.
>
> During the year 1962 British Columbia exported to foreign countries $602,400,000 worth of wood and wood products. Of this total, 75 per cent went to the United States, while 12 per cent went to the United Kingdom. The most important wood products exported in order of their value were: Lumber, $303,500,000; pulp, $123,600,000; newsprint, $105,900,000.

I think we in British Columbia have a tremendous heritage and a wonderful opportunity so far as this particular aspect of our economy is concerned. As I have pointed out, it is important not only to Canada but to British Columbia. Of course, as indicated by the percentage of the wealth that is accumulated from this source in British Columbia, there is a tremendous contribution in turn to our national economy.

Now, the entry of the federal government into the areas of activity and responsibility that have hitherto been considered of provincial concern now extends to forestry. I just read a booklet the other day pointing out the periods of time during which the federal government moved into certain areas that previously had been under provincial jurisdiction. It referred to national health and welfare, labour and the trend now to accept certain responsibilities with respect to the education of our people, especially in higher education. This trend has been extended now to forestry. Here, we come again to the importance of federal-provincial relations. Forestry comes under provincial jurisdiction, yet it seems as though the problems in this area are of such a magnitude, so widespread and so general across the country, that it seems advisable the federal authorities should assume some particular role so far as the development of our forests is concerned.

This was pointed out by the hon. member for Port Arthur as presenting one of the problems, the fact that we now have ten provincial jurisdictions and a federal jurisdiction. If there is going to be satisfactory progress made in the various fields of endeavour

there will have to be close co-operation and liaison maintained between federal and provincial jurisdictions. I do feel, however, as I have pointed out, that unquestionably the establishment of the federal Department of Forestry has been worth while. It has a legitimate function to perform so long as it is careful to confine itself to those matters outlined when the department was set up.

Reference has been made to the matter of conservation. We know that this is a very important part of forestry development in our country. If we do not have proper conservation and reforestation, then the time is going to come when we are not going to have any forests. This has been recognized by those who have been interested in this particular matter, and a great deal of attention has been given to it. I was reminded the other day, when there was a discussion taking place on federal-provincial fiscal arrangements, that natural resources were included in the setting of the bases for the equalization grants, but no attention was given to the cost involved. The gross income was considered.

I should like to refer to a brief statement from a publication dealing with British Columbia forest industry facts, which states that the provincial government received $35 million in direct revenue, exclusive of income and sales taxes, from the sale of timber licences and stumpage in 1963, but the British Columbia forest services spent $17 million on all phases of its activities which included protection and the renewal of the resource. We see here therefore that in the province of British Columbia, and I imagine in other provinces that have extensive forest resources, a great deal of money is expended on the matter of conservation. I feel that in all of our discussions and in all of our negotiations we should remember, or the federal government should remember, that there is a great deal of money spent in conservation and promotion of these different things which should be taken into consideration. This includes, of course, fire protection to which the minister made reference in his introductory remarks.

There is just one other matter to which I should like to make a brief reference, and that is the matter of research. I think it is very necessary for research in this particular field to be accelerated. A certain amount is being done in universities by provincial governments. Then of course the industry itself is expending considerable amounts of money on research. However, the problems that affect the forest industry are more or less general. I suppose there are some local problems, but to a large extent the problems that affect the industry are country-wide, from one coast to the other. I feel there is a legitimate area here in which the federal department could expand its research facilities. The minister made some reference today to the fact that facilities are being extended in the province of British Columbia. We do appreciate this. As I pointed out, this is one of the fields in which I think those in the forest industry have a part to play. They could do so by pooling all their resources, pooling all their research facilities. Only in this way will adequate and effective progress be made in the field of research.

As I have stated, Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make these brief remarks. Other matters will be dealt with when we come to the various items.

Mr. Hamilton: There is no department of the government of Canada that can better be described as the Cinderella department than the Department of Forestry. I do not believe I need to hold up the committee by reminding all Canadians that the forest industry, not only presently but for long years in the future, is the most important industry we have in Canada. Under the constitutional arrangement that we have, this industry is under the ownership, management and control of our ten provincial governments. The only direct control the federal government has in this field is in the Northwest Territories and the Yukon.

Having mentioned the simple realities of the background of the situation, I may say it has become increasingly clear in the last 15 years that something was drastically wrong with the handling of our forests in Canada. There is no need quarrelling about how this complicated situation developed. The fact remained that something had to be done. The reasons something had to be done were clear. In 1949, for example, the food and agriculture organization pointed out in its report that tremendously increased demands would be occurring in the world markets for products of the forests. This report in 1949 should have warned us in Canada that we, with our tremendous base of forest resources, should begin to plan for the day when we would be under pressure to supply the market.

In 1959 the food and agriculture organization of the world published its second report, pointing out once again in a revised form that the calculation on which the demand factor had been predicted in 1949 was wrong and it should have been much greater than had

been indicated in 1949. It was on the basis of the 1959 report that the government of the day decided to do something about the challenge facing the forestry industry of Canada. We based our decision in setting up a new forestry department on the fact that demand by the people of the world for the products of the forests, primarily in paper products at that time but also in sawn lumber, would increase at such a rate that if something was not done in the lumber and paper producing countries of the world there would be a serious shortage all around the world. This was the first premise on which we worked.

The second premise on which we worked was that since the ownership of the forests and their management lay in the hands of the provincial governments, it was impossible for the officials of the branch of forestry, which was then in the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources, to deal on a basis of equality with ministers and deputy ministers at the provincial level. It seemed clear to us that if we were to take advantage of the opportunities that existed in the markets of the world for the products of the forests, we had to raise the status of this branch to the full level of having its own minister. It is, after all, our No. 1 industry; and this was done.

I would like to be able to say that in the intervening four years much progress has been made, but quite frankly I am appalled at how little has been done to meet the challenge of the opportunity that exists. As the hon. member for Port Arthur pointed out, you cannot move in the forest industry quickly and get the results you want. All your planning is based on 20, 30, 40 and even 100 years ahead, but the basic fact is that the demand is there, and just as the people of the world need food, so do they need the fibres of the forest.

In the Department of Forestry there is collected under one department three main branches. Each one of these branches, whether it be the forestry resource section, the pathology and entomology division or the forest products division, have concentrated in their respective divisions probably more brainpower and more dedication than any other department of government which we have. Yet with all this ability—undermanned, not supported fully by treasury board, not achieving what they should be able to achieve—in spite of all this tremendous asset, we are missing the boat.

[Mr. Hamilton.]

To my mind the reason is very simple. Because they are restrained by the constitutional limitations on what they can do under the federal government, the tremendous achievements and accomplishments within this limited framework have not been sufficient to make a big impact on what I think is the crucial challenge before us.

The hon. member for Port Arthur pointed out what he thought was the problem. I can say this, and I think the minister will understand as his predecessor understood—this is not a partisan political criticism—that there is a problem and a challenge that has to be met, but it cannot be met by the minister's officials. This is a challenge to the minister. The responsibility rests on his shoulders, and if I may repeat a bit of what the hon. member for Port Arthur said, knowing from the minister's background and from the province of Quebec the difficulty he will have in the constitutional field, in spite of all the difficulties they place before him the country expects from the Minister of Forestry, to use the words of the hon. member for Port Arthur, such diplomacy, such charm, such practical inducements that he can lead these provincial departments, not only of forestry but all the ones that surround that industry, into the light of the opportunities that now exist. The opportunity is there. I said this to the minister's predecessor, that no minister in any government had a greater opportunity to serve his country well than did the Minister of Forestry.

What are some of the things that can be done to bring these provincial governments to see the light of opportunity? First of all they should be impressed with the fact that the federal government has a place in this picture, and the place the federal government has is in the marketing arena through the Department of Trade and Commerce. Second, it has a place in taxation policies, yes and even monetary policies, which have a direct bearing on the success or failure of getting the provincial governments, through their control of the forest licences, to do the things that the national interest demands.

A moment ago I mentioned the reports of F.A.O. in 1949 and 1959. So desperate is the situation that in 1964 F.A.O. did not choose to wait until 1969 for its regular decennial report, but issued a special report just a month ago, appealing to the whole world and warning the whole world not only of the impending shortage in pulp and paper products but also in sawn lumber.

Look at the figures of the proportions of use of wood products in Europe. Just a few

years ago 80 per cent of the forest production of Europe went into the sawn lumber section of the industry. Now that is rising to 90 per cent and 95 per cent, to meet the demand for sawn lumber as the people of Europe rehabilitate themselves and have better standards in their housing. Thus the demand for sawn lumber is rising at a very rapid percentage rate, and as they lessen the supply of wood production going into paper production this gives us an opportunity.

Just a few months ago I visited the mainland of China and in conversations I had with vice-ministers of that government one of the things they emphasized to me was that in addition to the farm machinery and fertilizer they needed for their 300 million acres of farmland, they had to face up to the practical fact that they would have to come into the markets of the world and buy newsprint in tremendous quantities. You can readily visualize why that is so.

Over there in the score of provinces in China the great forests of centuries ago were denuded and those which were left were burned off by the Japanese, with result that only two provinces have forestry reserves of any substance. You cannot take a nation of 700 million people and leave it without paper. What is the use of educating 80 million students in their schools unless there is something for them to read? How can they build up an industrial nation without the paper on which an industry is based? Here is one of the greatest demand factors that the world has faced in the last 10 years, and the only thing that stops unlimited purchases by the Chinese of paper and paper products in world markets is the fact that they have to earn the money to buy them; and they are desperately striving to do that. But here you have a demand factor. If the intentions of that government are going to be met, they want as a minimum to put a newspaper into every home in China. There are 700 million people in this one market, compared with 200 million in the United States and Canadian markets. Even if the newspaper that goes into those homes has only three or four pages, or even eight pages, as compared with our many-pages newspapers, the demand factor is tremendous.

When the Chinese look around the world for sources of supply they see the great forest reserves of Russia, but they know these forests will not meet their need because their products have not yet been adapted to the making of pulp and paper. They know that in the southeastern United States there is a potential for increasing production in pulp and paper because of the rapid growth of the forests in that part of the world due to the climate. But the potential is limited, in the face of this tremendous demand. They look at the heavy pressure on the forests of western Europe and see there is not much hope for them there. They look at the forests of the tropical areas of the world. They are not yet suitable for pulp and paper production on a large scale. Then they know that the one area in the world which can help them out is Canada, with its tremendous forest reserves.

How, then, I ask the minister, are you going to take opportunities like this, when as minister you have no control over the provincial governments except in regard to inducement in connection with markets? This is where the leadership test occurs. I think the minister should accept the fact that our paper industry, for instance, has grown up like Topsy and is to too large a degree integrated with the markets of the south. It is not a case of the production of a forest limit being available to buyers all over the world; the product of that timber limit is dedicated to the same newspaper in the United States every year. In too many cases this is so.

So far no provision has made any effort to change this situation. I am sure the minister also knows that, generally speaking, the forests of Ontario eastward are fairly well dedicated to some form of production right now. He knows that the only available virgin forest for pulp and paper production are in Ontario, British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba. These areas of the interior of British Columbia through to Manitoba cannot easily assimilate pulp and paper mills, even though there is a demand factor in the world for their production, because they are cut off from the place where the demand exists. The demand for pulp and paper products is first in Europe, where the growth rate is nearly 15 per cent per year. It is slowly and steadily increasing in the United States, I think by about 5 per cent. Then there are these virgin markets in China that I have outlined. But these areas cannot possibly get into those markets because they are in the centre of the continent. The mills on the eastern seaboard, on the St. Lawrence seaway and the coastal areas of British Columbia are to a large measure dedicated to southern market integration and their production is taken up by those markets.

I put these facts before the minister because on the basis of these facts, with the

market opportunity here, with the system of marketing that is going on, I am sure the minister, with his reputation of getting over tremendous difficulties, can see the obvious solution to the problems. This one challenge met in the next five to ten years would be the greatest contribution that could be made by any minister of any department of any Canadian government, in dollars and cents; there is no question about it.

I do not know precisely how many more new mills we could develop in virgin forests. My guess would be, somewhere around 20, or maybe as high as 30; but that is all. Here we have a demand factor much greater than this extra number of mills could meet. This raises the proposal of the hon. member for Port Arthur. I know that the departmental officials all know that sooner or later this country has to turn its attention to systematic silviculture; but that is not going to come easily in view of this nice, comfortable rut into which the forest industry has got itself, particularly on the paper side, in dedicating its production to markets southward, when most of the new markets are eastward and westward.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the second challenge which the minister faces is how to make a breakthrough in this respect and induce the industry to look for greater marketing opportunities. The minister must impress upon the industry that in the long run not only will they be meeting the dividend requirements of their directors day by day or year by year, but there will be an increasing use of their products and a much greater production within the limits of their territory as the years go by—if not now, then 25 or 30 years from now.

The minister must use all the techniques at his command to get the industry to depart from the well established tradition of relying upon the type of cutting they carry out and leaving regeneration to nature. All this must be challenged. I am no scientist, Mr. Chairman, but I know enough about it to realize that the scientists can talk about it, write papers on it, and get no place. This is what is happening. The minister, with all the prestige of a federal ministry behind him, has to take the case to the industry, to the provincial ministers, and eventually to the people of Canada. He can do it if he will hold out the inducement of more money at the end of the rainbow. I do not think I was wrong when I said earlier in my remarks that the forest industry is the Cinderella industry. Take it out of the kitchen and put it up at the top level.

I do not think there is any question about it; many of us would just love the opportunity of accepting this challenge and tackling the problem. I personally am envious of the minister, that he has this great opportunity in his grasp. If he does measure up to the opportunity, I will be the first to praise his name; but if he does not; I will be there as hard as I can go asking for action. He has one of the best groups of men ever collected around a minister. They will give him all the scientific information on production, control of disease, forest products research, and so on. But the minister's job is to realize that only he has the prestige, working within the limitations of the constituency, to get rid of these tremendous taboos that have been built up over the last 60 years and make a breakthrough in the ways I have suggested.

There are many sidelines I could lead the minister into. I do not think I would be wrong in suggesting that with all his opportunities, and in spite of the reluctance of the provinces—because they have treasury boards too—he could take much of the land in Canada which has no particular purpose and rededicate it to forest use. That might be done under the individual farm program, under ARDA, or through the county forests. But do not forget that it might also be done under the national forests. We have never moved into that field in Canada. There are arguments both for it and against it, but it cannot have escaped the minister's notice that in the last congress in the United States a bill went through one of the houses allowing the minister there to take over a ten year period some 50 million acres and add it to the national forests. The use of these national forests is not limited just to watching trees grow; it is also used for other purposes, mainly recreation.

In addition to that the hon. member for Port Arthur has spoken with some reason in expressing satisfaction regarding the tremendous contributions made by the civilian conservation corps in the United States in the 1930's. He suggested that we should take a look at this in Canada, and I agree with him. Not only do our forests lend themselves to a great business opportunity for the country, but they serve as a training course for young people not only from rural areas but from our cities, who have two months every year in which they could serve their country well. I do not follow things in the United

States closely but I understand that they expect to have one million people functioning under the youth conservation act the minute it goes through this year. Unfortunately, in Canada we could only speak of about 100,000; but these 100,000 could not only be used on work in the forests but could be tied in with the recreational and redevelopment activities around our cities and would provide a working force which would not only assist in their training but would also build assets for which there are markets at the end of the road.

I think I have said enough to indicate that there are some things which the minister will have in his mind, and I will be looking forward to the introduction of his bill in the house which will set up a new department. I do not blame him for reserving till that time his own personal philosophy, and for taking that opportunity to describe in some detail what he intends to do about these things. I hope that the remarks of the hon. member for Port Arthur and myself will have some bearing on the ideas which he will be presenting at that time.

While I am on my feet, although I may be a little out of order in asking for clarification, I should like to say now that I realize that much of this redevelopment work which will be done under ARDA will have to be through the forestry arm. Over the next few years we are going to require thousands of foresters, in the same way as over the years we have developed thousands of farmers. These foresters will be devoted to the shifting over from a very inefficient method, in my opinion, of handling forests into the more efficient methods of silviculture in areas close to civilization. In this field, which is purely within the hands of the provincial government, the key to the situation is that the federal minister can dangle before the provinces opportunities for markets. Where his persuasiveness will be really required is in the fact that the provinces will have a positive return.

If I may give an example, the province of Ontario puts 100,000 acres a year into reforestation. It is estimated that there are eight million acres as a minimum which should be shifted into forests in Ontario. At the rate they are going it will take 80 years. But the demand factor is on us now and in five or ten years the world will be in a precarious position in regard to supplying the needs of the woods section of the economy. I suggest that this matter is very urgent.

If I may move a little further into this field, let me say I know the difficulties cannot be cured all across the country all at once. Under the ARDA concept you have an opportunity of selecting certain areas upon which you can concentrate. I have been watching the reports coming in from the interlake area and the news from Gaspé, and they have been getting the facts out. But on reading these reports I keep finding the prejudices of the past coming into them, even when people are supposed to have approached the subject completely from an all-resource use concept. In the report on the interlake area of Manitoba, which I assume the minister has seen, there is outlined the various opportunities for redeveloping the whole area between the two lakes in Manitoba. But they forgot the forestry part. If I were minister and paying half the cost of that study I would say: "Look, I don't mind paying half the cost, because this report came at the initiative of the province of Manitoba, but have you not forgotten something?" Forestry provides one of the great opportunities for redeveloping that area, and because the provincial authorities in Manitoba have been disappointed so often in the last 20 or 25 years about getting pulp and paper mills you cannot blame them in one sense for being disillusioned. However, it is the purpose of the minister to restore their faith and not to overlook the possibility of that type of use in the redevelopment of that area.

Likewise in the clay belts of Ontario and Quebec. I drove through that area last week end to look at it once again. In an area of good land where the farmers are farming good farms, I see 90 per cent of the area going back into natural forests. I know the land is good but they are suffering from a very simple missing ingredient—lack of markets. I know the initiative lies in the hands of the provinces under ARDA to make proposals, but that does not stop a livewire minister from having frequent chats with provincial ministers and telling them they are overlooking something. I should like to see a good land area on the northern slopes going to Hudson bay, James bay and Quebec. Take this area on as one where you realize that there is a market for these products which are there—beef and wood products. These may be combined. There are people there trained to do this sort of work. As the hon. member for Port Arthur mentioned, you have an Indian population which adapts itself to this type of work. Another area which I think is ideally suited,

with good land but cursed with a lack of markets, is the Lake St. John area in Quebec. The whole area up from the Saguenay I should like to see looked at as an area like the Gaspé and the interlake area in Manitoba.

We accept the principle that the provinces must provide the initiative, but not the whole thing entirely. I suggest that the minister make a proposal to the provinces and they may bring forward something as a result. But it must be suggested. If two, three or four areas in Canada are being given the opportunity of going into pilot operations on a silviculture approach, this gives an opportunity to the trained men in the minister's department to work with the ARDA people and show that forestry can produce dollars and cents per acre in a superior fashion to what is now being produced from marginal agriculture and nutritional soil.

I thank you very much for allowing me the privilege of putting these ideas before the minister, because after the hon. member for Port Arthur had spoken I could not resist the opportunity of expanding his remarks.

Mr. Macdonald: Mr. Chairman, I should like the opportunity on the occasion of the minister's estimates being before the committee to take a few minutes of this committee's time to make a few remarks both to affirm some of the statements made just now by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle and to discuss a particular problem related to forest and potential forest land in part of southern Ontario surrounding the city I represent.

Coming as I do from an entirely metropolitan riding perhaps I should establish my qualifications to make some remarks on this subject. I think possibly I may claim a more intimate and longer standing association with the federal government forestry branch than almost any member of the house, being the son of a man who was an employee of the federal forestry branch for 40 years, ultimately becoming a director. I have heard from him and his associates many expressions of the frustrations about which we have just heard from the hon. member for Qu'Appelle, in respect of the problem created by division of jurisdiction over Canada's forest resources, and the particular frustrations of people with scientific training in forestry and related sciences who see what Canadian forests are capable of, what they require and the way in which they are failing to receive the attention they deserve.

[Mr. Hamilton.]

One particular area that seems of importance to me, and that I should like to stress today, relates to some of the marginal lands, some of the worked out lands, and some of the farm lands in southern Ontario stretching right from the Quebec border to lake Huron which, initially cleared as long ago as a century, or a century and a half, have over a period of time been worked out or by maltreatment ceased to be productive for farm purposes.

I think it has been clearly established over a period of years, including consideration by the Senate committee on land uses in Canada, that there is a great potential for this land, and a great opportunity for various levels of government to introduce and encourage reforestation of these lands, which perhaps should never have been taken out from under forest cover in the first place. A great many recommendations in respect of the development of these lands have called for intervention of governments. I point out there is a great deal of initiative on the part of private operators, and chiefly individuals who have over a period of years both for profit and purely on the basis of a hobby, established tree farms in areas where they have engaged in reforestation in an attempt to put these lands again under tree cover.

One of the difficulties that has stood in the way of people carrying on this enterprise has been the manner in which, over a period of years, property assets represented by these reforestation projects, have been treated for tax purposes. In this respect the federal government does not have sole and absolute jurisdiction.

The first difficulty arose in that area which might generally be described as death duties where both the federal government, by way of estate tax, and the provincial government, by way of succession duties, have levied taxes against the assets of deceased persons. The remarks I have made I address both to the Minister of Forestry and his colleague the Minister of Finance, for consideration at the time of the budget. I would also suggest that the Minister of Forestry keep these ideas in mind for consideration when he is next talking with provincial governments in respect of agreements between federal and provincial governments which are initiated on the basis of the present statute, and which were originally negotiated on the basis of the Canada Forestry Act.

The chief effect, I would suggest, of the present arrangement in respect of estate

taxes and succession duties is the encouragement of bad forestry practices because of the necessity of recovering cash to pay these estate taxes and succession duties. The necessity for a quick turnover so that the claims of the crown can be satisfied means that bad forestry practices may often be followed and land that has, with great care, been brought slowly along to the point where it might be put to a sustained yield basis, may for example have to be subject to strip cutting altogether, or other bad forestry practices which will yield an immediate or early cash return. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it deserves the consideration of both the federal and provincial tax authorities, to see how, by constitutional arrangements and related legislation, changes can be effected, making it possible to postpone the payment of succession duties and estate taxes until such time as, in accordance with good forestry practice, the forest crop on any particular land is realized. In the case of lands which are on a sustained yield basis I suggest a formula could be worked out for periodic payment of succession duties and estate taxes or, if it is land on which the forest is ultimately brought to maturity and is going to be cut clear, then at such time the estate taxes or succession duties which may have been outstanding, with added interest, could become payable.

At the same time, I would suggest that municipal taxes may have a serious effect on tree farming and tree farmers in our different provinces, and that efforts should be made to recast the structure of municipal taxes so they recognize the special character of a forest. As hon. members know, land devoted to forestry may for very many years, in accordance with good forestry practice, not yield any income at all. But, as we all know, nothing is more certain than that each year the county tax assessor will be around to collect his mite from the owner of the land.

Mr. Chairman, what I am suggesting again today is that the payment, or if not the payment perhaps the assessment arrangements under provincial legislation, could be changed so that the assessment and payment of municipal taxes could be postponed until the crops from the particular land is realized, in accordance with good forestry practice.

In respect of these various amendments, and for inspiration in connection with this type of amendment, I would suggest the minister and his department could possibly look to some of the measures which have been enacted in the United Kingdom in recent years for the purpose of encouraging the owners of particular lands to maintain them under forest, and to follow good forestry practices. In particular I would refer the minister to the provision in the United Kingdom death duty legislation which defines timber and agricultural land, or that devoted to timber in a particular way, at the lower rate which is applicable to that part of a person's estate which is under forest. I think both the provincial and federal governments should seriously consider this kind of amendment to our taxation statutes, which in the long run I suggest would ultimately lead to the same revenue but would adjust the structure of the taxation in such a way as to be consistent with the manner in which these very valuable resources by Canadians should be developed and realized.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I believe it is five o'clock. I will therefore wait until the next opportunity to make my remarks.

[*Text*]

Progress reported.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: 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.

ANNUAL VACATIONS ACT

PROVISION FOR THREE WEEKS HOLIDAY AFTER FIVE YEARS

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre) moved the second reading of Bill No. C-54, to amend the Annual Vacations Act (three weeks after five years).

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple and straightforward bill, the entire purport of which is contained in the title. The bill proposes to amend the Annual Vacations Act which is already on the statute books, to provide that an employee with five years employment shall have three weeks annual vacation with pay. As hon. members are aware, at the present time the act provides for one week after one year and for two weeks after two years of employment. The present act goes no further. But in this day and age a great many people, especially those who have served for any period of time, do have a longer vacation each year than two weeks, and it seems to many of us that such

a provision ought to be part of our national labour legislation.

I hope it can be clear at this time, because it has not always been clear with respect to these bills of mine, that this does not refer to civil servants. It does not refer to federal employees. It refers to workers who come under federal labour jurisdiction. I mention that because on two or three occasions when I have had companion bills before the house I have read the next day in the press that the member for Winnipeg North Centre was again trying to get something more for federal civil servants. I do that in its place, Mr. Speaker; but this is general labour legislation which applies to all those workers in Canada the nature of whose employment is such that they come under federal labour jurisdiction. These include railway, transportation and communications workers, bank employees and quite a long list of others. The list has been put on the record a number of times.

Although the list is a long one we know that labour matters in this country are the subject of divided jurisdiction. Some come under federal jurisdiction, some come under provincial jurisdiction. Roughly speaking, about one tenth of the labour force comes under federal labour jurisdiction and the remaining 90 per cent come under provincial jurisdiction.

The purpose of this bill is to improve a piece of federal legislation that we already have. Actually, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the request, if I may call it that, made in this bill is a very reasonable one. In fact, it is so reasonable I am almost ashamed of it. Instead of asking for three weeks vacation with pay after five years I think the bill should have asked for three weeks after three years or four years at the most. But around this place one has to learn to expect things to move slowly, especially with the 1919 Liberals still in power, and so if we could get this much at least it would be a bit of progress.

But I say, Mr. Speaker, that no one can deny the utter reasonableness of this proposal. It is not breaking new ground as to principle. The principle is already established that by federal labour legislation we declare that workers who come under that jurisdiction should have holidays with pay. So far we have provided just two definitions. We say that those who have worked for one year shall get one week's vacation with pay and we say that those who have worked for two years shall get two weeks vacation with pay. It is our contention that we should widen this definition and say that those who have worked for five years shall get at least three weeks vacation with pay.

Because this proposition is so reasonable I hope that the hon. member for Kootenay East (Mr. Byrne), who I see in his place and who as parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Labour will no doubt be replying, will treat it in the simple, straightforward, reasonable manner in which it is presented. I hope he will not give us another of those profound orations that go all around the subject but fail to deal with the simplicity and straightforwardness of the proposal. I do not know whether he can do it but I throw out the challenge to him. He has been on his feet a lot this week and has had a good deal of practice. I suggest that today he come up with something new, and what he really ought to come up with is an admission that this proposition is so reasonable that the government is prepared to accept it. If he cannot do that, the least it can do is to ask the house to refer the subject matter to the committee for that further study that is so often a way out for the government.

One of the other answers that the parliamentary secretary no doubt will make is that this is an item in a national labour code and why does the member for Winnipeg North Centre not wait for the national labour code and see if this provision is not included in that code? As the hon. member for Kootenay East knows, I have been waiting and waiting and waiting. For a while he sat over on this side of the house and he complained about having to wait and wait and wait. At the moment I am not going to rehearse the long wait it has been for most of my lifetime, since 1919, but I remind the parliamentary secretary and the house of how difficult it is to get action on this simple matter at this session of parliament.

As everyone knows, in the last session of parliament, the first after the 1963 election, we were told categorically we would get a labour code at this session of parliament. Sure enough, when we met on February 18 it was promised in the speech from the throne. That promise is to be found on page 2 of *Hansard* for February 18. Two days later the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) spoke in the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne and as found on page 57 of *Hansard* he underlined during the course of his speech this promise in the speech from the throne, a national labour code, and said it would be brought forward at this session.

Four days later the Minister of Labour (Mr. MacEachen) spoke in the same debate and as

recorded on page 157 he confirmed that a national labour code would be brought in at this session. In the meantime we have had many weeks, many months, of the session, and where are we getting? On April 21 I asked the Minister of Labour for about the umpteenth time if we could expect the national labour code to be put on the order paper soon. His reply was that it would appear on the order paper "as quickly as possible". That is to be found on page 2397 of *Hansard* for April 21. We let a few weeks go by, but because "as quickly as possible" did not seem to be very fast I asked a similar question on July 13 and the answer is to be found on page 5380 of *Hansard* where the Minister of Labour said that the national labour code would be on the order paper "soon".

On August 4, as recorded at page 6351 of *Hansard,* I asked the Minister of Labour (Mr. MacEachen) if we were not going to get this on the order paper soon in view of his promise that it was coming soon. Some members will recall that he replied that I was misquoting him; that it had not been promised soon, but only as soon as possible. Well, there is a fine distinction between those phrases. When I was able to show the minister that he had said "soon" on one occasion, he came back with that interesting quip to be found on page 6351 of *Hansard,* that it would be on the order paper as soon as possible, and he hoped that would be soon.

Well, as the parliamentary secretary knows, I asked the minister a question about this matter this afternoon on orders of the day. He was still unable to give an answer as to when this matter would be on the order paper. I must say that in reply to one question I got a definite, one word answer, "Yes". What was the question to which that reply was made? The question was, will it be on the order paper at this session? I see my genial friend, the parliamentary secretary, nodding his head confirming what the Minister of Labour said. How long is this session going to last? It could be the longest session in history. Sessions have been known to last over three calendar years. There is no requirement that a session be prorogued so long as there are items on the order paper with which the government wants to proceed. This session may go on interminably.

Miss LaMarsh: It already has.

Mr. Knowles: For once, I agree with an interjection by the hon. lady, who just said that it already has gone on interminably. But look at what that does to the things we have been promised. I suggest that is not good enough, and because that is not good enough I say to the parliamentary secretary that he should not give this item in a national labour code the kind of treatment he has given some of the other measures I have introduced.

I say to him also that it is no use using the argument that these things should all be introduced in one package. He knows very well that if I were to introduce a bill containing all of the things in one package he would say, "You are asking us to swallow too much at once; you should introduce these things one at a time." I say to the parliamentary secretary as simply as I can, in terms I am sure he can understand, that this is a simple, reasonable proposition. There is no new philosophy, no new principle. It is already the law of the land that workers under federal jurisdiction must get holidays. All that is asked is that those employees coming under federal labour jurisdiction should receive three weeks holidays with pay after five years of service. I put it to the parliamentary secretary: Come on, come through today.

Mr. Gerald A. Regan (Halifax): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Knowles: The new parliamentary secretary?

Mr. Regan: Thank you. I am very pleased to have the opportunity to participate for a few moments in this discussion. There is no question but that a review of *Hansard* over the years will show that the question of annual vacations with pay has long been of keen interest to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). I think he would have to grant, however, that over the years some progress has been made in that direction. There was a time, of course, when there was no provision for paid annual vacations, but there is provision at the present time. I think that the time the hon. member took this afternoon might well have been utilized in telling us how he reached the exact formula of three weeks after five years. Why not two and a half weeks or four weeks? Why not four years, ten years or seven years? I think it would be very interesting to know the amount of research the hon. member conducted on this particular aspect of the bill before presenting it.

I believe that therein lies the consideration the government must give before coming forward with minimum standards legislation that covers not only vacations with pay but

also minimum wages, the length of the work week and so forth. This is legislation that will be forthcoming at this session and, as the Minister of Labour (Mr. MacEachen) said in the house today, it will be on the order paper before this session is completed.

Mr. Knowles: When is that?

Mr. Regan: The hon. member, I believe, would have to agree that there is no magic advantage in having legislation on the order paper when we have a backlog of legislation on the order paper for which priorities have already been established. If there is no end in view for the present debate that is under way, if the pension legislation has to be dealt with next and if there is other legislation to come, what is the advantage? You have the undertaking of the minister that it will be dealt with at this session of parliament. I suggest there is certainly no great advantage in having it on the order paper now as compared with having it on the order paper a month from now.

Mr. Winch: You can settle it right now.

Mr. Knowles: This bill is on the order paper; let us pass it.

Mr. Regan: In so far as the subject matter is concerned, we have already pointed out to the house that there should be a considerable amount of research given to this matter of the type that has been undertaken by the Department of Labour. This research should be directed toward the length of the vacation, and after how many years of service it should be given. The hon. gentleman did not go into that question at all, although in his research he may have done so. At any rate, I believe he would agree that there should be research conducted into these questions. How much vacation should a worker receive and after how long a period of work?

The principle has been rather widely accepted in collective bargaining for some years that there should be a gradual extension of vacation periods according to the length of service of the employee. I suggest this is a recognized principle, that the worker who stays a long time on one job has some sort of vested interest. He perhaps builds a home in the area and so perhaps becomes more settled in that particular region. He puts his children into the schools of that region to which they become accustomed. In general, he is contributing more, acquiring more of a vested interest in that particular position. By the same token, he may or may not be progressing on the salary scale by staying on the job over the years. I feel this is a sound principle and he is entitled to a greater amount of vacation.

The hon. gentleman's formula suggests that after five years service three weeks should be granted. Certainly, as many members of the house know, there are collective agreements in the country today that do provide three weeks vacation after five years. There are collective agreements that provide four weeks after ten years and some provide four weeks after 20 years. This is an extension of the principle. There is a great deal of variety in the provisions of collective agreements in this country today concerning the length of the vacation period. Certainly I feel, despite the fact that the hon. member has pointed out only one out of ten Canadian workers is subject to federal jurisdiction, that it is desirable to extend this principle. A great many of these people are covered by pretty good collective agreements and I refer, for example, to the railway employees. Other employees should have something comparable.

Even so, I think it is good that the federal parliament should be concerned about this question. The federal parliament, in general, should show the way for the provinces when it comes to minimum standards for employee benefits of this type. I think that this is the next best thing we can do to having full jurisdiction. As the hon. member pointed out, there is divided jurisdiction today and, as a consequence, our legislation directly affects only very few.

I would be accused by some of my hon. friends of being a centralist if I said it is a shame that all the workers in the country are not subject to federal legislation with regard to labour standards, but I think it is unfortunate that there is not uniformity in this regard across the country. I think federal legislation as it has existed in the past, and as it will be in the labour code which will be presented for discussion this session, is a good thing to show the way to provinces, and I would hope those provinces that do not have as good legislation would see fit to fall in line as time passes.

Dealing with the progressive philosophy of such legislation I would point out that there are many people in Canada who are not subject to the protection of trade unions, and many who do not have the benefits of collective bargaining agreements, people who are at the mercy of their employers. But let me hasten to say that sometimes the employer is a very benevolent man or company and takes good care of them. Unfortunately that is not so in other cases. In England, on the

other hand, a higher percentage of the working population has always been subject to collective agreement. Over the years in that industrialized economy there has been such a history and tradition of trade unionism that even those who are not protected by a trade union, because the number involved may be too small for a union to be effective, are by custom and tradition covered by the principles of the legislation.

Unfortunately we in Canada find that something less than 25 per cent, or some such small percentage of our workers are unionized, and there are whole areas of the country where many people are employed in small industries, in the retail trades and other work, who do not have the protection of collective bargaining. This type of legislation, and that which will be included in the national labour code to be presented by the Minister of Labour, will be important to these people because it will provide them with that sort of protection. It gives them coverage by law that other employees sometimes receive by negotiation through collective agreements.

Over the years in my law practice I have encountered trade union people who have not been in favour of widespread legislation to provide minimum standards, because they say if one goes too far in that direction then what need is there for a person to belong to a trade union, and thus it would be difficult for unions to maintain their membership. I do not suggest this has been a general statement. I do not suggest it comes from the enlightened trade unionists, but the answer to it is obvious in that there is always need for collective bargaining and collective representation for workers.

Mr. Knowles: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Regan: Certainly.

Mr. Knowles: Before he sits down would he tell us if he favours the principle of this bill?

Mr. Regan: If the hon. member has not gathered from my remarks whether I do or not, then I have been totally ineffective.

Mr. Knowles: Granted.

Mr. Regan: Thank you. I only want to say I favour the principle of this bill very much. I am not sure whether I said earlier that I questioned whether it should be this exact amount for this exact number. I think we should have full facts and figures to determine this.

Mr. Winch: How many years do you want for your research?

Mr. Regan: I do not want any years for my research. Fortunately the Department of Labour, with its vast resources, has already done this. If the hon. member will contain himself just a little, I would point out to him that the Minister of Labour has already indicated that before this session is finished parliament will have the opportunity to debate a national labour code, which I think hon. members on that side will find attractive. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I support the principle of this legislation; but I am sure my hon. friend from Winnipeg North Centre will look forward to seeing the legislation which the minister is introducing.

Before I sit down perhaps I might be allowed to say that along with other types of legislation that go hand in hand with this, such as that covering minimum wage standards, hours of work and so forth, I would like to see consideration given by the house toward providing a statutory security clause so that a worker who has worked 15 or 20 years in a job, in a place where there is not a collective agreement and where there cannot be a union for one reason or another, cannot be booted out by the employer when he reaches the age of 50, or becomes half a step slower because of his advancing years, without that worker having the right to have his case reviewed by some committee of the labour relations board to determine whether there was proper cause for his dismissal. This would recognize that a worker who has spent a certain amount of time in the job, possibly 15 years, has acquired a vested interest in that job and has contributed to the enterprise, just the same as its owner. I would like to introduce a bill to that effect on some future occasion and—

Mr. Knowles: If the hon. member does so it will not be talked out by this side.

Mr. MacInnis: Referring to this security business, can the hon. member cite any examples where this may be taking place in industry, and does he not realize that in industry the unions in negotiating their general agreements protect the worker in this instance?

Mr. Regan: I think the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. MacInnis) missed the point of what I was saying. I was speaking about the worker in a store where there are only three people, or in a small plant where there is no trade union. The hon. member knows there are many people in our own

province who, for one reason or another, do not belong to unions. What I am saying is that legislation of this type would provide to a man who did not have the protection of a collective agreement the same type of security of tenure, so long as he was a good employee, that the trade union can provide in a larger industry.

Mr. MacInnis: The hon. member might re-read what he has just answered me, especially with reference to clerks and others who do not have the advantages of unions. If he is talking about Nova Scotia he is not entirely correct.

Mr. Regan: I do not want to pursue this point because it is not relevant to the bill, but as a lawyer I have acted for the I.R.W.D.S.U. in many places in Nova Scotia and I know that only a very small percentage of the clerks in that province have collective agreements at the moment, and that there are many employees in stores in Nova Scotia who do not have the advantage of the protection of a trade union.

I would conclude my remarks by saying I support the principle of the bill and I look forward to the idea of increased vacations according to the principle set out in the bill. I look forward with keen anticipation to the national labour code which will be introduced by the man who I think most of us would have to agree is an excellent Minister of Labour (Mr. MacEachen).

Mr. Winch: You also believe in Santa Claus.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, the principle of Bill No. C-54 is likely to draw the sympathy of every hon. member.

In my opinion, the spirit of the bill is better than the suggestion made by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Regan) who said that it would be advisable rather to deal with the seniority of Canadian workers and guarantee them the same position at 55 years of age, if their usefulness is half of what it was 20 years before.

I think that the best solution then, and I hope that it will be included in the labour code which is supposed to be introduced in the near future, that at 55 years of age, if a man is unable to work any longer, he should then be retired with a sufficient pension to make room for younger men or the growing generation. This way, I think that everybody will be respected, and the labour code will play quite a satisfactory part in the whole country.

Coming back to Bill No. C-54, under which, after five years' employment, any employee should be entitled to three weeks' holidays, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) tells us that this legislation will affect about 10 per cent only of the Canadian labour force.

We must not forget that even though Bill No. C-54 affects only 10 per cent of the Canadian labour force, this legislation will have the same results in each of the Canadian provinces. This is probably the objective which is in the back of the mind of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, that this bill passed in Ottawa will have results in every province, that everywhere the same specification will be adopted, namely, "three weeks' holidays after five years".

We have no objection to three weeks' holidays after five years, but I object—

[*Text*]

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. member would permit a question. He realizes that I do not mean mandatory; but I do agree that it would give a lead to the provinces.

Mr. Caouette: Well, that comes to about what I said.

[*Translation*]

Quite sincerely, Mr. Speaker, we have no objection to the granting of three weeks' holidays after five years of employment but as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre stated a while ago, the results of such a legislation at the provincial level would be that the owners of small businesses like groceries, haberdasheries and restaurants would be hard put to balance their budgets and would find it impossible to abide by the law and give their employees three weeks' paid holidays every year.

I wonder whether it is truly necessary to enact either federal or provincial legislation in that respect considering the existence of collective agreements as it was mentioned a few minutes ago.

In this day and age, several Canadian industries give their staff three weeks' holidays after five years of service. Several private enterprises do so. No federal or provincial legislation was necessary to achieve that. That is why we have unions.

My good friend from Winnipeg North Centre is familiar with the work done by unions in Canada, because he has been a

union member for years. Under the circumstances, why not let employers and employees settle their differences through the unions?

When an industry is able to give three weeks' vacation after five years of employment or when a businessman or a private enterprise are able to do so, there are no more difficulties, in my opinion, and the principle of the three weeks' vacation quickly becomes a fact in many fields or sectors of our economy.

However, what I cannot admit is that we, in Ottawa, decide to enact legislation which does not provide that it will concern only 10 per cent of the Canadian labour force but which obliges the whole country to give three weeks' vacation after five years of employment.

In my own business, we give three weeks' vacation after five years of employment. We did not need federal or provincial legislation to do so. But we acted and we still act in good faith. In fact, throughout the country we see that more and more of those cases are settled more and more easily.

I wonder if federal legislation which would have implications in the provinces—because it is intended to give direction to the provinces—would not be likely to disturb many small businessmen and industrialists who do everything in their power to maintain their business and their trade in operation.

So, why compel those people, why drive them up against the wall? Because in the end salary increases or longer vacations do cost money, and ultimately the consumers will be the ones to pay for them. There will be an increase in costs, in the price of services or products, and those who will get three weeks' holidays or higher wages will be the ones to pay for those increases. Because the businessman, the industrialist—and my good friend from Winnipeg North Centre knows it—when I have to increase my employees' salaries, it is obvious that the consumer who comes to have his car repaired pays more per hour than he did before.

It happens in every field of the economy.

My good friend from Winnipeg North Centre should, therefore, think about that. Why always introduce measures that will further burden the Canadian consumer. To take a certain amount from one pocket and put a lesser amount back in the other pocket is no solution, I think.

I appreciate that this bill will please employees since it provides three weeks' holidays after five years of service. But they are the ones who will pay for those holidays, because then carrying charges and operating costs will rise and that, in turn, will entail a rise in retail prices to be paid by the consumer. We are always back where we started. The solution suggested by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre reminds me somewhat of the dog going around in circles chasing his tail.

[*Text*]

Mr. Knowles: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Caouette: Certainly.

Mr. Knowles: In view of the line of his argument, may I ask him how he justifies his contention that old age pensions, family allowances and things like that ought to be increased? Does not the same thing happen; they have to be paid for? Is the hon. member not aware that these principles of social justice are part of twentieth century thinking?

Mr. Caouette: You are still in the seventeenth century.

Mr. Knowles: My hon. friend does not know where he is.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, this is what I shall say to my hon. friend: Old age pensions and all social security are paid by the Canadian people anyway. If my good friend who is sitting here in the house had understood what Social Credit is suggesting as an alternative, as the true social security, he probably would not have moved a bill in this vein.

Now, we are paying for social security, whereas Social Credit has for 30 years been asking for the distribution in Canada of a national dividend which would not come out of the people's pocket and would increase the income of every Canadian citizen, being based on Canada's national production. This dividend would be paid directly to the Canadian consumer, without creating either inflation or deflation, while maintaining a steady commercial balance. If my hon. friend from Winnipeg North Centre realized this, he would not ask silly questions like the one he just directed to me with regard to old age pensions and social security.

Mr. Speaker, we are going around in circles, and I shall say and repeat, that as long as we continue to look at the matter from that angle, we shall probably also continue to accept legislation like Bill C-54 or a similar one. We shall go on with the same system, which is the very cause of this legislation.

If the Canadian worker received his due share of the tremendous production of Canada through the development of our natural wealth, he would not need three week's holidays a year, because he probably would take two months' leave paid by the surplus revenue from the development of this country's natural wealth. But such things are overlooked.

This year Canadian production will reach $46 billion in goods and services, and because of that outstanding production, the total national revenue will amount to some $34 billion. Now, there will be a gap of $12 to $14 billion between production and purchasing power, that is the total national revenue of Canadians. No one talks about filling that gap, but they talk about raising taxes again which will further reduce the revenues of the Canadian people, leaving aside millions and billions of dollars of goods which will not be disposed of.

We see that the government is looking for markets throughout the world, while some Canadians do not even have the bare essentials. The first market is always the domestic market. Then it is in order to try to increase our imports and exports and to try to balance them as much as possible, but I think that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, instead of introducing every year—undoubtedly in order to make some political capital—legislation calling for three weeks' vacation, should take a look at Social Credit suggestions. Then he would be useful to his electors in the Winnipeg North Centre riding and to all the people, all across Canada.

[*Text*]

Mr. D. G. Hahn (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, judging from this debate I think it is time we took a recess. We seem to be coming around full cycle. Earlier this session, in fact on March 6, on a Friday such as this, in a private members' hour such as this, and playing to a crowd such as we have here now, I got up and spoke to a bill. For some strange reason the bill was introduced by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), and when I look at that bill and then look at the bill before us today I find that even the bills are practically the same. It seems to me that if the private members' hour is going to get as repetitive as the flag debate perhaps we should call a halt and go home.

Mr. Knowles: Perhaps we should pass both.

[Mr. Caouette.]

Mr. Hahn: As I did then, I congratulate the hon. member for introducing this bill, and I do so on two counts. First of all, like the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Regan) I agree with the principle contained in this bill and think it has a great deal of merit. It should be given serious consideration. Second, I bow to the experience of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, because when I look at Bill C-15 which we debated on March 6 and when I look at this present bill I find two very similar items which probably could well have been incorporated in one bill. The hon. member's years of experience in the house has enabled him to split these bills and thereby gain two trips to bat. I hope that perhaps we younger members by following some of these learnings and teachings of our more experienced elders will also acquire some useful ideas as parliamentarians.

The bill we have now is one which (a) I agree with in principle and (b) I do not think should pass today, and for much the same reasons as were evident in the last session, or in the previous debate on March 6. I think everyone agrees that holidays with pay are desirable and necessary; and I think we all agree, at least I certainly do, that three weeks after five years is a reasonable proposition. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Regan) suggested that we should do a lot of research into this problem. I do not think that on this particular point a lot of research is really needed. I think three weeks after five years is reasonable. I believe that to some degree industry, and particularly those segments of it which are unionized and are negotiating contracts, has decided to recognize this in some of the agreements which have been signed. I also agree that we need standards on statutory holidays, standards for hours of work, minimum wage legislation, legislation covering employees' safety—in fact, all the things which should be embodied in a proper and comprehensive labour code.

I am as anxious as the hon. member to see this labour code brought forward, but I feel strongly that it would be wrong to do these things piece by piece by piece. I feel that our labour legislation, instead of being embodied in a series of acts, should be contained in one comprehensive act, and I feel that that is the only logical and sensible way to do it.

As stated in the speech from the throne, such a labour code is to be brought forward this session. I know the hon. member has been asking "When, when, when?", and I know a number of us on this side of the

house have been asking the same thing, because we are as anxious as he is.

Mr. Knowles: May I ask the hon. member a question. Does he get any better answers than we get?

Mr. Hahn: Perhaps I should give the hon. member the standard answer—"If he will only be patient—". I have every confidence that we will have a labour code on the order paper and before this parliament at this session. There are certainly a great number of us on this side of the house pushing very hard for it, and I think with some degree of success. So to me it is not logical to introduce these bills and pass them one at a time; rather it is logical to embrace all our labour legislation in one code, bring it in, debate it and get it through. This I am hopeful, in fact reasonably certain, will happen this session, and for that reason we should not, as I see it, pass this particular bill at this particular time.

The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Regan), when he was speaking on this bill, made several points which I think are worth commenting on. He spoke about the role of the federal government and its labour legislation setting the standard for the provinces to follow. I heartily agree with this. I know we do not have the jurisdiction in the labour field, but I also feel that federal labour legislation will provide a strong incentive, a strong target for the provinces to shoot at. I think if we enact good labour legislation it will only be a matter of time before the provinces follow suit. Public pressures would ultimately force them to do so.

The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Regan) worried about the effects of a good labour code on the possible bargaining position of unions. He was afraid if we introduced labour legislation possibly the argument could be advanced that we do not need organized labour because the government has done this for us. I think this is a false argument. I do not think the government should or ever would get into specific legislation dealing with wages. This must be a matter for negotiation. Many fringe benefits are matters for negotiation.

What we are attempting to do here, as we should do with all our social legislation, is set minimum standards below which we do not expect Canadians to live and exist. It is then the job of the free enterprise part of our economy, in this instance the employer and employee, through their unions or as individuals to negotiate above this minimum. I feel that a comprehensive labour code could be introduced that would provide a reasonable base, but still allow ample scope and incentive for trade unions to carry on above that level, industry by industry and community by community across the country.

The hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) raised some rather interesting points to which I take strong exception. I take issue with the thesis he was trying to advance. For instance, he indicated that holidays with pay, minimum wages and so on, could be detrimental to certain industries, and he cited the case of the owner of a small store who could not afford to pay certain minimum wages or give holidays. My feeling is that as Canadians we cannot afford to have that type of industry or operation existing in our country. If the operation is below a standard that is decent and reasonable we cannot tolerate it. If that operation can only survive without paying a reasonable wage scale and without providing reasonable amenities to the employees, then in my opinion it has no right to exist in our society.

I think the line of reasoning advanced by the hon. member for Villeneuve can be reduced to the argument: Why pay anything over and above starvation wages? We can follow his reasoning in respect of the economics argument, that an employer may not be able to afford these things, down to a point where we reach a ridiculous situation, supporting conditions of employment likened to those which existed before the industrial revolution. Of course I think we all agree that this is not satisfactory, and I do not believe many people in this country would seriously accept that thesis.

We all agree that there are minimum standards, and that the federal government has a responsibility to legislate in respect of them. Even though they do not apply to all people in the country, they at least would set a standard that should be followed. A standard having been set by the federal government, presumably then the provincial governments would set their own standards so people will be effectively covered and protected.

Following the reasoning of the hon. member for Villeneuve, who suggested that instead of social security we might have Social Credit, I would ask him this question: If we change from social security to Social Credit what do we have to lose? I think we have a great deal to lose.

Mr. Speaker, I know the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) is extremely anxious to hear from his adversary and friend, the parliamentary secretary, and has been waiting now for over half an hour. I do not want to deprive him of that pleasure, so I will allow the parliamentary secretary

to answer some of the questions raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Plourde: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit me a question?

[*Text*]

Mr. Hahn: Certainly, if the hon. member will allow me "un moment".

[*Translation*]

Mr. Plourde: Before condemning the Social Credit doctrine, has the hon. member tried to understand it? Has he ever studied it or has he tried to understand it before he condemns it as a whole?

Mr. Habel: He cannot understand it, since you do not understand it yourself.

[*Text*]

Mr. Hahn: I do not condemn it in total. I do condemn certain specific points raised by the hon. member for Villeneuve in his speech dealing with this item. I condemn those points of view that were raised. In respect of my comprehension of Social Credit, as the Speaker has often said during the question period, this is too large a subject to be dealt with during private members' hour.

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, my remarks will be very brief.

I fail to understand the logic of the arguments of the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Hahn), that we should not let this bill pass at this time because there is a labour code about to be introduced by the government. If such is true, that is wonderful and I think we would all welcome it. However it seems to me it would be very wise to let the subject matter of this bill pass to the appropriate committee in order that discussion can take place, because after all we are not sure just when this new labour code will come, or in what form.

Mr. Hahn: May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Thompson: I think the time hardly permits that, Mr. Speaker.

In so far as it is within the authority of the federal government to legislate on such labour matters, the intention of this Bill C-54 is sound and practical. Certainly we live in an age of potential leisure, and stand on the threshold of an age when the labour of men's hands will produce far more with less effort. We had better begin to prepare, and this is one very small step in that direction.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that it is reasonable at this time to permit this bill to pass to the appropriate committee for further study, as far as the subject matter is concerned, that committee being the committee on industrial relations. We will then be better prepared to accept this labour code, which we are given to understand will be brought forward this session.

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I regret that time will not permit me to give a full answer to the many questions raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). As usual he began his speech by telling me that the Liberals made promises back in 1919.

Mr. Winch: Yes, and we are still waiting for them to be fulfilled.

Mr. Byrne: I was not in the position to make policy in those years.

Mr. Knowles: You probably had more influence then than you have now.

Mr. Byrne: I was catching gophers out in the Maple Creek area, and getting three cents per tail, in order to make spending money.

If the present Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) made promises as far back as 1958, you will recall that in very great measure they have been fulfilled.

An hon. Member: It is six o'clock.

Mr. Byrne: It may seem strange to the hon. member that the Liberals are still around, in view of his suggestion that they made promises back in 1919 and have not fulfilled them as yet. The Liberals are still here and have been in power since 1919, with the exception of a few short periods.

An hon. Member: It is six o'clock.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. The hour appointed for consideration of private members' business has expired.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MacLean (Queens): Mr. Speaker, would the acting house leader indicate whether there is any change in the program for next week, and is it possible for him to give an indication of the estimates to be considered next Friday?

Mr. Laing: I am unable to do that, Mr. Speaker, but on Monday we will resume debate on the motion standing in the name of the Prime Minister, as outlined in orders of the day under item 44(A).

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

APPENDIX

ADDRESSES AT OPENING OF THIRD COMMONWEALTH EDUCATION CONFERENCE

Address of the Prime Minister, The Right Honourable Lester B. Pearson when welcoming the delegates to the third commonwealth education conference, House of Commons, Ottawa, Friday, August 21, 1964.

It is my pleasant duty today to welcome you, as I do most warmly, on behalf of the Canadian people and government, to the third commonwealth education conference.

As you open your 15-day conference, I do not envy you your assignment. I confess that there have been occasions in the last 30 years or so when I have felt that the teaching profession had many advantages over diplomacy or politics; and that I hadn't sufficiently appreciated my good fortune many years ago, when I was on the faculty of the University of Toronto. But when I look at the challenge facing today's educators; when I look at the problems confronting you, I am forced to conclude that my escape from a teaching career may not have been such a misfortune for me after all.

The objectives and the agenda of your conference are certainly impressive. For man's every goal—the good life, happiness, security, even global peace—depends in the end on education; on closing the "education gap" which is fundamental to every other gap.

It is encouraging to see in such a conference as this, delegates from all continents and races, working together in harmony and partnership in a cause so vital to mankind's future, We welcome, along with the representatives of 17 independent members of the commonwealth, delegates from many British dependencies and territories—some 16, I believe. The progress of these regions toward independence and, if they so desire, commonwealth membership—and the development of their resources to sustain the obligations of independence—is a source of deep satisfaction to us all.

This march of colonies to independence is also a fine tribute to Great Britain's enlightened record of "disengagement from empire"; one that others in the world might emulate.

Before your conference president delivers the inaugural address, perhaps I may be permitted to add to these remarks of welcome a few observations on the recent commonwealth prime ministers' conference which was attended by leaders of governments representing people of diverse races, cultures, creeds and colour, from all parts of the world. The conference made several proposals which will, I am sure, be before you for consideration.

—proposals for new, co-operative development projects; for additional study of techniques in administration and development planning.

—proposals for the possible formation of a new institute to provide specialized training and research to senior administrators concerned with development problems in new countries;

—proposals for strengthening existing commonwealth programs; for promotion—possibly through a commonwealth foundation—of interchanges and closer contacts within professions;

—proposals for a commonwealth medical conference;

—proposals for possible forms of technical assistance to the developing countries which would permit them to participate in the establishment and use of a global system of satellite communications.

Even more significant evidence of the spirit that guides the nations of the new commonwealth in their co-operative endeavours, was the prime ministers' agreement on the importance of the commonwealth's attitude to those interracial problems which threaten the orderly development of mankind.

"As a community of many different races", the prime ministers said, "the commonwealth is itself an almost unique experiment in international co-operation among people of several races and continents."

The co-operation we seek depends primarily on mutual understanding; and understanding is the goal of all education. We made progress toward that goal in London, in the "declaration on racial equality" which was unanimously and wholeheartedly accepted.

The importance of and the need for such a declaration of racial co-operation and equality was never more apparent. Racial discrimination and the intensification in many areas of mutual fear between races must be, for us all, one of the most disturbing features of the present world situation; the root cause of difficulty and danger in many unsolved problems.

The problem of course exists both within and outside the commonwealth. But obviously

if the commonwealth could not meet its own challenge, confidence in our brave experiment would have been badly shaken, if not destroyed—not only among our own members, but among other millions of people who see in the commonwealth example their best hope for co-operation between races.

With this in mind—and I am quoting from the communiqué—"The prime ministers affirmed their belief that, for all commonwealth governments, it should be an objective of policy to build in each country a structure of society which offers equal opportunity and non-discrimination for all its people, irrespective of race, colour or creed. The commonwealth should be able to exercise constructive leadership in the application of democratic principles in a manner which will enable the people of each country of different racial and cultural groups to exist and develop as equal citizens."

Canada of course takes a special pride in this conference; in the progress made in this field during the past five years. The decision for a commonwealth conference on education came on the initiative of the Canadian government of the day in 1958. This fact naturally makes us feel doubly privileged to have this third conference here, in our capital.

In the progress made in carrying out the four co-operative programs recommended by the first conference at Oxford, this country has demonstrated its faith in and willingness to help underdeveloped and emerging countries and people. I can assure you that we will continue to do that.

As part of this objective, we wish to help make other nations educationally self sufficient. So an ever increasing proportion of our increasing aid programs goes directly for educational purposes.

In the next two weeks you will be assessing the results of this co-operation recommended by previous conferences. You will be recommending ways to improve present forms of assistance; weighing new proposals against problems seemingly defiant of any solution. You will again be asking whether in a world in which no country has enough scholars and teachers, the limited supply of those who can help should be reduced by sending them to the developing countries to teach and to assist, in the establishment of basic programs of study; or whether it would not be better to bring more of the students and scholars from the developing countries to train in established facilities outside their new borders. Both are necessary. But an expert judgment of what the proportions should be, one to the other, would be helpful.

You have before you an agenda which would make the wisest and most energetic blanch. I congratulate the liaison council and the liaison unit on putting forward such a challenging agenda and on their planning and organization of the conference. Among the subjects for committee discussions, I notice that for the first time, the uses of mass media—television, films, tape recordings; the uses of electronic sound and sight—in education—are to be considered. The potential here, of course, staggers the imagination. It will in time affect almost everything you are discussing. It can be the most significant method ever devised for closing the educational gap at a rate beyond our fondest hopes. But it can also become the most frightening of all the results of modern technology in its tendencies to "dehumanize" society.

Before concluding, may I say how fortunate we have been to secure as president of the conference one of our outstanding and most distinguished citizens, Right Hon. Vincent Massey. My own deep respect and admiration for him is shared by all Canadians and indeed by all who know him. His long and brilliant career of public service as educator, in the broadest sense, businessman and diplomat was climaxed when he became, as Governor General, the first Canadian representative of the monarch in Canada.

I am honoured and privileged to welcome you to Ottawa and I am delighted now to be able to turn the conference over to its president.

Address given by Right Hon. Vincent Massey, C.H., at the opening of the third commonwealth education conference, Ottawa, Friday, 21st August, 1964.

My first words must be of gratitude for the honour of being asked to preside at the third commonwealth education conference. As a Canadian, I welcome you to this country, which is proud to be your host for the meeting; as president of the conference, which is so important for all our countries, I welcome you to this opening session.

[*Translation*]

Allow me to use our other official language to wish a most sincere and cordial welcome to French speaking members of the conference.

[*Text*]

Many of you will not have been in this country before. I am glad to know that a number of you will be travelling in Canada

when the conference is over. So that you will better understand what you see, I should like to tell you a little about the background. Here, as elsewhere in the world today, the one certain thing is change. In the course of my own lifetime, I have seen Canada evolve from an agricultural economy to a largely industrial one; from a colony to a sovereign state; from a country with no foreign relations to one represented in over 60 nations.

We have a complicated national pattern. We are a land of many cultures. There is a large French part, a large English part and a host of smaller ethnic parts. Every part by itself is a minority, separate and distinct. Quebec is the home of French culture in North America and so is more than just one of our ten provinces. Some say that our plural society is a mosaic; others call it a salad. Canada in recent years has received great waves of immigration from Europe, increasing our population since the second world war by more than two millions, but these newcomers have not been caught up and reshaped—differences are welcomed here. In spite of this increase, you may be struck by the fact that our population is small for so large a country—even that which we have is, to some extent, reduced by emigration. Many immigrants have made Canada a stopping point on their way to the United States, and many native born Canadians have moved south. Though immigration surpasses emigration, it does not fully replace the skills and drive of those we lose.

Canadian life has been influenced to an extent we sometimes hardly realize by the fact that we are a northern country. This is reflected in the way we live and, indeed, in our national character. We lie between two giant neighbours and are flanked by two great oceans opening out to the occidental and oriental worlds; this results in as many problems as advantages. In Canada there are six time zones across our 4,500 miles of breadth, and we require systems of transportation and communications which would be regarded as unjustified were it not for the fact that national unity demands the east-west links which offset the ever-present pull to the south.

Canada is a monarchy, indeed, she has been since her beginning, whether the crown was French or English. Now the crown of the kingdom of Canada is Canadian. We are really not a young or shapeless country. We are in our fourth century of settlement and are about to celebrate the hundredth anniversary of our constitution. That document is today one of the oldest constitutions in the world continuously in force. It establishes the principle of "peace, order and good government". This time-honoured objective was chosen in preference to the alternative formula "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness". The choice indicates a society founded upon allegiance instead of social contract, a society reflecting the organic growth of tradition itself rather than one created by an explicit act of reason or will.

Canada has practically no revolutionary background, few national myths and folk heroes. Her existence has always been too precarious, her dependence upon "mother countries" always too real, and her peoples' jealousy of their cultural heritages too intense to permit flirtations with adventure. However, as you will be aware during your sojourn here, we are now passing through one of those periods which most countries, and all federations, experience, of constitutional and political strain and readjustment to a new equilibrium. The hereditary sense of tolerance and compromise which has enabled us to carry on over the generations will, I have no doubt, ultimately help us to settle the questions which today beset us. We have learned tolerance in a hard and practical school. As a Canadian writer has said, "Not only was this country formed out of ... defeated racial and political groups; some of these groups had once been bitter enemies of one another...and they had to live in peace..."

However, compromise in Canadian life has always somewhat blurred our image of ourselves, and has often discouraged bold initiatives in nation building. Through the early years another handicap was our status as a dependency. But this has not been without its compensations. Having been a colony ourselves, we understand more acutely the feelings of those who travel a road with which we are already familiar. Our only wars have been in self defence or for the liberation of other peoples. Our tradition has been peaceable, without even internal strife except enough to remember and fear its possibility.

The result of history, geography and colonization is that there are attitudes and things which are peculiarly Canadian, Canada did not just happen. It was built and is maintained by the concerted efforts of her people. Western and northern Canada have been a workshop, planned and ordered by government and business established in advance of settlement.

For national schemes we have employed the device of the crown corporation, a semi-independent governmental body containing features of both public and private enterprise.

Yet the result—though socialistic—has not been socialism, perhaps because here the public is suspicious of "state planning" and "nationalization". The technique of the crown corporation, a characteristic Canadian compromise, may well be of value to countries with similar problems.

Another result of the Canadian experience that may interest other developing nations is our practice of federalism. Although our loose federal constitutional structure, with vast areas of power vested in the provincial governments, has sometimes made it difficult to tackle some national problems, it has allowed the establishment and development of a single state in which the two major European cultures and a host of minorities have co-existed and flourished.

This confederation is one of the two great political experiments with which Canadians have been concerned. The other one to which we have made a significant contribution is the commonwealth itself, for its pattern of independence, growing from responsible government, was first developed here in Canada a century ago. The peculiar constitutional principles which caught on in the whole empire, and transformed it, emerged as we solved our own relations with the mother country; we became a constitutional laboratory in which the nineteenth century empire was created. The new commonwealth after the second world war was built on ideas of association which Canadians advocated in opposition to those of imperial federation and a united front which found favour in some quarters in Great Britain and the other dominions.

The plural and diverse communities of other commonwealth countries have much in common with this one. In unfeignedly welcoming the new countries to their independence, congratulating them on their achievement and wishing them every happiness and success for their people, we Canadians also hope to be known as understanding and helpful. Like Canada, the more recent members have been formed by practical compromise through a process of evolution, rather than by the application of logic. Indeed, this process is still being adapted to the commonwealth's growing number of member countries. Though necessary and unavoidable, the growing pains of nationhood are always difficult and sometimes severe. They are not unknown to us. One of the great indefinable bonds of the commonwealth is the special and active interest assured to new members in facing the difficult problems that are bound to arise in setting up a sovereign country.

I am one of those who believe in the commonwealth—I admire its concept and respect its functions; as a Canadian I am proud of it—any of us who have been concerned with its growth could hardly feel otherwise. The commonwealth began here when three colonies in British North America were federally united in 1867. A few years before Sir John Macdonald, the principal architect of what became Canada, said:

"We are fast ceasing to be a dependency, and are assuming the position of an ally of Great Britain. England will be the centre, surrounded and sustained by an alliance not only of Canada, but Australia, and all her other possessions; and there will be thus formed an immense confederation of freemen, the greatest confederacy of civilized and intelligent men that has ever had an existence on the face of the globe."

From these origins we have passed through four identifiable stages. First, from the British North America Act of 1867 to the statute of Westminster of 1931—the so-called "old commonwealth", about which Sir Wilfrid Laurier observed in 1907, "The proper basis of the British empire was that it was to be composed of a galaxy of nations under the British crown."

Second, from the statute of Westminster to the independence of India and Pakistan, involving the beginnings of the "new" commonwealth with its republican members. Mr. Nehru, so sorely missed by all of us, said in 1950:

"We are members of the commonwealth—that rather strange and odd collection of nations which seems to prosper most in adversity—it does teach us many lessons, and in the sense that we get on best together when we meet in complete freedom and comradeship and we know that there is going to be no pressure or compulsion exercised upon us."

Third, from the independence of India to the establishment of Malaysia, the widening of the "new" commonwealth.

Fourth, there remains a period of adjustment in many places. In this last stage, the great decolonizing function of the commonwealth is being concluded. Its shape and boundaries have now been more or less defined. There only remains a time of mutation or consolidation.

Realizing what we have to work with, we must decide what we wish to do with it. Now is the moment of our greatest opportunity. To know what we should do, it is

worth considering what we are and where we are going.

In the last 17 years the commonwealth has grown from five independent countries to nearly 20. The 70 million people in this group of nations have increased to 700 million—a quarter of the world's population.

Many attempts have been made to define this association of countries. Mr. John Holmes, the head of our institute of international affairs, has spoken of it as:

"an association among countries of various races and continents which, in spite of wide differences of political practice and international orientation, share, as a result of a common historical experience, certain constitutional and legal attitudes, governmental and business practices and habits of working together. It is a matter of faith and will."

Many adjectives have been applied to the commonwealth. It has been called "shapeless, unorganized, unstructured, anomalous, illogical". Some of our more advanced theologians have even suggested that we accept the inevitable, dismantle the traditional apparatus, abolish the nomenclature, and suppress the ritual in the hope that the essential faith will survive in hibernation to re-emerge in its own time, transformed and revitalized. Others say that there is no chance of survival at all, that the commonwealth is fit for nothing but the reminiscences of aging statesmen. An anonymous writer, not very long ago, delivered himself of an utterance, rather less than statesman-like, when he said "The commonwealth has really become a gigantic farce."

Of course it is not only in Great Britain that some politicians would seek to blame the commonwealth connection for one or other or indeed all of their domestic ills. There will always be those who dream of solving their problems by denying their duties and historical or sentimental attachments, to seek the illusory freedom of total irresponsibility, predicated upon no principle higher than a policy of pure self interest. That is not our way. Because there is implicit in the concept of the commonwealth, values of duty and honour and service, no definition of it can be wholly satisfactory. It is much easier to say what it is not than to say what it is. It has been described as a club, but a club has certain set rules and obligations which the commonwealth does not possess, at least so far. It is not a power bloc. It is not a diplomatic unit. It is not an economic force. It is not even a group of like minded people or of like minded nations, and yet in a sense it can sometimes be those things, although it is none of them. It does confer certain economic advantages on its members. In fact, the commonwealth is often justified in some countries by the expectation of more favourable economic terms. It has also political advantages. Canada uses it as a counterbalance to the United States. Perhaps for this reason, Canadians may have been guilty of underestimating the economic factor and stressing the political. Certainly the commercial and financial advantages of membership have, for many years, been of rather less importance to Canada than to other members. The commonwealth has also certain military advantages. A number of recent incidents have shown the readiness of members to help one another, even in the absence of formal treaty commitments.

Besides these non-sentimental realities, we are also a network of personal relationships. A recently published handbook named 85 organizations and societies in Britain alone concerned with various aspects of commonwealth relations and the list is certainly far from exhaustive. These organizations, ranging from the commonwealth collection of micro-organisms, to the consultative space research committee, reach their apex at the prime ministerial level. Regular meetings and constant interchanges of information are as valuable as their results are immeasurable. After all, we have in this room today a vivid example of how the commonwealth can be put to work.

Such relationships and advantages are not in themselves the commonwealth. They are components but they give us only glimpses of the whole. It remains an almost completely informal association and this, in many ways, is perhaps its greatest merit. Lacking rigidity, it cannot be shattered by a blow in any one place. The commander in chief of Hitler's navy reported in September, 1940, "The British empire is not expected to collapse owing to the peculiar innate force of the political objectives embodied in the commonwealth of nations".

Through its development since the war, the commonwealth has shown striking adaptability. Indeed, to quote a recent comment, "... one of the most persistent of illusions is that it is essentially a conservative and stable institution. In fact, it is a supreme triumph in wild, zestful, fantastic innovation." Making a virtue of necessity in accordance with its genius, the commonwealth today glorifies its diversity and freedom from commitment. It possesses what has been called

"invertebrate informality". It finds its virtue not in unity of policy but in a search for understanding, for the sharing of views and constant consultation among its members.

It is often asked what is the value of these functions; has the commonwealth any future? It is important to remember that it does exist, and that it influences the international relationships of each of its members. Those who have experienced it believe in it, and their attitude must be recognized as partially a matter of faith. The fact that the mystique is difficult to define and unacceptable to some critics, does not mean that it can be discarded.

The United Kingdom's negotiations with the common market tore the last shred of illusion away from the commonwealth. It was a moment of truth when the full extent of the post-war revolution had to be recognized and accepted. Many are now realizing that what then seemed a death rattle was, in fact, a birth pang of a new stage in our development.

The shape of the commonwealth and the full contrast of its diverse interests, have been borne in upon us. Aware of our differences, and of the realities of our situation, we can see that we none the less form the only grouping of nations which bridges the many divisions of a much divided world. The rich and the poor, the east and the west, the tropical and temperate, the developing and the developed—all these are contained in our family grouping. We have on hand a supreme opportunity to help one another and to set an example for other countries in the mending of these differences that threaten our existence.

For the commonwealth to meet the challenge of mutual assistance, it must be recognized that each country has a responsibility in leadership. Although to do this we must abandon the idea of the commonwealth as an English institution, no one will ever forget the greatness of the British legacies. The railways, harbours and industries which Britain built are far less important than the institutions of government, above all the values which she brought to our peoples, and left with them. These have made the deepest impact. Today the greatest testimony to British genius can be seen in the civil service, the judiciary, the armed forces and even the playing fields, which stand for the finest in British traditions. It is a record that history is unlikely to ignore. It will be remembered with the contributions of Greece and Rome to world civilization. But the past must not be allowed to dominate the present. As Professor Silcock of the University of Malaya said not long ago:

"The commonwealth is no longer a wheel with only one centre of force and drive. If it is to survive at all, it will be as a lattice of increasing intercommunications and interaction. No monopoly of initiative and concern should be expected of the government, the people or the press of the 'mother country'."

To draw people together is, of course, the function of the United Nations and it has sometimes been said that its existence makes the commonwealth unnecessary. The answer is that the ties which hold the races and continents in contract are frail and tenuous enough; every reinforcement is worth while and among other contemporary international organizations with which it can and should be compared, the commonwealth has shown more internal consistency than any other. As Mr. Nehru pointed out at the time, India did not leave the commonwealth over the Suez incident because, in his view, it would have been a retrograde step to sever any link that exists between nations.

Though there may be impatience and trespasses upon civil liberties among member states, one can ask how much worse things might be without the commonwealth influence. In all our countries there is a substantial body of opinion—conscious of the sins we have committed in the name of effective government, of the mixed history of colonial rule, of racial intolerance—which insists that we must not expect all the traditions of Westminster in countries where unity is frail, illiteracy is high, and the economy a baffling puzzle. There should be patience and good intention in watching and helping others to solve the paradoxes that beset the final stages of colonialism in various corners of the world. If our multiracial fraternal society has any reason for existence, the most immediate is to resolve these problems.

Our way is to take a pragmatic route to the realization of higher ideals. We cannot all have the same constitutional mechanisms. But, equally, we must not expect too much of the commonwealth's now respectably established tradition of limitless elasticity. Though all nations must work out their own salvation, there are certain values—civil rights as much as racial equality—that we must preserve at all costs. Up to a point it may be claimed that variations on the democratic theme to suit local conditions are permissible. It may even be argued that, as regards patently deplorable manifestations, the wisest course is to maintain contact in order to exercise such restraining influence as is possible and to encourage the democratic forces that must ultimately prevail. But

certainly there is a line beyond which we cannot go in tolerating the membership of governments which deny the few but fundamental principles which have distinguished the commonwealth. These are values of individual liberty and human respect, and how fully we are committed to them is, I think, exemplified by the recent declaration of racial equality made at the prime ministers' meeting in London. Here we see the unique and constructive leadership which the commonwealth can exercise in securing the application under difficult circumstances of democratic principles.

Of course, allowances must be made. It has been said that "people who live differently, think differently". Countries in diverse stages of development cannot possibly subscribe to identical political ideas, still less to identical practices. There are those who wish to see established one all-encompassing institution, covering the commonwealth like an umbrella. There are others who feel that structural formality can only assuage, not cure, internal weakness and dissension. Certainly the idea that disunity among governments can be avoided simply by the creation of international councils is an illusion. At the same time, however, and provided we have a constructive attitude of mind, the innumerable contracts nurtured between our member states over many years, which I have mentioned—governmental, professional, cultural, economic, educational and so on—offer an excellent mechanism for a real contribution to the world order. At their recent meeting, the commonwealth prime ministers conceived of a secretariat that I have no doubt will greatly encourage this function. To quote the communiqué:

"This secretariat, being recruited from member countries and financed by their contributions, would be at the service of all commonwealth governments and would be a visible symbol of the spirit of co-operation which animates the commonwealth."

Better than talking about the commonwealth is the willingness to use it. Here we have a great conference which exists within the pattern of our relationships, a gathering which reflects a common purpose. No better practical link can be found than in the sphere of education. It was H. G. Wells who said "Human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe". If we accept as an initial proposition that, next to peace, the world's greatest need today is a general lift in the standards of living of the poorer nations, then I think it is obvious that broad educational advance should be our primary objective. Education must now be regarded as a human right. As such, it is an end in itself, without reference to costs and returns. Its chief purpose is to develop the human personality so that men may take advantage of their spiritual, intellectual and material gifts, to preserve and transmit a society's values and enable people to understand the world in which they live. Only an educational system based on such sound social purposes can develop human resources effectively. Without it, there can be no continuing economic growth, nor can political power be broadly distributed. Undoubtedly, education may cause social tensions since it creates new aspirations and new needs besides opening up fresh opportunities and widening horizons for individuals and nations. It can, however, be the force that also relieves tensions and creates understanding not only within a nation but on an international level as well.

Within the commonwealth, education has always been a common exchange. Even ten years ago more than 50,000 overseas students were receiving instruction in our various countries; the vast majority of them were from other members of our association of nations. Then, less than six years ago, I am happy to say, on Canadian initiative, the commonwealth trade and economic conference at Montreal decided to institute a scheme of scholarships and fellowships. Subsequently, at Oxford and later at New Delhi these plans for straight academic exchange were amplified to include the provision of teachers and teacher-trainers.

If I may inflict some figures upon you, beside the 250 scholars involved in the commonwealth scholarship program, there are some 800 students from the developing countries who are studying or training in Canada under Canadian aid programs and some 160 Canadian educators are serving abroad in commonwealth countries. Since 1950 more than 4,500 scholars and others from the developing countries have received training in Canadian institutions under various Canadian scholarship programs.

Whatever we may think about these programs, it must be admitted that much remains to be done. There are those who say that if we ordinary Canadians knew more about it, we would be inspired to greater efforts. It is true that as recently as 1962 our contributions to these programs of development amounted to only some $60 million per annum, less than 1 per cent of our federal

budget. But about a year ago all this underwent a profound change. It now seems probable that in the fiscal year 1964-1965 upward of $230 million will be available for commitment by Canada to grants, development loans and special credits. Perhaps, as some of our own informed people have said, our attitude is still one of "how much can we spare" instead of "how much can we share", but at least it must be admitted that we are today sparing more freely.

Mr. Lewis Perinbam, until recently secretary general of the Canadian national commission for UNESCO, has pointed out that at present the only centre for commonwealth studies on this continent is to be found at Duke University in North Carolina. He has suggested that, as we approach Canada's centenary, it would be fitting to establish for the use of all our members a Commonwealth study centre in Canada, fully equipped and staffed to perform functions perhaps too obvious to list, and which would be under the aegis of the federal and provincial governments. Perhaps the world's fair building in Montreal might be used to house this Commonwealth study centre.

Of course, Canada's experience is only one example of what is being done about education in the commonwealth. Every country is involved and countless people are now familiar with the problems—the urgent question of the supply of textbooks, for example. But for the newly developing countries the need is frequently for people rather than equipment or money—people with knowledge and experience. We are all in need of more teachers today. Here in Canada we are acutely conscious of this, but our problem is subtly different from that of the less developed countries. We are concerned about automation; about a new way of life which provides all man's wants with little labour and, it seems, at the touch of a button or under the guidance of a computer. Compare this situation with that of some other lands where the most primitive of methods, requiring much labour and a great amount of time, do not produce enough for one man, let alone his family. The problem abroad is to build from the bottom. We are told that in Asia eight million primary school teachers will have to be trained by 1980; this would require 500,000 more teacher-trainers. In Africa, over the same period, the need will amount to 700,000 additional primary school teachers, and, on the educational top level, about 80,000 more members of university staffs.

This third commonwealth education conference is concerned with the vast difficulties involved and the complicated solutions required. We are presented with a frontier giving us abundant opportunities for thought and action. The great heritage of ideas and knowledge which the commonwealth countries offer, can broaden the framework of our co-operation and enrich each member. Aid for education is not really aid at all; it is a form of partnership. Education is a true meeting ground for donor and receiver.

In a sense all nations are "developing" countries. To be economically retarded does not mean culturally backward. If many commonwealth countries are for the moment less advanced than others in economic terms, this cannot dull their great history, rich in cultural and social achievement. We all have something to learn from one another. This is very true of those of us whose origin is European. One recalls the words of Mr. Nehru at the opening of the second conference in 1962:

"European civilization has a magnificent record and yet many people immersed in [it] ...had in the past, not so now perhaps, no knowledge of the rest of the world and of the great things the rest of the world has done in the past. It is not a good thing for any cultured and civilized man not to know what has happened elsewhere..."

Through education, reason and observation can be brought to bear on the everyday problems of man's relations with the world and the people about him. Education opens the door of understanding, and besides showing the way to prosperity, lets in the light of peace. These, one need hardly say, are goals worthy of our greatest efforts.

Statement of acceptance of the Chairmanship at the third commonwealth education conference by Honourable Paul Gérin-Lajoie, Quebec minister of education, Friday August 21, 1964.

Mr. President, Mr. Prime Minister, Mr. Minister for External Affairs, distinguished representatives,

I am deeply impressed by the honour which you have bestowed upon me, in asking me to preside over your work. I do not believe that this honour is offered to me so much in my personal capacity; above all, I see in it a homage to Canada, which I have the honour of representing here with my colleagues from the Canadian delegation, to Quebec, my home province, of which I am

minister of education, and to all my fellow countrymen.

[*Translation*]

I wish to see a special meaning in the fact that you chose a minister from a French speaking government to preside over a conference bringing together countries with different languages and cultures, that is true, but where English constitutes a historic bond. Quebec actually forms within the Canadian confederation an homogeneous but different element. Almost a century ago, the two founding races of Canada decided by common agreement to enter into a pact which would enable them to live together while respecting one another's characteristics, language, social and political institutions, and safeguarding also their own interests and aspirations.

English Canada and French Canada are therefore made up, within one country, of both distinctive elements and essential, even integral parts, the union of which has permitted to create, develop and maintain Canada.

[*Text*]

Our distinguished president, Right Hon. Vincent Massey, is one of those Canadians who has best understood the profound reality and fundamental importance of Canadian dualism. As an eminent member of the English speaking community, who has to his credit both a highly distinguished public career and many literary accomplishments, he has acknowledged publicly and in numerous circumstances the essential contribution of his French speaking compatriots to the Canadian identity.

The selection by this conference of a chairman from Quebec also suggests to me a parallel between the commonwealth and Canada; for both today are in their own way primarily dedicated to fostering increased understanding and closer co-operation between partners, while respecting individual particularisms; indeed, it is from this very diversity that the commonwealth today derives its main strength and its purpose, and Canada, its unique personality and character.

I earnestly hope that our exchange of views and the sharing of our varied experiences will make possible a keener appreciation of our solidarity, and that our conference will facilitate an even more active participation of the commonwealth in those tasks for which it is particularly well suited. This accomplishment in turn, while strengthening the bonds which link our governments and peoples, cannot but contribute to greater co-operation and friendship within the whole community of nations.

Because of that sense of equality and of mutual respect inherent in the commonwealth, I know that I can rely on your fullest collaboration toward the success of this conference, particularly since we are all gathered here to seek answers suited to our multiple educational problems. In return, I assure you of my own keenest co-operation in the services of this third commonwealth education conference.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, August 24, 1964

The house met at 2 p.m.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

CALLS TO MONTREAL NEWSPAPERS BY FORESTRY MINISTER

Question No. 1,491—**Mr. Pigeon:**

Did the Minister of Forestry make any telephone calls to *La Presse* and/or *Le Devoir* in Montreal since June 4, 1964, and, if so (a) to whom were such calls made (b) what was the cost of such calls, and (c) to whom has each such call been billed?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): (a) The Minister of Forestry was in communication by telephone with Mr. Michel Roy of *Le Devoir* on July 5, 1964, as explained in *Hansard* of Friday, July 24, 1964, at page 5923, as follows:

Hon. Maurice Sauvé Minister of Forestry: On July 5 last, I was at the meeting of the Quebec Liberal federation in Quebec. In the afternoon I met some newspapermen with whom I discussed the problem of the strike at *La Presse* on a friendly basis and in view of my trade union background, from 1952 to 1955, when I took part in several collective bargaining agreements and in the settlement of many labour disputes. I therefore discussed with those newspapermen the problem of *La Presse*.

In the evening, between seven and nine o'clock, I tried to make a phone call, but all public phones in the Laurentide hotel were busy, so I went to the reporters room to make that call.

At that time a reporter from *Le Devoir* was giving a report of the activities of the convention to his information manager, Mr. Michel Roy.

Following the telephone call of that reporter, I asked to talk to Mr. Michel Roy...

(b) N/A.

(c) N/A.

[*Text*]

TENDERS FOR FISHERIES PATROL BOAT

Question No. 1,508—**Mr. MacEwan:**

1. What are the names of the tenderers and the amount of each tender of a 40-feet diesel driven patrol boat for the Department of Fisheries?

2. To whom will the contract be awarded?

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries):

1.

Yard	Engine	Tender price excl. s. tax
1. Alberton Industries Ltd.	(a) G.M. (U.S.), Model 5062-3200	$15,271.12
	(b) Volvo-Penta (Sweden), Model MD 96B	15,867.00
	(c) Perkins (G. Britain), Model 6-354	16,047.00
	(d) Caterpillar (U.S.), Model D 330	16,246.88
	(e) Caterpillar (U.S.), Model D 333	18,211.30
2. Stright-MacKay Ltd.	(a) G.M., Model V-6-53	18,426.00
	(b Volvo-Penta, Model MD 96B	18,628.33
	(c) Perkins, Model 6-354	18,655.93
	(d) Caterpillar, Model D 330	18,874.91
	(e) Dorman (G. Britain), Model 6LBT	20,399.83
3. Gerald L. Stevens	(a) Perkins, Model 6-354	22,350.00
	(b) Volvo-Penta, Model MD 96B	22,450.00
4. Benton Gray	(a) G.M., Model 5062-3200	27,034.12
	(b) Caterpillar D 330	27,128.00
	(c) Volvo-Penta	27,300.00
	(d) Perkins 6-354	27,530.00
5. St. Mary's Bay Industries Ltd.	G.M. or Caterpillar	40,150.00

Questions

2. The contract has been awarded to Alberton Industries Limited.

TENDERS FOR FISHERIES PATROL BOAT

Question No. 1,514—**Mr. MacEwan:**

1. What are the names of the tenderers and the amount of each tender for a 45-foot diesel driven patrol boat for the Department of Fisheries?

2. To whom will the contract be awarded?

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries):

1.

Yard	Engine	Tender price excl. s. tax
1. Stright-MacKay Ltd.	(a) Volvo-Penta (Sweden), Model TMD 96B1	$21,963.00
	(b) Caterpillar (U.S.), Model D 333	22,046.00
	(c) Dorman (G. Britain), Model 6LBT	22,341.00
	(d) G.M. (U.S.), Model 7062-7200	22,661.28
2. *Alberton Industries Ltd.	(a) G.M. 7062-7200	25,607.00
	(b) Volvo-Penta, TMD 96B1	25,846.00
	(c) Caterpillar D 333	26,619.67
	(d) Rolls Royce (G. Britain)	28,702.60
*(Amended prices were submitted after closing date but these have been disregarded)		
3. Pinaud's Yacht Yard Ltd.	(a) Volvo-Penta, TMD96B1	31,708.00
	(b) Caterpillar D 333	31,715.00
4. Benton Gray	(a) Caterpillar D 333	32,435.00
	(b) Volvo-Penta TMD 96B1	33,135.00
	(c) G.M. 7062-7200	33,390.28
	(d) Rolls Royce C6NFLM	36,273.00
5. St. Mary's Bay Industries Ltd.	G.M. or Caterpillar	44,350.00

2. The contract has been awarded to Stright-MacKay Ltd.

PREVAILING RATE EMPLOYEES, MINES AND TECHNICAL SURVEYS, OTTAWA

Question No. 1,531—**Mr. Fisher:**

1. How many prevailing rate employees are there with the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys, technical services branch in Ottawa?

2. What are their occupations?

3. What consideration has been given in the past four years to bringing these employees within the civil service?

4. Have the employees indicated any desire to become civil servants?

5. What are the difficulties which prevent such a change or transfer?

6. Is there any record of representations on this subject from any of the civil service associations?

Hon. W. M. Benidickson (Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys): 1. Sixty four positions, one of which was vacant on July 15, 1964.

2. Labourer, labour foreman, machinist, machinist foreman, toolmaker, sheet metal worker, welder and layout man, motor mechanic, electrician, carpenter, foreman carpenter, light equipment operator, handyman.

3. In response to representations received early this year, the department asked for advice on current treasury board policy regarding change of status of prevailing rate employees. The department was advised that there has been no change in the policy which was established in 1959, when it was decided by treasury board that exempt employees would not be brought under the Civil Service Act.

4. Representations to this end were made by a staff association which claimed to represent the wishes of 48 of these employees.

5. See answer to No. **3** re treasury board policy.

6. Yes. The department received representations on this subject in a letter dated January 30, 1964, from the civil service association of Canada.

DEFENCE PRODUCTION CONTRACTS TO FAIREY AVIATION

Question No. 1,599—**Mr. Coates:**

1. What was the dollar value of contracts awarded by the Department of Defence Production to Fairey Aviation for the fiscal years 1959-60, 1960-61, 1961-62, 1962-63 and 1963-64 and the estimated value of contracts for 1964-65?

2. What was the employment figure for the above years and the present employment at the plants located at Eastern Passage and Halifax international airport?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): 1. The dollar values of prime contracts awarded by the head office and district office

of the Department of Defence Production to Fairey Canada Limited are as follows: 1959-60, $8,050,641; 1960-61, $3,710,599; 1961-62, $3,963,526; 1962-63, $3,684,905; 1963-64, $2,097-793; 1964-65, (April-July 31) $2,848,935*.

* Information on the value of contracts placed in 1964/65 is available only to the end of July. An estimate of the value of contracts placed to the end of the current fiscal year cannot be made since it is the policy of the department to award contracts as the result of competitive tender, wherever possible.

These figures, while in direct reply to the question, do not reflect total plant work load attributable to Canadian defence expenditures since they do not include subcontracts received from other prime contractors of D.D.P. Nor do they necessarily reflect annual expenditures made by D.D.P. in Fairey due to the fact of overlap on contracts from one year to the next. Following is a table which more nearly reflects actual expenditures on prime contracts per fiscal year at Fairey: 1959-60, $3,751,000; 1960-61, $4,063,222; 1961-62, $2,096,627; 1962-63, $3,884,695; 1963-64, $3,266,685; 1964-65, (April-July 31), $968,300.

2. Total average annual employment figures for the combined staffs at Eastern Passage and Halifax international airport are as follows: 1959-60, 865; 1960-61, 915; 1961-62, 854; 1962-63, 803; 1963-64, 759; 1964-65, 738 (estimated).

SAKIMAY INDIAN RESERVE—VISIT BY R.C.M.P.

Question No. 1,612—**Mr. Orlikow:**

Did the R.C.M.P. visit the Sakimay Indian reserve on July 18, 1964 and, if so (a) for what purpose (b) did the R.C.M.P. have search warrants when they searched Indian tents and houses on the Sakimay Indian reserve (c) were dogs used at the Sakimay Indian reserve on July 18, 1964 (d) what was the purpose of taking dogs to that Indian reserve (e) were the police dogs kept on a leash while they performed their duties at the Sakimay Indian reserve?

Mr. D. S. Macdonald (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): So far as the Royal Canadian Mounted Police is concerned:

(a) Yes, to police a pow-wow on the reserve; to enforce the Indian Act and to keep peace.

(b) Members did not have search warrants. No houses or tents were searched, but several vehicles were searched and seizures of liquor made. Appropriate charges were laid under the Indian Act or Saskatchewan liquor act in these cases.

(c) Yes, dogs were there but were not used except as indicated in the answer to question (d).

(d) To protect the police cars and any exhibits stored in the police cars. During a similar event last year, police cars were damaged and some exhibits were stolen when the cars were unattended.

(e) The dogs were not performing any specific duties except as indicated in the answer to question (d). One dog was kept in the car at all times. One dog was let out for a few minutes and kept on a leash.

*RADIO STATION CKPM

Question No. 1,613—**Mr. Irvine:**

1. Who are the incorporators of the company that presently operates radio station CKPM?

2. What individuals were the applicants before the board of broadcast governors requesting a grant of licence for radio station CKPM?

3. On what basis, grounds and reasons did the board of broadcast governors grant such licence?

4. How many applications were made before the board of broadcast governors within a period of five years prior to the granting of CKPM of their licence for a similar licence in Ottawa, and who were the applicants therefor?

5. Who are the present shareholders (preferred and common) of the company that operates CKPM, what is their distribution of shares and are they Canadians?

6. If CKPM is operated by individuals rather than a corporation, who are they, what is their personal interest and are they limited partners?

7. What networks is CKPM affiliated with and what other individual radio stations is it affiliated with?

8. What is the capitalization of the company, or net worth of the partners of the partnership?

Mr. J. B. Stewart (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): 1. James A. Stewart, Mrs. Ailsa Stewart, William Gordon Burke-Robertson.

2. The application was made by James A. Stewart on behalf of a company to be incorporated.

3. The board of broadcast governors recommended the approval of the application by Mr. Stewart, indicating that in the opinion of the board the proposed new station would provide a desirable additional AM radio service to listeners in Ottawa.

4. Nine applications were referred to the board by the Department of Transport for an AM radio licence in Ottawa since July 1959, as follows: October 1959, by James A. Stewart; October 1960, by James A. Stewart; February 1962, by J. W. Pellie on behalf of a company to be incorporated; July 1962, by Roger Seguin on behalf of a company to be incorporated; August 1962, by Sudbury Broadcasting Co. Ltd. (French language); August 1962, by Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (French language); December 1962, by Radio Prestige Ltee (French Language); December 1962, by

James A. Stewart; July 1963, by James A. Stewart.

5. (a) The Department of Transport has always treated the lists of shareholders as confidential. (b) The shareholders are Canadians.

6. CKPM is operated by a corporation, Confederation Broadcasting (Ottawa) Limited.

7. None.

8. Authorized capital $100,000.

HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS EXPENDITURES, B.C.

Question No. 1,663—**Mr. Barnett:**

What, for each of the fiscal years commencing with 1920-21, are expenditures made for the seacoast of British Columbia by the Canadian hydrographic surveys?

Hon. W. M. Benidickson (Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys): 1963-1964, $939,795; 1962-63, $1,008,997; 1961-62, $946,497; 1960-61, $681,282; 1959-60, $619,000; 1958-59, $692,000; 1957-58; $479,000; 1956-57, $527,000; 1955-56, $380,000; 1954-55; $404,000; 1953-54, $428,000; 1952-53; $323,000; 1951-52, $188,000; 1950-51, $197,000.

Note: Expenditure records for the period prior to 1950-51 are not available.

IMMIGRANTS TO CANADA, 1901-1911

Question No. 1,670—**Mr. Choquette:**

1. How many immigrants entered Canada between 1901 and 1911?
2. What was their country of origin?
3. How many of those immigrants were English speaking and how many French speaking?

Questions

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): 1. See attached table.

2. See attached table.

3. Not available. See further explanation in response to part 3 of question No. 1,676.

Total immigration to Canada by ethnic origin—10 year periods 1901 to 1964 (June 30)

—	1901–1910	1911–1920	1921–1930	1931–1940	1941–1950	1951–1960	1961–1964 (June 30)
Albanian	—	9	156	37	119	238	138
Arabian	349	34	44	16	63	613	366
Armenian	1,444	409	1,191	55	96	1,534	2,197
Austrian (4)	19,857	10,119	246	—	—	17,426	2,101
Belgian	8,124	11,113	11,378	1,036	4,042	15,435	2,083
British	675,684	669,188	503,726	78,678	244,020	479,640	89,095
English	478,259	463,136	257,838	47,016	166,451	295,355	51,921
Irish	26,741	42,939	74,460	13,094	25,351	67,309	13,770
Scottish	133,617	140,745	146,856	17,085	47,328	106,724	21,139
Welsh	19,645	8,354	14,862	1,483	4,890	10,252	2,265
N.E.S.	17,422	14,014	9,710	—	—	—	—
Bulgarian	4,346	13,840	1,620	172	248	832	83
Chinese	10,699	28,878	4,364	4	2,654	21,931	4,694
Czech-Slovak	398	1,529	28,165	7,425	5,947	6,874	582
Danish	3,286	3,841	17,987	908	3,229	27,652	2,599
East Indian (3)	5,480	106	477	266	361	3,394	3,755
Egyptian (5)	49	21	13	—	—	104	444
Estonian	—	—	612	43	7,127	7,263	197
Finnish	12,621	9,651	29,610	758	1,228	16,386	1,301
French	15,835	12,197	5,055	13,482	14,780	41,045	10,346
German	19,958	18,213	72,980	12,163	21,468	249,300	24,938
Greek	3,914	5,301	3,835	848	3,399	39,377	16,110
Hungarian	9,876	4,611	29,959	4,177	4,978	47,313	3,066
Icelandic	2,659	988	297	82	116	396	31
Iranian	123	78	57	7	14	140	154
Italian	58,508	62,661	25,103	3,898	21,552	253,653	55,941
Japanese	13,441	7,242	4,099	989	42	1,102	542
Jewish	46,289	29,464	49,447	8,237	24,393	38,326	7,347
Latvian	—	—	373	47	8,183	7,018	306
Lebanese (2)	—	—	—	—	—	1,765	1,503
Lithuanian	—	—	5,553	443	8,951	3,696	294
Luxemburger (5)	—	32	128	—	—	368	53
Maltese	2	1,353	456	28	1,850	6,770	2,126
Mexican	—	26	2	11	28	207	89
Negro	444	1,205	772	461	1,253	5,675	6,074
Netherlander	4,789	6,071	11,637	2,536	32,899	126,298	7,776
Norwegian	13,200	7,736	20,212	1,491	2,535	9,856	1,528
Polish	73,094	35,409	47,719	4,720	37,175	42,624	8,352
Portuguese	54	101	1,024	51	345	22,361	14,237
Rumanian	4,771	4,590	5,611	518	1,482	2,902	568
Russian	37,492	60,390	14,680	1,083	3,775	6,059	675
Spanish	366	2,771	249	201	494	5,873	3,887
Swedish	18,484	10,283	21,245	1,382	1,714	6,276	1,301
Swiss	1,438	1,385	5,305	670	1,544	9,798	2,408
Syrian	4,741	1,169	1,381	294	403	1,369	331
Turkish	2,404	1,651	107	7	24	591	764
Ukrainian	4,866	55,743	58,553	8,198	22,831	14,257	647
Yugoslavian	11,733	6,142	20,348	3,025	5,755	30,123	8,380
Others	5,765	757	350	115	204	981	1,440
From the U.S.A. (1)	535,309	625,949	224,076	—	—	—	—
	1,631,892	1,712,256	1,230,202	158,562	491,321	1,574,841	290,749

(1) Breakdown by ethnic origin for United States immigration not available in 10 year periods prior to 1931.
(2) Prior to 1955, Lebanese included with Syrian.
(3) Ceylonese and Pakistani included with East Indian.
(4) From 1925 to 1952 Austrian included with German.
(5) Prior to 1955 Egyptian and Luxemburger included with others.

Questions

IMMIGRANTS TO CANADA, 1911-1921

Question No. 1,671—**Mr. Choquette:**

1. How many immigrants entered Canada between 1911 and 1921?
2. What was their country of origin?
3. How many of those immigrants were English speaking and how many French speaking?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): 1. See attached table.

2. See attached table.

3. Not available. See further explanation in response to part 3 of question No. 1,676.

Total immigration to Canada by ethnic origin—10 year periods 1901 to 1964 (June 30)

——	1901-1910	1911-1920	1921-1930	1931-1940	1941-1950	1951-1960	1961-1964 (June 30)
Albanian	—	9	156	37	119	238	138
Arabian	349	34	44	16	63	613	366
Armenian	1,444	409	1,191	55	96	1,534	2,197
Austrian (4)	19,857	10,119	246	—	—	17,426	2,101
Belgian	8,124	11,113	11,378	1,036	4,042	15,435	2,083
British	675,684	669,188	503,726	78,678	244,020	479,640	89,095
English	478,259	463,136	257,838	47,016	166,451	295,355	51,921
Irish	26,741	42,939	74,460	13,094	25,351	67,309	13,770
Scottish	133,617	140,745	146,856	17,085	47,328	106,724	21,139
Welsh	19,645	8,354	14,862	1,483	4,890	10,252	2,265
N.E.S.	17,422	14,014	9,710	—	—	—	—
Bulgarian	4,346	13,840	1,620	172	248	832	83
Chinese	10,699	28,878	4,364	4	2,654	21,931	4,694
Czech-Slovak	398	1,529	28,165	7,425	5,947	6,874	582
Danish	3,286	3,841	17,987	908	3,229	27,652	2,599
East Indian (3)	5,480	106	477	266	361	3,394	3,755
Egyptian (5)	49	21	13	—	—	104	444
Estonian	—	—	612	43	7,127	7,263	197
Finnish	12,621	9,651	29,610	758	1,228	16,386	1,301
French	15,835	12,197	5,055	13,482	14,780	41,045	10,346
German	19,958	18,213	72,980	12,163	21,468	249,300	24,938
Greek	3,914	5,301	3,835	848	3,399	39,377	16,110
Hungarian	9,876	4,611	29,959	4,177	4,978	47,313	3,066
Icelandic	2,659	988	297	82	116	396	31
Iranian	123	78	57	7	14	140	154
Italian	58,508	62,661	25,103	3,898	21,552	253,653	55,941
Japanese	13,441	7,242	4,099	989	42	1,102	542
Jewish	46,289	29,464	49,447	8,237	24,393	38,326	7,347
Latvian	—	—	373	47	8,183	7,018	306
Lebanese (2)	—	—	—	—	—	1,765	1,503
Lithuanian	—	—	5,553	443	8,951	3,696	294
Luxemburger (5)	—	32	128	—	—	368	53
Maltese	2	1,353	456	28	1,850	6,770	2,126
Mexican	—	26	2	11	28	207	89
Negro	444	1,205	772	461	1,253	5,675	6,074
Netherlander	4,789	6,071	11,637	2,536	32,899	126,298	7,776
Norwegian	13,200	7,736	20,212	1,491	2,535	9,856	1,528
Polish	73,094	35,409	47,719	4,720	37,175	42,624	8,352
Portuguese	54	101	1,024	51	345	22,361	14,237
Rumanian	4,771	4,590	5,611	518	1,482	2,902	568
Russian	37,492	60,390	14,680	1,083	3,775	6,059	675
Spanish	366	2,771	249	201	494	5,873	3,887
Swedish	18,484	10,283	21,245	1,382	1,714	6,276	1,301
Swiss	1,438	1,385	5,305	670	1,544	9,798	2,408
Syrian	4,741	1,169	1,381	294	403	1,369	331
Turkish	2,404	1,651	107	7	24	591	764
Ukrainian	4,866	55,743	58,553	8,198	22,831	14,257	647
Yugoslavian	11,733	6,142	20,348	3,025	5,755	30,123	8,380
Others	5,765	757	350	115	204	981	1,440
From the U.S.A. (1)	535,309	625,949	224,076	—	—	—	—
	1,631,892	1,712,256	1,230,202	158,562	491,321	1,574,841	290,749

(1) Breakdown by ethnic origin for United States immigration not available in 10 year periods prior to 1931.
(2) Prior to 1955, Lebanese included with Syrian.
(3) Ceylonese and Pakistani included with East Indian.
(4) From 1925 to 1952 Austrian included with German.
(5) Prior to 1955 Egyptian and Luxemburger included with others.

[Mr. Badanai.]

IMMIGRANTS TO CANADA, 1921-1931

Question No. 1,672—**Mr. Choquette:**

1. How many immigrants entered Canada between 1921 and 1931?
2. What was their country of origin?
3. How many of those immigrants were English speaking and how many French speaking?

Questions

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): 1. See attached table.

2. See attached table.

3. Not available. See further explanation in response to part 3 of question No. 1,676.

Total immigration to Canada by ethnic origin—10 year periods 1901 to 1964 (June 30)

——	1901–1910	1911–1920	1921–1930	1931–1940	1941–1950	1951–1960	1961–1964 (June 30)
Albanian	—	9	156	37	119	238	138
Arabian	349	34	44	16	63	613	366
Armenian	1,444	409	1,191	55	96	1,534	2,197
Austrian (4)	19,857	10,119	246	—	—	17,426	2,101
Belgian	8,124	11,113	11,378	1,036	4,042	15,435	2,083
British	675,684	669,188	503,726	78,678	244,020	479,640	89,095
English	478,259	463,136	257,838	47,016	166,451	295,355	51,921
Irish	26,741	42,939	74,460	13,094	25,351	67,309	13,770
Scottish	133,617	140,745	146,856	17,085	47,328	106,724	21,139
Welsh	19,645	8,354	14,862	1,483	4,890	10,252	2,265
N.E.S.	17,422	14,014	9,710	—	—	—	—
Bulgarian	4,346	13,840	1,620	172	248	832	83
Chinese	10,699	28,878	4,364	4	2,654	21,931	4,694
Czech-Slovak	398	1,529	28,165	7,425	5,947	6,874	582
Danish	3,286	3,841	17,987	908	3,229	27,652	2,599
East Indian (3)	5,480	106	477	266	361	3,394	3,755
Egyptian (5)	49	21	13	—	—	104	444
Estonian	—	—	612	43	7,127	7,263	197
Finnish	12,621	9,651	29,610	758	1,228	16,386	1,301
French	15,835	12,197	5,055	13,482	14,780	41,045	10,346
German	19,958	18,213	72,980	12,163	21,468	249,300	24,938
Greek	3,914	5,301	3,835	848	3,399	39,377	16,110
Hungarian	9,876	4,611	29,959	4,177	4,978	47,313	3,066
Icelandic	2,659	988	297	82	116	396	31
Iranian	123	78	57	7	14	140	154
Italian	58,508	62,661	25,103	3,898	21,552	253,653	55,941
Japanese	13,441	7,242	4,099	989	42	1,102	542
Jewish	46,289	29,464	49,447	8,237	24,393	38,326	7,347
Latvian	—	—	373	47	8,183	7,018	306
Lebanese (2)	—	—	—	—	—	1,765	1,503
Lithuanian	—	—	5,553	443	8,951	3,696	294
Luxemburger (5)	—	32	128	—	—	368	53
Maltese	2	1,353	456	28	1,850	6,770	2,126
Mexican	—	26	2	11	28	207	89
Negro	444	1,205	772	461	1,253	5,675	6,074
Netherlander	4,789	6,071	11,637	2,536	32,899	126,298	7,776
Norwegian	13,200	7,736	20,212	1,491	2,535	9,856	1,528
Polish	73,094	35,409	47,719	4,720	37,175	42,624	8,352
Portuguese	54	101	1,024	51	345	22,361	14,237
Rumanian	4,771	4,590	5,611	518	1,482	2,902	568
Russian	37,492	60,390	14,680	1,083	3,775	6,059	675
Spanish	366	2,771	249	201	494	5,873	3,887
Swedish	18,484	10,283	21,245	1,382	1,714	6,276	1,301
Swiss	1,438	1,385	5,305	670	1,544	9,798	2,408
Syrian	4,741	1,169	1,381	294	403	1,369	331
Turkish	2,404	1,651	107	7	24	591	764
Ukrainian	4,866	55,743	58,553	8,198	22,831	14,257	647
Yugoslavian	11,733	6,142	20,348	3,025	5,755	30,123	8,380
Others	5,765	757	350	115	204	981	1,440
From the U.S.A. (1)	535,309	625,949	224,076	—	—	—	—
	1,631,892	1,712,256	1,230,202	158,562	491,321	1,574,841	290,749

(1) Breakdown by ethnic origin for United States immigration not available in 10 year periods prior to 1931.
(2) Prior to 1955, Lebanese included with Syrian.
(3) Ceylonese and Pakistani included with East Indian.
(4) From 1925 to 1952 Austrian included with German.
(5) Prior to 1955 Egyptian and Luxemburger included with others.

Questions

IMMIGRATION TO CANADA, 1931-1941

Question No. 1,673—**Mr. Choquette:**

1. How many immigrants entered Canada between 1931 and 1941?
2. What was their country of origin?
3. How many of those immigrants were English speaking and how many French speaking?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): 1. See atttached table.

2. See attached table.

3. Not available. See further explanation in response to part 3 of question No. 1,676.

Total immigration to Canada by ethnic origin—10 year periods 1901 to 1964 (June 30)

——	1901-1910	1911-1920	1921-1930	1931-1940	1941-1950	1951-1960	1961-1964 (June 30)
Albanian	—	9	156	37	119	238	138
Arabian	349	34	44	16	63	613	366
Armenian	1,444	409	1,191	55	96	1,534	2,197
Austrian (4)	19,857	10,119	246	—	—	17,426	2,101
Belgian	8,124	11,113	11,378	1,036	4,042	15,435	2,083
British	675,684	669,188	503,726	78,678	244,020	479,640	89,095
English	478,259	463,136	257,838	47,016	166,451	295,355	51,921
Irish	26,741	42,939	74,460	13,094	25,351	67,309	13,770
Scottish	133,617	140,745	146,856	17,085	47,328	106,724	21,139
Welsh	19,645	8,354	14,862	1,483	4,890	10,252	2,265
N.E.S.	17,422	14,014	9,710	—	—	—	—
Bulgarian	4,346	13,840	1,620	172	248	832	83
Chinese	10,699	28,878	4,364	4	2,654	21,931	4,694
Czech-Slovak	398	1,529	28,165	7,425	5,947	6,874	582
Danish	3,286	3,841	17,987	908	3,229	27,652	2,599
East Indian (3)	5,480	106	477	266	361	3,394	3,755
Egyptian (5)	49	21	13	—	—	104	444
Estonian	—	—	612	43	7,127	7,263	197
Finnish	12,621	9,651	29,610	758	1,228	16,386	1,301
French	15,835	12,197	5,055	13,482	14,780	41,045	10,346
German	19,958	18,213	72,980	12,163	21,468	249,300	24,938
Greek	3,914	5,301	3,835	848	3,399	39,377	16,110
Hungarian	9,876	4,611	29,959	4,177	4,978	47,313	3,066
Icelandic	2,659	988	297	82	116	396	31
Iranian	123	78	57	7	14	140	154
Italian	58,508	62,661	25,103	3,898	21,552	253,653	55,941
Japanese	13,441	7,242	4,099	989	42	1,102	542
Jewish	46,289	29,464	49,447	8,237	24,393	38,326	7,347
Latvian	—	—	373	47	8,183	7,018	306
Lebanese (2)	—	—	—	—	—	1,765	1,503
Lithuanian	—	—	5,553	443	8,951	3,696	294
Luxemburger (5)	—	32	128	—	—	368	53
Maltese	2	1,353	456	28	1,850	6,770	2,126
Mexican	—	26	2	11	28	207	89
Negro	444	1,205	772	461	1,253	5,675	6,074
Netherlander	4,789	6,071	11,637	2,536	32,899	126,298	7,776
Norwegian	13,200	7,736	20,212	1,491	2,535	9,856	1,528
Polish	73,094	35,409	47,719	4,720	37,175	42,624	8,352
Portuguese	54	101	1,024	51	345	22,361	14,237
Rumanian	4,771	4,590	5,611	518	1,482	2,902	568
Russian	37,492	60,390	14,680	1,083	3,775	6,059	675
Spanish	366	2,771	249	201	494	5,873	3,887
Swedish	18,484	10,283	21,245	1,382	1,714	6,276	1,301
Swiss	1,438	1,385	5,305	670	1,544	9,798	2,408
Syrian	4,741	1,169	1,381	294	403	1,369	331
Turkish	2,404	1,651	107	7	24	591	764
Ukrainian	4,866	55,743	58,553	8,198	22,831	14,257	647
Yugoslavian	11,733	6,142	20,348	3,025	5,755	30,123	8,380
Others	5,765	757	350	115	204	981	1,440
From the U.S.A. (1)	535,309	625,949	224,076	—	—	—	—
	1,631,892	1,712,256	1,230,202	158,562	491,321	1,574,841	290,749

(1) Breakdown by ethnic origin for United States immigration not available in 10 year periods prior to 1931.
(2) Prior to 1955, Lebanese included with Syrian.
(3) Ceylonese and Pakistani included with East Indian.
(4) From 1925 to 1952 Austrian included with German.
(5) Prior to 1955 Egyptian and Luxemburger included with others.

[Mr. Badanai.]

Questions

IMMIGRANTS TO CANADA, 1941-1951

Question No. 1,674—**Mr. Choquette:**

1. How many immigrants entered Canada between 1941 and 1951?
2. What was their country of origin?
3. How many of those immigrants were English speaking and how many French speaking?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): 1. See attached table.

2. See attached table.

3. Not available. See further explanation in response to part 3 of question No. 1,676.

Total immigration to Canada by ethnic origin—10 year periods 1901 to 1964 (June 30)

——	1901–1910	1911–1920	1921–1930	1931–1940	1941–1950	1951–1960	1961–1964 (June 30)
Albanian	—	9	156	37	119	238	138
Arabian	349	34	44	16	63	613	366
Armenian	1,444	409	1,191	55	96	1,534	2,197
Austrian (4)	19,857	10,119	246	—	—	17,426	2,101
Belgian	8,124	11,113	11,378	1,036	4,042	15,435	2,083
British	675,684	669,188	503,726	78,678	244,020	479,640	89,095
English	478,259	463,136	257,838	47,016	166,451	295,355	51,921
Irish	26,741	42,939	74,460	13,094	25,351	67,309	13,770
Scottish	133,617	140,745	146,856	17,085	47,328	106,724	21,139
Welsh	19,645	8,354	14,862	1,483	4,890	10,252	2,265
N.E.S.	17,422	14,014	9,710	—	—	—	—
Bulgarian	4,346	13,840	1,620	172	248	832	83
Chinese	10,699	28,878	4,364	4	2,654	21,931	4,694
Czech-Slovak	398	1,529	28,165	7,425	5,947	6,874	582
Danish	3,286	3,841	17,987	908	3,229	27,652	2,599
East Indian (3)	5,480	106	477	266	361	3,394	3,755
Egyptian (5)	49	21	13	—	—	104	444
Estonian	—	—	612	43	7,127	7,263	197
Finnish	12,621	9,651	29,610	758	1,228	16,386	1,301
French	15,835	12,197	5,055	13,482	14,780	41,045	10,346
German	19,958	18,213	72,980	12,163	21,468	249,300	24,938
Greek	3,914	5,301	3,835	848	3,399	39,377	16,110
Hungarian	9,876	4,611	29,959	4,177	4,978	47,313	3,066
Icelandic	2,659	988	297	82	116	396	31
Iranian	123	78	57	7	14	140	154
Italian	58,508	62,661	25,103	3,898	21,552	253,653	55,941
Japanese	13,441	7,242	4,099	989	42	1,102	542
Jewish	46,289	29,464	49,447	8,237	24,393	38,326	7,347
Latvian	—	—	373	47	8,183	7,018	306
Lebanese (2)	—	—	—	—	—	1,765	1,503
Lithuanian	—	—	5,553	443	8,951	3,696	294
Luxemburger (5)	—	32	128	—	—	368	53
Maltese	2	1,353	456	28	1,850	6,770	2,126
Mexican	—	26	2	11	28	207	89
Negro	444	1,205	772	461	1,253	5,675	6,074
Netherlander	4,789	6,071	11,637	2,536	32,899	126,298	7,776
Norwegian	13,200	7,736	20,212	1,491	2,535	9,856	1,528
Polish	73,094	35,409	47,719	4,720	37,175	42,624	8,352
Portuguese	54	101	1,024	51	345	22,361	14,237
Rumanian	4,771	4,590	5,611	518	1,482	2,902	568
Russian	37,492	60,390	14,680	1,083	3,775	6,059	675
Spanish	366	2,771	249	201	494	5,873	3,887
Swedish	18,484	10,283	21,245	1,382	1,714	6,276	1,301
Swiss	1,438	1,385	5,305	670	1,544	9,798	2,408
Syrian	4,741	1,169	1,381	294	403	1,369	331
Turkish	2,404	1,651	107	7	24	591	764
Ukrainian	4,866	55,743	58,553	8,198	22,831	14,257	647
Yugoslavian	11,733	6,142	20,348	3,025	5,755	30,123	8,380
Others	5,765	757	350	115	204	981	1,440
From the U.S.A. (1)	535,309	625,949	224,076	—	—	—	—
	1,631,892	1,712,256	1,230,202	158,562	491,321	1,574,841	290,749

(1) Breakdown by ethnic origin for United States immigration not available in 10 year periods prior to 1931.
(2) Prior to 1955, Lebanese included with Syrian.
(3) Ceylonese and Pakistani included with East Indian.
(4) From 1925 to 1952 Austrian included with German.
(5) Prior to 1955 Egyptian and Luxemburger included with others.

Questions

IMMIGRANTS TO CANADA, 1951-1961

Question No. 1,675—**Mr. Choquette:**

1. How many immigrants entered Canada between 1951 and 1961?
2. What was their country of origin?
3. How many of those immigrants were English speaking and how many French speaking?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): 1. See attached table.

2. See attached table.

3. Not available. See further explanation in response to part 3 of question No. 1,676.

Total immigration to Canada by ethnic origin—10 year periods 1901 to 1964 (June 30)

——	1901–1910	1911–1920	1921–1930	1931–1940	1941–1950	1951–1960	1961–1964 (June 30)
Albanian	—	9	156	37	119	238	138
Arabian	349	34	44	16	63	613	366
Armenian	1,444	409	1,191	55	96	1,534	2,197
Austrian [4]	19,857	10,119	246	—	—	17,426	2,101
Belgian	8,124	11,113	11,378	1,036	4,042	15,435	2,083
British	675,684	669,188	503,726	78,678	244,020	479,640	89,095
English	478,259	463,136	257,838	47,016	166,451	295,355	51,921
Irish	26,741	42,939	74,460	13,094	25,351	67,309	13,770
Scottish	133,617	140,745	146,856	17,085	47,328	106,724	21,139
Welsh	19,645	8,354	14,862	1,483	4,890	10,252	2,265
N.E.S.	17,422	14,014	9,710	—	—	—	—
Bulgarian	4,346	13,840	1,620	172	248	832	83
Chinese	10,699	28,878	4,364	4	2,654	21,931	4,694
Czech-Slovak	398	1,529	28,165	7,425	5,947	6,874	582
Danish	3,286	3,841	17,987	908	3,229	27,652	2,599
East Indian [3]	5,480	106	477	266	361	3,394	3,755
Egyptian [5]	49	21	13	—	—	104	444
Estonian	—	—	612	43	7,127	7,263	197
Finnish	12,621	9,651	29,610	758	1,228	16,386	1,301
French	15,835	12,197	5,055	13,482	14,780	41,045	10,346
German	19,958	18,213	72,980	12,163	21,468	249,300	24,938
Greek	3,914	5,301	3,835	848	3,399	39,377	16,110
Hungarian	9,876	4,611	29,959	4,177	4,978	47,313	3,066
Icelandic	2,659	988	297	82	116	396	31
Iranian	123	78	57	7	14	140	154
Italian	58,508	62,661	25,103	3,898	21,552	253,653	55,941
Japanese	13,441	7,242	4,099	989	42	1,102	542
Jewish	46,289	29,464	49,447	8,237	24,393	38,326	7,347
Latvian	—	—	373	47	8,183	7,018	306
Lebanese [2]	—	—	—	—	—	1,765	1,503
Lithuanian	—	—	5,553	443	8,951	3,696	294
Luxemburger [5]	—	32	128	—	—	368	53
Maltese	2	1,353	456	28	1,850	6,770	2,126
Mexican	—	26	2	11	28	207	89
Negro	444	1,205	772	461	1,253	5,675	6,074
Netherlander	4,789	6,071	11,637	2,536	32,899	126,298	7,776
Norwegian	13,200	7,736	20,212	1,491	2,535	9,856	1,528
Polish	73,094	35,409	47,719	4,720	37,175	42,624	8,352
Portuguese	54	101	1,024	51	345	22,361	14,237
Rumanian	4,771	4,590	5,611	518	1,482	2,902	568
Russian	37,492	60,390	14,680	1,083	3,775	6,059	675
Spanish	366	2,771	249	201	494	5,873	3,887
Swedish	18,484	10,283	21,245	1,382	1,714	6,276	1,301
Swiss	1,438	1,385	5,305	670	1,544	9,798	2,408
Syrian	4,741	1,169	1,381	294	403	1,369	331
Turkish	2,404	1,651	107	7	24	591	764
Ukrainian	4,866	55,743	58,553	8,198	22,831	14,257	647
Yugoslavian	11,733	6,142	20,348	3,025	5,755	30,123	8,380
Others	5,765	757	350	115	204	981	1,440
From the U.S.A. [1]	535,309	625,949	224,076	—	—	—	—
	1,631,892	1,712,256	1,230,202	158,562	491,321	1,574,841	290,749

[1] Breakdown by ethnic origin for United States immigration not available in 10 year periods prior to 1931.
[2] Prior to 1955, Lebanese included with Syrian.
[3] Ceylonese and Pakistani included with East Indian.
[4] From 1925 to 1952 Austrian included with German.
[5] Prior to 1955 Egyptian and Luxemburger included with others.

[Mr. Badanai.]

IMMIGRANTS TO CANADA, 1961-1964

Question No. 1,676—**Mr. Choquette:**

1. How many immigrants entered Canada between 1961 and 1964?

2. What was their country of origin?

3. How many of those immigrants were English speaking and how many French speaking?

Questions

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): 1. See attached table.

2. See attached table.

3. All prospective immigrants to Canada, especially those who will be seeking employment upon arrival, have always been closely

Total immigration to Canada by ethnic origin—10 year periods 1901 to 1964 (June 30)

——	1901–1910	1911–1920	1921–1930	1931–1940	1941–1950	1951–1960	1961–1964 (June 30)
Albanian	—	9	156	37	119	238	138
Arabian	349	34	44	16	63	613	366
Armenian	1,444	409	1,191	55	96	1,534	2,197
Austrian [4]	19,857	10,119	246	—	—	17,426	2,101
Belgian	8,124	11,113	11,378	1,036	4,042	15,435	2,083
British	675,684	669,188	503,726	78,678	244,020	479,640	89,095
English	478,259	463,136	257,838	47,016	166,451	295,355	51,921
Irish	26,741	42,939	74,460	13,094	25,351	67,309	13,770
Scottish	133,617	140,745	146,856	17,085	47,328	106,724	21,139
Welsh	19,645	8,354	14,862	1,483	4,890	10,252	2,265
N.E.S.	17,422	14,014	9,710	—	—	—	—
Bulgarian	4,346	13,840	1,620	172	248	832	83
Chinese	10,699	28,878	4,364	4	2,654	21,931	4,694
Czech-Slovak	398	1,529	28,165	7,425	5,947	6,874	582
Danish	3,286	3,841	17,987	908	3,229	27,652	2,599
East Indian [3]	5,480	106	477	266	361	3,394	3,755
Egyptian [5]	49	21	13	—	—	104	444
Estonian	—	—	612	43	7,127	7,263	197
Finnish	12,621	9,651	29,610	758	1,228	16,386	1,301
French	15,835	12,197	5,055	13,482	14,780	41,045	10,346
German	19,958	18,213	72,980	12,163	21,468	249,300	24,938
Greek	3,914	5,301	3,835	848	3,399	39,377	16,110
Hungarian	9,876	4,611	29,959	4,177	4,978	47,313	3,066
Icelandic	2,659	988	297	82	116	396	31
Iranian	123	78	57	7	14	140	154
Italian	58,508	62,661	25,103	3,898	21,552	253,653	55,941
Japanese	13,441	7,242	4,099	989	42	1,102	542
Jewish	46,289	29,464	49,447	8,237	24,393	38,326	7,347
Latvian	—	—	373	47	8,183	7,018	306
Lebanese [2]	—	—	—	—	—	1,765	1,503
Lithuanian	—	—	5,553	443	8,951	3,696	294
Luxemburger [5]	—	32	128	—	—	368	53
Maltese	2	1,353	456	28	1,850	6,770	2,126
Mexican	—	26	2	11	28	207	89
Negro	444	1,205	772	461	1,253	5,675	6,074
Netherlander	4,789	6,071	11,637	2,536	32,899	126,298	7,776
Norwegian	13,200	7,736	20,212	1,491	2,535	9,856	1,528
Polish	73,094	35,409	47,719	4,720	37,175	42,624	8,352
Portuguese	54	101	1,024	51	345	22,361	14,237
Rumanian	4,771	4,590	5,611	518	1,482	2,902	568
Russian	37,492	60,390	14,680	1,083	3,775	6,059	675
Spanish	366	2,771	249	201	494	5,873	3,887
Swedish	18,484	10,283	21,245	1,382	1,714	6,276	1,301
Swiss	1,438	1,385	5,305	670	1,544	9,798	2,408
Syrian	4,741	1,169	1,381	294	403	1,369	331
Turkish	2,404	1,651	107	7	24	591	764
Ukrainian	4,866	55,743	58,553	8,198	22,831	14,257	647
Yugoslavian	11,733	6,142	20,348	3,025	5,755	30,123	8,380
Others	5,765	757	350	115	204	981	1,440
From the U.S.A. [1]	535,309	625,949	224,076	—	—	—	—
	1,631,892	1,712,256	1,230,202	158,562	491,321	1,574,841	290,749

[1] Breakdown by ethnic origin for United States immigration not available in 10 year periods prior to 1931.
[2] Prior to 1955, Lebanese included with Syrian.
[3] Ceylonese and Pakistani included with East Indian.
[4] From 1925 to 1952 Austrian included with German.
[5] Prior to 1955 Egyptian and Luxemburger included with others.

examined at the time of their application as to their ability to speak either or both of Canada's two official languages. However, it was not until January of this year that information respecting language ability was recorded in such a way as to enable tabulations to be produced in this respect. Of the 51,323 immigrant arrivals during the first six months of 1964, 22,975 were able to speak English while 4,317 were able to speak French. A further 1,053 had some knowledge of either English or French but it was not considered sufficient to permit their carrying on a conversation.

CIVIL SERVICE COMPETITION 64-263

Question No. 1,683—**Mr. Aiken:**

1. With reference to competition No. 64-263 of the civil service commission for planning and research officers, Department of Public Works, for which positions is the knowledge of both the English and the French languages required?

2. What positions are presently available to be filled from this competition?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): 1. There are three positions to be filled at the present time. It is essential that at least one be filled by an officer with a knowledge of both the English and French languages.

2. Three planning and research officer positions.

PUBLIC WORKS TUG "CANSO"

Question No. 1,692—**Mr. Coates:**

1. Is it the intention of the government to remove from service the Department of Public Works tug *Canso* and, if so (a) will a replacement be provided for the *Canso* (b) if no replacement is planned for the *Canso* what does the government intend to do about the crew of the tug?

2. Were tenders called for the replacement of this tug prior to April 22, 1963, and did the present administration cancel this tender call?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): 1. Yes, at the conclusion of the 1964 dredging season. (a) No replacement is planned. (b) The crew will be laid off at the end of this season and will be considered for alternate employment elsewhere in the public service according to their qualifications, experience and length of service.

2. No.

FISHWAY CONSTRUCTION, QUEENS COUNTY, N.B.

Question No. 1,716—**Mr. Fairweather:**

1. What is the total cost of the fishway built on the Salmon river, Queens county, New Brunswick, in 1963?

2. How many men were employed on construction of the fishway and how long did it take to build?

3. What is the result of the latest count of salmon using this fishway?

[Mr. Badanai.]

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): 1. An adult salmon counting fence was built on the Salmon river, Queens county, New Brunswick, in 1963. Total cost $15,813.70.

2. Construction was by contract and consequently information re number of men employed not available.

3. To date no salmon have passed through this counting fence. It is a late run river and it is not anticipated fish will enter until the fall of the year.

GRAIN UNLOADING FACILITIES, SAINT JOHN, N.B.

Question No. 1,723—**Mr. Fairweather:**

Are there facilities at the port of Saint John, New Brunswick, to discharge a cargo of grain as well as load such a cargo and, if not, what plans has the national harbours board prepared to add this necessary facility and by what date?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): There are no facilities for the discharge of waterborne grain cargoes at Saint John harbour, and the national harbours board would not feel justified in recommending the installation of such facilities without evidence that they would be used to the extent necessary to warrant the expenditure.

TRANS-CANADA HIGHWAY WIDENING, CALGARY, ALTA.

Question No. 1,724—**Mr. Woolliams:**

1. With reference to the widening of the trans-Canada highway through 16th avenue north Calgary, what financial share, if any, is the federal government contributing to this necessary improvement?

2. Under the agreements with the provinces, does the federal authority make contributions to the improvement and widening of the trans-Canada highway, irrespective of what route it follows?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): 1. No requests have been received for participation by the federal government in the widening of the trans-Canada highway through 16th avenue north Calgary.

2. No. Canada will only share in construction costs on the route designated in the trans-Canada highway agreements. The shareable portion of construction costs is limited to that required to construct a two lane highway to a specified standard as provided for in the trans-Canada highway agreements.

INTEREST ON NATIONAL DEBT

Question No. 1,738—**Mr. Laprise:**

What amount has been paid in interest on the national debt since confederation?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Total interest payments on the national debt of Canada since confederation is estimated at $15,202,067,544.

[*Text*]

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

ACQUISITION OF LAND, BUFFALO POUND LAKE, SASK.

Question No. 1,434—**Mr. Herridge:**

1. What was the policy adopted with respect to the purchase or expropriation of land surrounding Buffalo Pound lake in connection with the building of the Saskatchewan dam?
2. What were the number of parcels of land purchased or expropriated?
3. What was the acreage, assessed value, and amount paid for each parcel purchased or expropriated?

Return tabled.

TRADE

DIVERSION OF CANADIAN WHEAT AND FLOUR BY RUSSIA TO CUBA

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Prime Minister because the matter covers more than one department. It has to do with an article in the London Sunday *Times* of yesterday's date regarding the diversion by the U.S.S.R. of wheat sold under the contract between the U.S.S.R. and the Canadian wheat board. Is it a fact that some 250,000 tons of wheat and flour under the 1963 contract with the U.S.S.R. were diverted by the purchaser, the U.S.S.R., to Cuba; and was this action agreed to by the Canadian government? Naturally I should like to know too whether the wheat board asked for the views of the Canadian government before consenting to this diversion.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I did notice the report to which my right hon. friend has referred, and I am going to ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce to deal with the matter.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, as hon. members may recall from my disclosure to the house last year of the terms of the agreement between the U.S.S.R., the Canadian government and the Canadian wheat board, there were in effect two agreements, one of them under which the U.S.S.R. purchased certain quantities of wheat and flour on which credit terms were available, and a second agreement relating to the sale of wheat and flour for Cuba. Under that second part of the agreement sales were strictly for cash.

To make the position quite clear, Mr. Speaker, under the Canada-U.S.S.R. trade agreement concluded last fall there was a sale of approximately 252,000 tons of wheat and 175,000 tons of flour for direct shipment to Cuba on a cash basis. I might add that all shipments of wheat and flour purchased under the Canada-U.S.S.R. wheat agreement have been completed with the exception of a small quantity of flour to be delivered shortly to Cuba.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I would then direct this question to the Prime Minister. With respect to the diversion of this wheat and flour to Cuba, has there been any complaint made by any friendly government?

Mr. Pearson: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker; and even those governments which have cut off normal trade with Cuba have agreed, I think—I am speaking particularly of the United States—not to prevent the sale to Cuba for cash of exports of certain foodstuffs and medical supplies.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Among the countries in the western hemisphere that have discontinued trading relations, recognition and the exchange of representatives, are there any which are allowing the diversion of wheat or wheat products to Cuba?

Mr. Pearson: I cannot answer that question without an examination. I shall be glad to look into it. I should add that the countries to which my hon. friend refers are selling direct to Cuba for cash, foodstuffs and medical supplies.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): May I ask a supplementary question. I ask the Prime Minister if he knows of any international commitment which Canada has made which would preclude our selling wheat either directly or indirectly to Cuba.

Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker.

HOUSING

VANCOUVER—REPORTED RENT INCREASES IN VETERANS PROJECT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the minister who reports to parliament for Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, and because of the imperative nature of my question, may I direct it to the Prime Minister. In view of the fact that within a few days hundreds of veterans in the Fraserview veterans project in Vancouver will be facing an order increasing their rent by 80 per cent, with the alternative of agreeing to a purchase price which is unacceptable to them or an eviction

notice, I ask the Prime Minister if he will interest himself to see that this order is withheld pending a further investigation of the complaints. I am asking if this can be done in view of the fact that the order is to take effect within a few days.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I will look into the matter immediately as requested by my hon. friend.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

THOMPSON, MAN.—STEPS TO ASSIST EMPLOYMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): My question is directed to the Minister of Labour. In view of the fact that Thompson, Manitoba, has suffered an exodus of more than 3,000 residents since August 12, can the minister inform the house whether he has taken any steps to encourage negotiations or bring about renewed negotiations in order that another place in Canada might not become a ghost town?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): I wish to advise my hon. friend that whatever steps can be taken by the national employment service, as an agency of the Department of Labour, will be taken to assist in the situation. If my hon. friend could be more specific as to what particular matters he has in mind, I would be glad to take the question as notice.

INDUSTRY

QUEBEC—POSSIBLE LOCATION OF NEW AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRIES

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question to which either the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Industry and Minister of Defence Production could reply. Are they in a position to inform the house of the progress made in the talks and negotiations between the Peugeot and Renault companies, as well as the Quebec government, on the one hand, and the federal government, on the other, concerning tariff concessions to be granted to those companies if they were to establish themselves in the province of Quebec?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to add at this time.

[*Text*]

PUBLIC SERVICE

PROTESTS RESPECTING RECENT SALARY INCREASES

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): With further reference to the recent salary increases, may I ask whether a message has been received by the Prime Minister from Vancouver respecting the dissatisfaction particularly of clerks and typists, grades 1 and 2? The message states that these employees were overlooked in the last group B cyclical review and have now been granted paltry increases of $90 and $120 per annum. The telegram asks for an immediate review by the treasury board. In the face of what the Prime Minister said the other day, is he prepared to say that the matter is being reviewed by treasury board so that a measure of fairness and justice will be done to these people?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, as I said on Friday the matter will be looked into at once. It is under close examination, and I hope a statement can be made on it tomorrow.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Is it before the treasury board?

Mr. Pearson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I think it will be the president of the treasury board who will report to the house on it tomorrow.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

ISSUE OF NEW STAMP WITH INSCRIPTION "QUÉBEC LIBRE"

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Hon. Théogène Ricard (St. Hyacinthe-Bagot): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Postmaster General, I should like to direct a question to his parliamentary secretary. Would he tell the house whether a new stamp, bearing the words "Free Quebec" was issued lately by the department?

Mr. Alexis Caron (Parliamentary Secretary to Postmaster General): I shall refer the question to the minister.

[*Text*]

POWER

BAY OF FUNDY—REQUEST FOR ECONOMIC SURVEY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the

Prime Minister. In view of the statement by the chairman of the Atlantic development board that the engineering feasibility of the harnessing of the bay of Fundy tides has been confirmed, is it the intention of the government to request the board to initiate immediately an economic investigation into this matter?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to take that question as notice, and I hope I or one of my colleagues will be in a position to reply tomorrow or the next day.

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Albert): As a supplementary question, in view of this announcement will the Prime Minister also reassess the other projects in the maritimes such as Passamaquoddy and Mactaquac, and will there be any diminution in government interest in them?

Mr. Pearson: Well, Mr. Speaker, these projects are all related to each other, and I hope we would not decide on one without examining the relationship of that one to all the others.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR INCREASE IN BURNT OUT PENSION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Veterans Affairs but in his absence I shall direct it to the acting minister. In view of the impassioned demands being made continually upon members of this house relative to veterans allowances, otherwise known as burnt out pensions, before this session closes will there be legislation introduced to take care of their increased costs since the last amendment of 1961?

Hon. Lucien Cardin (Acting Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Veterans Affairs I shall take this question as notice and bring in an answer tomorrow or the day after.

Mr. Winch: Do I understand that there will be an answer tomorrow?

Mr. Cardin: Tomorrow or the day after.

EDUCATION

STUDENT LOANS—DESIGNATION OF PROVINCIAL AGENCIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Minister of Finance whether he is ready to make any report as to the various agencies in the provinces to which students should apply in respect of the student loan legislation?

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I hope very much to be able to make a full statement probably on Thursday or Friday of this week.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

POSSIBLE DELAY IN PURCHASE OF NEW EQUIPMENT

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence.

Is he in a position to inform the house whether he intends to wait until the special committee on national defence presents its report to make a decision as regards the purchasing of the new military equipment recently recommended by his specialists' committee?

[*Text*]

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): No, Mr. Speaker, it is not the intention to do so.

Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Pictou): As a supplementary question, does the minister expect that the government will make a decision on the matter of these anti-submarine weapons by late this fall?

Mr. Hellyer: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would hope so.

HARBOURS

VANCOUVER—INQUIRY AS TO LEASES OF WATERFRONT PROPERTIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stuart A. Fleming (Okanagan-Revelstoke): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Transport but in his absence perhaps the acting minister might take it as notice. Can the minister advise the house whether reports current in Vancouver over the week end regarding the issue or transfer of leases on waterfront properties to the Coal Harbour Development Company are correct? Is so, may I ask him whether the views of the Vancouver west end and downtown ratepayers association have been taken into account and, further, whether there is financial stability in the company to which these leases have been transferred?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (President of the Privy Council): I will be glad to take the question as notice and give an answer tomorrow if possible.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

INQUIRY AS TO HOLDING OF BY-ELECTIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): I wish to address a question to the Prime Minister. Last week the right hon. gentleman told me he was giving consideration to calling by-elections in Westmorland and Waterloo South. I was just wondering whether they will be called in the next 44 days so that representatives of these constituencies can participate in the flag debate.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): This is naturally an important factor in the consideration I have been giving to this matter. I hope to be able to make a statement later in the week about the date of these by-elections.

AIRPORTS

WINNIPEG—INQUIRY AS TO INSTALLATION OF ESCALATORS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Transport, may I direct a question to his parliamentary secretary. In view of the fact that we are still awaiting the installation of certain escalators at Winnipeg international airport, can a statement be made soon as to when these installations will be made?

Some hon. Members: Order paper.

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): I will take the question as notice.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

REQUEST FOR TEXT OF SPEECH BY DR. DEUTSCH

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. M. Fisher (Port Arthur): I want to ask the Prime Minister a question. It arises from a speech by Dr. Deutsch which was widely reported in the United States. Since the annual report of the economic council was given to us only a short time ago, and since there was very little in that report which seems to dovetail into, or be a replica of, what Dr. Deutsch came out with in terms of Canada's economic growth, I wonder whether the Prime Minister would consider seeing that the complete text of what Dr. Deutsch had to say in the United States is made available to all members of the house.

[Mr. Fleming (Okanagan-Revelstoke).]

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I would be very glad to discuss the matter with Dr. Deutsch and see whether the text of that speech can be made available to members.

CANADIAN FLAG

OFFICIAL ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW DESIGN

The house resumed, from Thursday, August 20, consideration of the motion of Mr. Pearson:

> 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 the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Diefenbaker and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. More.

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, on Thursday I referred to the introduction of this flag resolution and to the Prime Minister's open invitation to members to participate. It is a well known fact that members on this side of the house have since accepted that invitation and have made their observations on this subject. The Prime Minister saw fit on one occasion to refer to this as a filibuster. Whether the participation to which I have referred is known as a filibuster or not, I can tell the house that I personally am proud to take part in this debate.

When I spoke on Thursday I also gave reasons why I personally believe that the term "filibuster" as applied by the Liberals to the debate is certainly not applicable to what has taken place in this house. I indicated that in Wednesday's debate, which took up fewer than 29 pages of *Hansard*, there were two pages of rulings from the Chair, 61 identified interruptions and in all more than 100 interjections by hon. members. There were, in addition, speeches by an hon. member of the New Democratic party and by a representative of "the Liberal group", to repeat a phrase used by the Minister of Trade and Commerce in the course of his own contribution, during which he made no reference whatsoever to his leader, or to the Liberals being a party.

This reminds one of the statement made by the Minister of Finance during a television broadcast when he said he "thought the Liberal party had a leader." In this case the Minister of Trade and Commerce does not

recognize that there is either a party or a leader. Of course, as was mentioned on another occasion, the hon. gentleman has his own ambitions and is probably directing all his energies in that direction.

The Minister of Forestry took exception to certain remarks I was making and rose to tell the house just why he was present as a minister. It is interesting to see that as reported on page 7106 of *Hansard,* in the second column, the minister's first sentence was:

> I thought we had been elected in this parliament to take decisions.

This fact is clearly indicated by the Liberal party when it takes the decision, the personal decision, of the Prime Minister and gives it its blessings. It has been my understanding that we as members are here to make decisions. Of course it is a very simple matter to make a decision, but it is our further duty to make the right decision. Much doubt has been cast on the decision of this house to introduce to this country a three maple leaves flag which is the personal choice of the Prime Minister.

I say it is his personal choice, Mr. Speaker, because in my own province, as I said before, the two members for Halifax, in my opinion with prior knowledge, made these very bold statements which are a clear indication to the Prime Minister that his personal choice has not been accepted within his own party. These two hon. members made it quite clear that any support which they would give the three maple leaves flag was qualified support.

I further indicated, Mr. Speaker, that the members of his own cabinet are divided on this particular matter, and I threw out the challenge that one particular minister had informed me that his choice would be anything but the three maple leaves flag. He was against it. At the same time he indicated to me what was his choice, which is a clear-cut indication that within the cabinet itself this party is divided. And why should it not be divided? It is the personal selection of the Prime Minister. The Minister of Forestry indicated that we were here to take decisions, but hon. gentlemen opposite are giving the decision of the Prime Minister their blessing.

Why have we not heard from the Liberal members on this particular matter, Mr. Speaker? Why do they not get up in support of the three maple leaves flag? Why have we not heard from the two members for Halifax, who qualified their support for the three maple leaves flag? Let us hear them get up now and give their unqualified support. Let us also hear from the cabinet minister who is quite dissatisfied with this proposed flag. These opinions were all expressed prior to the introduction of this resolution, so let us hear these hon. gentlemen support the three maple leaves flag; and give it unqualified support, not the qualified support they indicated they would give when they knew what the resolution would contain.

Mr. Regan: I would not support your filibuster.

Mr. Mandziuk: They have nothing to say.

Mr. MacInnis: The hon. member now interjecting is well aware of what I think of his ability, especially when he was trying to chair a certain committee.

Mr. Mandziuk: Which member?

Mr. MacInnis: He does not even show enough ability to make himself properly identifiable. The finger of blame in this debate has been pointed in many directions and for many reasons, but as far as I am concerned the finger can only be pointed in one direction, and that is in the direction of the Prime Minister himself, who has made a personal choice and imposed it on the members of his party. Perhaps I should say "group", because after all that is what the Minister of Trade and Commerce called it. He has imposed on his own group his opinion of what should be the flag design.

The Prime Minister has now said that he is willing to allow this matter to go before a committee. This was the suggestion put forward some time ago by the Leader of the Opposition. However, the Prime Minister's willingness to allow it to go to a committee comes rather late, considering that his action to date has put his own members in such a position that they are more or less obligated to go along with the pressure put upon them by the Prime Minister, which was made quite clear when he introduced his resolution in the first place.

I say the finger can be pointed in one direction and one direction only, namely directly at the Prime Minister. Should he not wish to take my word for this, perhaps he would like to go back to some of the advisers he was looking to for advice not too long ago. He might question the advice of Mr. Ryan of *Le Devoir,* to whom I understand he went for advice. He might ask what Mr. Ryan thinks of this particular flag design; and in that connection he might read an editorial which appeared in that paper over the week end in which the lack of leadership on his part in pointed out, a matter which his own group is fully realizing is the case today.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, the usual sort of contribution is coming from hon. members opposite. I have invited them to get up, if they are in favour of the three maple leaves flag, and give the house their unqualified support for the personal choice of the Prime Minister. But that they cannot do.

Mr. Regan: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I submit that the fairy tales told by the hon. member in the last ten minutes have nothing to do with the subamendment and should be ruled out of order.

Mr. Speaker: I have been listening intently to the speech of the hon. member, and frequently during the last few minutes he has referred to the question of designs. There was the question of the three maple leaves and of one or two other designs alluded to by the subamendment. In my opinion, although he is being rather general he is within the ambit of the subamendment.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to you for putting the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Regan) in his place. However, through you, sir, I would call his attention to the remarks of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, his own colleague, to which he did not see fit to rise and raise a point of order. If I have strayed I submit I have not strayed nearly as far as did the hon. member's own colleague, the minister, on that occasion.

With reference to the three leaves design, it has become obvious across the country to many members of the Liberal group that what the Prime Minister has tried to do in foisting his personal choice upon this parliament has become a very difficult task, and quite possibly hon. gentlemen opposite will rise in their places within the next few hours or days and those who can will indicate their reasons for supporting the three maple leaves flag. But I would very much doubt whether many of them could do that with a clear conscience.

Today we have a flag flying which was referred to by the late Mackenzie King as the official Canadian flag. We have flying today a flag which was recognized by Prime Minister Louis St. Laurent, who said that no new flag should be a party flag. We have flying today a flag which was recognized by the present Leader of the Opposition when he was prime minister. In conclusion I can only say that if it was good enough for the three prime ministers prior to this administration coming into office, it is certainly good enough for this present Prime Minister leading the group he is in in this house.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Digby-Annapolis-Kings.

Hon. George C. Nowlan (Digby-Annapolis-Kings): Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to be recognized even though I have not yet risen. Perhaps I might attribute my recognition to the shadow cast by my six foot five inch frame when I do rise. This reminds me of the situation one found, as a small boy born in the days before there was complete pollution of our streams, before our rivers were dammed and all the brooks had been frozen, when one walked along the banks of a brook in late February or early March and heard the sound of a little water trickling underneath the ice. Then one could run back home and say "I think spring is coming". Sometimes, of course, spring was followed by a freeze and the water would stop running. Sometimes the water kept on running and it would not be too long before one could hear the cracking and booming of the ice in the lakes and would know that a complete thaw had taken place; that not only had spring arrived but summer, even a belated one, was not far removed.

Certainly this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate I am speaking in an atmosphere similar to that sound of running water underneath the ice, and at this stage I should not want to say anything or do anything which would result in a freeze and stop the running of the water. We can always be optimistic, and perhaps it behooves all of us at this time to be very careful of the situation.

Mr. Speaker, there are one or two general statements I should like to make while carrying on this debate. In the first place I think all members here are fair minded, subject to some political pressure, and will admit that this debate has been of a very high standard.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nowlan: Did I hear something from the other side? I might have known that some would disagree.

This has been an emotionally charged debate in respect of matters which are very close to many of the members. This is a debate which could have aroused bitter feelings, recriminations and statements which would be very difficult to overlook or control in a parliament such as this. Of course there have been political overtones, as there always are when dealing with matters of this kind; because in a proper sense of the word this

is a political body, and politics are bound to be interspersed in our activities.

I do suggest there have been less politics and more sentiment and expression of feeling during this debate, considering the subject matter. I am sure that students of parliamentary history, when reading the speeches made during this debate at some time in the future when many of us are no longer members here, will find it very difficult to understand the comments of some of the press columnists to the effect that this is a very poor parliament. A poor parliament could not have produced a debate such as we have had, and I refer to speeches made by hon. members on all sides of this house. Some great speeches have been made. Of course all the speeches made have not been great, but on the whole parliament as an institution can be very proud of the debate which has taken place.

As I have said, I am sure that students in the future, after we have been long since forgotten individually, will read this debate not only to discover the history of Canada but because of its high quality. The speeches have been emotionally charged, but the situation has been adequately handled. I am sure speeches to be made from now on will continue to be of that high order.

Mr. Speaker, there are two misconceptions I should like to deal with at this time. One has been the suggestion that this debate is a filibuster. That suggestion has been made casually by one or two hon. members opposite, although not by those in the front row. That suggestion has been mentioned casually on occasion by the radio and press men. The suggestion was given an official position a day or two ago by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who referred to the debate as a Tory filibuster. That was the first time the expression was used by an hon. gentleman in the front row opposite. That minister had the nerve and temerity to call this a Tory filibuster.

I remind that hon. gentleman that we are speaking here today at the proper request of the Prime Minister, who said it was the duty and responsibility of all hon. members in all parties to not only express the feelings of their constituents but their own feelings as well. I agree with the Prime Minister that it is our duty to express our opinions, and that is exactly what we are doing and have been doing for a week or more. It is true that one or two speeches have been made in repetition, and that two or three speakers have spoken twice during this debate. That is understandable for various reasons known to hon. members who have had the responsibility of marshalling the debate and arranging for speakers.

Generally speaking there has been no repetition. This is the first time I have spoken during this debate, and I know there are other members on this side of the house who have not spoken but who will, I am sure, take part in this debate. They will not be taking part in a Tory filibuster but will be expressing their opinions in response to the wishes of their constituents. Our constituents expect us to speak, Mr. Speaker, and for some of us in any event our consciences demand that we do so. I think in all fairness that fact is generally recognized by hon. members on the other side of the house.

Mr. Speaker, I think there has been a little suggestion, outside those one or two references by hon. members opposite who criticize us because we are taking up some time, that this is in fact a filibuster. There has been some criticism on the part of radio commentators and editorial writers who suggest this debate is being carried on for purely political purposes and that we are speaking only for the benefit of the people back home. All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that these intellectual halfwits who have no knowledge of sentiment or emotion themselves are hardly in a position to speak for those of us who do feel keenly and strongly about this matter.

If anyone desires a political reply to the charge of filibuster, Mr. Speaker, I call upon that distinguished member of the press gallery, Mr. Blair Fraser, who has never been recognized as a Conservative apologist but who has been accused of writing apologia for the Liberal party. He is a personal friend of mine, and I absolve him of that latter charge entirely. Mr. Fraser several days ago, commenting over C.B.C., said this was one of a number of false statements being put forward by certain people. He wanted to deny emphatically that it was the purpose of the Conservative spokesmen in the House of Commons, who were exercising their rights, to conduct a filibuster.

The second misconception, Mr. Speaker, is related to the suggestion that we are blocking or interfering with the nation's business. I must say that we are very concerned with the nation's business. I remind hon. members that the Prime Minister outlined the business which had to be done before the flag debate commenced and suggested that after the flag

debate was concluded there was going to be a recess of parliament. The business to which the right hon. Prime Minister referred has been completed and we are now dealing with the flag debate. If we are interfering with anything, Mr. Speaker, apparently we are interfering with our own vacations. There may be those who think we do not deserve to have a vacation because we are now receiving the huge sum of $18,000 a year. In any event, no one could suggest we are blocking the nation's business, because we would be away from this place were it not for this particular debate.

I think all members of parliament, not only those on this side, have been subject to a very caustic and critical press because of the fact they are prepared to participate in and listen to this debate when, were it not for this debate, they would be out of here. Again, if one wants to call an unprejudiced witness, in that same radio broadcast to which I referred a few moments ago Mr. Blair Fraser said no one could accuse the Conservative opposition of interfering with or interrupting the business of the country because if we were not dealing with this issue we would be away on our vacation and the business of the country would not be under discussion.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The government has nothing ready.

Mr. Nowlan: The Leader of the Opposition says the government has nothing ready. We are at least giving them time in which to produce something. We hope that when we get through with this matter they will be able to produce something, and if they do we will deal with it.

I wish to make one further reference to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. We all appreciate the real and obviously sincere concern which he felt for the future of the Conservative party. It almost brought tears to our eyes to realize he was so concerned about our future and, as I said, we appreciate it. But I will tell him that having been here for quite a few years and having taken part in public life in this country for many years, I have a very high appreciation of the contribution the Liberal party has made to the history and development of this nation, and I appreciate the fact that the Minister of Trade and Commerce shares these views and recognizes the countribution which the Conservative party has made to the history and development of this country.

With all due respect to hon. members farther down this side of the house and the contributions they have made from time to time for the good of the nation, I think everyone realizes that the two great old parties have been largely responsible for the development of Canada, and I hope and expect that this will continue to be so. But I want to assure the Minister of Trade and Commerce that his worry about our future is no greater than our worry about their future. What we are afraid of is that the Liberal party, as a result of their actions in this debate and the attitude they have taken, are going to become a sectional party rather than a national party and will largely cease to exist in certain parts of the country.

On Friday the Prime Minister made a statement which was very belated but very welcome. Apparently when the votes are taken on the amendments and the motion before the house the party whips will be relaxed and hon. members may vote as they see fit. This is certainly a rather belated conversion. As I have said, I do not want to deaden the sound of running water and I certainly do not want to raise any blood pressures at this time, but I think anybody will admit that the action of the government in bringing forward the flag resolution and the way it has been handled has been characterized, to put it gently and kindly, by a certain degree of stupidity and a high degree of stubbornness. No more kindly description could be applied to what has happened.

We were told that a flag had been produced by somebody for which the Prime Minister apparently took credit, although most of those on the other side do not know who produced it; and we were told that we could take it or leave it and if we did not take it there would be an election. If ever before there has been a political blunder in a highly emotional situation such as this, I have never seen it. I doubt that there ever has been such an action since confederation which affected people generally in their hearts, their souls and their minds to the extent this has, and which has been characterized with such stubbornness and such stupidity as the government has shown up to now. Therefore we welcome the statement of the Prime Minister that there will be no political pressure brought to bear on hon. members opposite when we come to vote, in that the whips will be off and the fate of the government will not be determined in any way, shape or form. In other words there is not going to be an election—

Mr. Diefenbaker: Three months late.

Mr. Nowlan: —because of the result of the vote. In that connection I draw attention to a former political leader in this house who was succeeded by an hon. gentleman to my left. I refer to Hon. M. J. Coldwell who was leader of the C.C.F. party in years gone by and who is one of the distinguished parliamentarians of this parliament and country. I wish to quote from a speech he made in the house on December 9, 1953. As found on page 748 of *Hansard* he said:

> No partisan recommendation should be made. When a recommendation is made to parliament—

He was referring to a flag.

> —the government should feel that it would be acceptable at least to the vast majority of members in all parts of the house. The matter of choosing a national emblem is too important to have connected with it any sort of political controversy either in the house or across the country.

Those words, uttered in 1953 by one of the distinguished parliamentarians of this country and of this century, are words which I would commend to all hon. members at this time. As I say, we welcome this conversion on the part of the Prime Minister, belated though it is. Some of us cannot quite forget the communist trials in the Stalin era when men were so brainwashed while they were confined that when they were released and brought into the open courtroom they confessed to sins of which they had never heard because they had been brainwashed to that extent. I hope that the brainwashing which has taken place on the other side of the house has not been of such severity and intensity that hon. members opposite cannot recover from it before we come to the vote.

I see that time is passing, Mr. Speaker, and as I did not mark the time I started I must watch myself. A partisan decision as to the flag was the first mistake that was made by the government. The second mistake which I suggest has been made by the government in dealing with this matter was when the proposed flag brought forward by the Prime Minister and the government was denuded of all historical significance, of everything which bespeaks our pride, our history and our traditions.

I have heard it said that the red ensign does not have a great deal of history behind it. There has been debate as to when it was used first. It has been said that it was flown over the parliament buildings up to 1904 and that it was then taken down. I have heard it suggested that it was not used during the first world war and that it came into use by virtue of some order in council long after the first world war was over.

I can speak with some little authority in this matter because I happen to be one who as a very junior soldier served in France for a very short time during the first world war. I well remember Sir Robert Borden, for instance, then prime minister of Canada, coming to Tincques in France on July 1, 1918, Dominion day, and Canadian ensigns were flying to welcome the prime minister. I am sure that others in the house including the Prime Minister, the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre who served in the first world war, can vouch for the statement I am making today.

If one wants further corroboration one does not need to go to a Tory politician or spokesman. I would refer the house to General Andrew McNaughton, who could hardly be described as a Tory supporter. I have been talking to him lately. He was commander of the Canadian corps of artillery during the first world war and was a great soldier and a great leader in the field. He said that the Canadian red ensign flew over the corps headquarters at that time. He remembers it very well, and he was proud of the fact that it was there.

Mr. Matheson: May I ask a question on that point? Was it not the blue ensign? Was not General Currie's flag the blue ensign?

Mr. Nowlan: I am not sure what General Currie's flag may have been. General Currie was commander of the Canadian corps, which was almost equivalent to an army command, although it was only recognized as a corps. General Currie may have had his own flag and it may have been the blue ensign. However, so far as the Canadian corps troops were concerned, so far as the Canadians serving in France were concerned, it was the red ensign that was flying.

As I have said, I think the second mistake which was made in connection with this proposed flag was the denuding from it of all references to our tradition, our pride and our history. You are taking a flag which is rich in history, which is colourful, and discarding it. I remember the first day I came into the courtyard of this House of Commons. Perhaps to some extent I was emotionally aroused because I was taking a seat in the House of Commons. However, I have never forgotten the picture of that red ensign flying over the peace tower. I never can forget it. I can say, and I am sure most hon. members will agree with me, that in colour, in richness and in the general picture that

this flag presents, it is second to none which is flying anywhere in the world today.

Now, if the resolution is adopted we are starting literally—and I do not mean to make a pun—and figuratively with a clean sheet. We are going to do away with our history and our tradition. In that connection I should like to refer the right hon. Prime Minister and other Liberals to the statement of a great liberal—not Liberal in the political sense—President Woodrow Wilson. We all recognize him as one of the great liberals of the North American continent. He said this in an address on June 14, 1915:

> The things that the flag stands for were created by the experiences of a great people. Everything that it stands for 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 do and live under that flag.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that is as fair a definition of a flag as one can get, and I commend it to hon. gentlemen opposite. The corollary to that mistake is the belief that the Canadian people would accept this denuding of our flag, this stripping of our heritage and tradition. There has never been a greater example, I will not say of political stupidity but of political ignorance, than has been shown in connection with this matter; to think that the Canadian people would stand idly by and see the flag which millions revere being cast aside so that we start off again with a clean sheet. If any government thought that would be accepted by the Canadian people, it is absolutely beyond my comprehension.

The reason for it, of course, or so we are told, is that this will achieve national unity. Feeling strongly as I do on this matter, and I know I am speaking for many others who feel the same way, I may say that if by throwing our flag into discard, by coming up with a new emblem of some kind or other, we could achieve national unity; if we were convinced of that, I think we would pay that price to achieve national unity. The trouble is you hear statements made by hon. members around this building. I am not referring to any one group or province or anything else, but we hear that this will not achieve national unity. The flag is only the beginning. Our problems are much deeper, and unless other solutions, financial, constitutional and otherwise are found, national unity will not be achieved. Finally you are told that this flag is simply a problem for English Canadians. Now, when you are facing that situation it is rather difficult to be convinced that if you are prepared to drop the red ensign, if you are prepared to start with a new sheet, you are going to achieve national unity.

We are asked to give up everything, many of us are, which we hold dear; everything of our pride, our history and our traditions. We are told afterward that this does not achieve anything in the end. Are we to scrap the flag we have, the flag which is flying over this building today, that warm, colourful, beautiful symbol of our history and our heritage? What are we to accept in exchange? We are prepared to make an exchange if we were sure it would be the means of accomplishing national unity, but we are not prepared to do it on the information we have at the moment.

We are asked to swap, and for what? We have a suggestion brought forward by the Prime Minister—I am not saying he developed it, but it is reported that he did—concerning the three maple leaf design. I had someone check with the office of the Secretary of State, and I found that there were 24 different copyrights on the three maple leaf design. They cover everything from beer to boloney and many other products in between. There are those who suggest one maple leaf as the design. I do not want to cause any discomfiture in that particular quarter, but I found that there were 327 copyrights issued covering one maple leaf. These are the matters which we are supposed to debate. We are asked to strip the hallmarks of our history and accept a copyright design for beer.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are told that all this will achieve national unity, but I doubt it. There are extremists in all places; there are extremists both English and French. There are extremists in various provinces. We all have to recognize that fact. I recognize it, and I make apologies for some of the English speaking extremists just as I am sure some of my hon. friends from Quebec make apologies for some of the extremists in their own province. A country which has no pride in history has very little hope for posterity. I am sure the French Canadians have pride in their ancestry, just as we have in ours. I am wondering what the habitants who came to the defence of this country and fought under the union jack to defeat Montgomery and save this country from becoming a colony of the United States would think today. I would think they would turn over in

their graves if they heard some of the statements which are allegedly being made by their descendants in this country.

It is not only limited to Quebec. I am speaking now from a prejudiced, personal position. I come from the ancient province of Nova Scotia. I come from that most ancient of constituencies, Digby-Annapolis-Kings, which includes Port Royal, the ancient capital of this country. This is the place to which Champlain came. He settled in that rich valley and developed enough courage and strength during two or three years to go on and establish French settlements at Stadacona and Hochelaga. We have a Port Royal, which name was changed only a few years ago by commission from the postmaster general in order to re-establish that old name. In that little community you have the Order of Good Cheer, which has been going on for over 300 years and which was established by Champlain. It is meeting regularly now and has been for more than three centuries. Surely this is part of our heritage, part of our tradition. One can say it has not got much to do with the flag, that you don't get a kettle on a flag; but if you scrap your traditions, if you start scrapping one then scrap all the others.

I simply point out that we have a French Canadian heritage not only in the province of Quebec, of which all Canada is proud, but we have it in my own constituency, in my own town, Port Royal. We are very proud of it, and we want to see it maintained.

My own position—and the Prime Minister said we should make our own positions clear—is very simple. In the two or three minutes left to me I want to say that in the first place I believe in supporting the red ensign. I believe it is a beautiful flag, a flag of history which contains our heritage and our traditions. I will support it as long as that is feasible in this discussion.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nowlan: Some modifications may be developed. I can think of modifications which can be developed following suggestions which may be coming forward with respect to one maple leaf. Somebody said to me today, "I thought you and your party were in favour of a distinctive Canadian flag. Why have you been telling the people you are in favour of a distinctive Canadian flag if you don't intend to support the maple leaves flag?" For years my party has stated it has been in favour of a distinctive Canadian flag, but I never dreamt that by adopting a distinctive Canadian flag we would denude it of everything of our history, traditions and heritage. I thought it would be possible with the red ensign to superimpose a maple leaf, or any other emblem, but I never thought the proposal meant the elimination of everything pertaining to our pride, history and traditions. That is what I meant, and that is what I believe my party meant when we said we were in favour of a distinctive Canadian flag.

Providing these ancient hallmarks are preserved we are prepared to accept any modification, maintaining the red ensign substantially; but I am not married to that. If that is impossible, if we cannot do that by agreement in this house, I support the proposal for a plebiscite because I believe, sir, in this matter—

[*Editor's Note: And an object having been thrown from the gallery:*]

Mr. Nowlan: It's all right. I don't think it's his heart's blood; I think it's his brains.

Mr. Bigg: It will be a live bomb next.

Mr. Nowlan: As I said, Mr. Speaker, if necessary I am prepared to accept a plebiscite on this matter. I do not think it is necessary, but certainly it is better to have that, to have all the Canadian people consulted, than to have any decision forced upon us by any government majority. Or as an alternative, as the Prime Minister hinted on Friday and as the Leader of the Opposition has also mentioned, the question of a committee of the house, should be given very careful consideration if that is the only avenue possible.

I read in the paper, or heard something this morning, to the effect that "this man Diefenbaker" would not agree to a committee and that he wanted interminable debate thereon. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that for any committee which may be set up there would have to be ground rules established first, and as I understand our rules, ordinarily a majority report is printed and there is no minority report. I do not think anyone in this parliament would expect a committee to be set up which would simply bring in a bare majority report, but I think in this case there would have to be a very substantial majority in favour of the committee's report, and it should not require a unanimous report because we do not want a situation where one or perhaps two people veto the decision of a committee of this house. But if you had a committee set up with ground rules established, whereby there would

have to be substantial unanimity in the committee's report, then I do not think there would be any need to debate it at length afterward in the house. In that way we would either get a substantially unanimous report accepted with very little discussion or we would not get a report at all, and in that event we would still be faced with the situation which exists now.

I apologize to the house, Mr. Speaker, for having taken up its time, but I have stated my own feelings on this matter and I am confident that men and women of good will, as the great majority of men and women in this house are, can work out this matter sitting down together and discussing it. I am confident we can arrive at a solution to this problem, which is probably the greatest emotional problem we have been confronted with, certainly since conscription and possibly since the beginning of confederation. This country in its first century has shown evidence of the development it can achieve, and I am certain its second century is going to show greater progress.

I am confident that by reason, by good will, co-operation and discussion we will be able to work out a solution to these problems which confront us, and that we can look forward to the second century of our confederation's history with even greater pride than that with which we look back on our first century.

Mr. Ralph Cowan (York-Humber): Mr. Speaker, on rising at this time to speak on the subamendment—and I understand we are being held very closely to the terms of the subamendment—I would point out that I desire to comment in particular on the first paragraph of the subamendment—"Are you in favour of the red ensign"?

I want, in introducing my remarks, to state definitely that not only am I a Liberal, but I am a Liberal of the Liberals. I would say to you, sir, there has not been a national convention of the Liberal party in Canada nor an Ontario provincial Liberal convention, outside of the Hepburn years, at which I was not an authorized delegate and entitled to vote, since 1923.

A national flag is the visible evidence of a country's soul and the symbol of its pride, and without it a nation is a dead thing. We have a national flag. We have a distinctive national flag.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Cowan: I am very happy to live under it, and I will do everything within my power to maintain it as the distinctive national flag of this nation. In 1919, as a boy of 17, I spent my summer vacation in the city of Ottawa and was here when the national Liberal convention was held at which Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King was selected as leader of the Liberal party. I acted as a scrutineer, at the age of 19, in the federal election of 1921, scrutineering for Eddie Lapierre who was the Liberal candidate in Nipissing when we won that riding from Charlie Harrison, who had been a Union government man and in 1921 ran as a straight Conservative. For 45 years I have taken part in provincial and federal elections as an active Liberal and have voted in many parts of Ontario as I moved from paper to paper during the course of my university years, before settling permanently in Toronto on Canada's major daily and outstanding weekly.

In the Canada Gazette in 1924 we find a certified copy of a minute of a meeting of the committee of the privy council, approved by His Excellency the Governor General on January 26 of that year. It reads:

> The committee of the privy council have had before them a report, dated 23rd January, 1924, from Right Honourable W. L. Mackenzie King, prime minister and secretary of state for external affairs, submitting that he has recently had his attention drawn to the practice which prevails of flying the blue ensign with the Canadian arms in the fly over the office of the high commissioner for Canada in London.
>
> The reason offered for this variation from the union jack, which is flown over all Canadian government buildings in Canada, is to be found in the need very generally felt by Canadians in London for a distinctive emblem which will afford a ready means of distinguishing the character of the buildings over which it floats, and the portion of the empire to which they belong.
>
> The Prime Minister considers that this purpose would be served by the employment in this connection of the red ensign with the Canadian arms in the fly, which though originally authorized by the Admiralty to be flown over vessels of the Canadian mercantile marine, has come to serve a wider application, having been displayed in times past from the government buildings in Ottawa, and quite generally throughout the country, where it is still often spoken of as the 'Canadian flag', meaning thereby, the distinctive emblem of Canada.

In this minute the word "distinctive" is used twice and the word "distinguishing" once. I quote further from the minute:

> The Prime Minister, therefore, recommends without contemplating any variation from the present practice regulating the flying of flags from the government buildings within the Dominion of Canada, and assuming that no local regulation would be violated thereby, that the requisite authority be given for displaying the red ensign with the Canadian arms in the fly, on suitable occasions from all buildings owned or occupied by

the Canadian government, and situated without Canada.

I point out that when the Canadian red ensign was designated as Canada's distinctive flag, every seat in the province of Quebec was held by a Liberal member, and W. L. Mackenzie King, with that backing behind him, and knowing the red ensign was acceptable as our national flag, took the action which resulted in this minute of a meeting of the privy council. It still holds.

However, in 1945, at a time when there was some uproar developing with regard to a national flag, there was a further order in council concerning the use of the Canadian red ensign. It is P.C. 5888, dated September 5, 1945. It reads as follows:

Whereas the Right Honourable W. L. Mackenzie King, the Prime Minister, reports that by order in council P.C. 134 of January 26, 1924, authority is given for displaying the red ensign with the shield of the coat of arms of Canada in the fly (commonly known as "the Canadian red ensign") on suitable occasions from all buildings owned or occupied by the Canadian government and situated without Canada;

That the Canadian red ensign was employed by Canadian forces during the present war; and

That, until such time as action is taken by parliament for the formal adoption of a national flag, it is desirable to authorize the flying of the Canadian red ensign on federal government buildings within as well as without Canada, and to remove any doubt as to the propriety of flying the Canadian red ensign wherever place or occasion may make it desirable to fly a distinctive Canadian flag—

The order in council continues:

His Excellency in council, on the same recommendation is further pleased to declare and doth declare that it shall be appropriate to fly the Canadian red ensign within and without Canada wherever place or occasion may make it desirable to fly a distinctive Canadian flag.

Mr. Speaker, the word "distinctive" appears four times in these orders in council, and the word "distinguishing" appears once.

As an active Liberal I attended the 1958 leadership convention of the Liberal party and I voted wholeheartedly for the leader we selected; I would vote for him again if another leadership convention were to be held tomorrow. But I want to give the house some facts and figures with regard to the claim that this party is committed to the realization of a new flag for Canada within two years of election.

As I say, I attended the 1958 convention, and I attended the national Liberal council meeting in 1960. Normally at those meetings I am placed as a member of the committee on health and welfare or the committee on labour, sometimes on both. I am interested in these three fields of human endeavour and I always will be.

At these conventions they hold a plenary session, as they call it. That is a fine, big sounding word. A plenary session is held just before a rally breaks up. Some pleasant things are said, good wishes are exchanged and the delegates go home. Usually half of them have already gone home before the plenary session opens.

Well, at this particular plenary session I listened intently while the recommendations of the committees in which I was most interested were brought forward as suggestions from the resolutions committee. I happened to be sitting to the right of a Liberal member of the Senate. The chairman of the resolutions committee said the party was committed to a distinctive national flag. This was the first I had heard of such a proposal and, let me point out once more, I was an authorized delegate to the convention.

I turned to the senator who was next to me and said "What is this all about? A distinctive national flag? I must get up and ask about that." He put his hand on my shoulder and said "Hold your horses. There is an element in the party that wants a distinctive flag, a flag different from the one we have now. But in the orders in council the word 'distinctive' appears and reappears. We have a distinctive flag now." "Well," I said, "If that's the way it is, I will keep quiet." I did not know there was any motion going in with regard to a distinctive flag. It was voted on, together with the other recommendations, about 20 minutes before the rump convention ended.

Later I looked at the orders in council, having never looked at them before, and found, as I have reported to this house, four references to the word "distinctive" and one to the word "distinguishing".

I am speaking today because I do not believe the great bulk of the Liberals across this nation of ours are committed to the doctrine of a new flag for Canada different from the red ensign. I have in my hand a press clipping from the Toronto *Star* of May 19, 1964, in which William MacEachern, one of our ablest writers and a senior man in the news room of the *Star*, reports on the introduction of the flag question into this parliament. The first paragraph reads:

Prime Minister Pearson today invited the opposition to throw his minority government out of office in a no-confidence vote Monday if it doesn't like the government's flag policy.

If a vote of no-confidence wins support of the majority in the house, the government must resign and a new election must be held.

Canadian Flag

Further on in the article, Mr. MacEachern quotes the Prime Minister as saying:

"Some people are forgetting that we have a very formal commitment as a party which is binding on the government to bring about a decision within two years of the election. We are getting toward that month. We only have now 10 months. From now on we will have to be a little more specific."

I have outlined to the house what happened when I attended this Liberal convention as a properly designated delegate, as I have attended so many Liberal party rallies and gatherings of one kind or another. I had never heard before of this proposed new flag, although I was told a certain element of the party was asking for one. This was when the senator explained to me that the word "distinctive" covered the situation because it appeared in the orders in council. Then we were suddenly presented with a flag design in the month of May, 1964.

Now, as a good Liberal—and I believe I am a good Liberal—I will not disclose what goes on in the Liberal caucus. It is one of the unwritten laws that one does not disclose what goes on in caucus once the doors are closed. But I can tell the house this. I am not prevented from disclosing what does not go in a Liberal caucus, and I would point out that we never saw any details of this flag until *Votes and Proceedings* of May 26 were issued on May 27. The opposition saw this design as soon as we did. If this denotes that the Liberal party caucus has given its approval to the design in question, I would like to know when it did so. I attended all the caucus meetings and the design was not shown and, as I say, we did not see it until *Votes and Proceedings* appeared on May 27.

I wish to draw attention at this point to a piece of campaign literature put out by the Liberal party. The heading is "Time for Action—Vote Liberal". This was circulated in my riding in March, 1963. The country voted in April, 1963. There are ten pages to this small leaflet, and every word in the report was written by the national Liberal federation or the Ontario Liberal federation, the address of which is 100 Adelaide street west, Toronto, Ontario. I paid for the printing of upwards of 25,000 copies by Spalding Printing Company, 16 Queen Elizabeth boulevard, Toronto. There is not a single reference in those ten pages to a flag. That piece of publicity was given to me and, as I say, circulated in my riding of York-Humber.

I hold here in my hands two pieces of Liberal publicity, one addressed to my second daughter, Miss Catharine Cowan, 55 Humberview road, Toronto, Ontario, who is now a graduate of Trinity College and who in June completed one year at the Sorbonne in Paris and has a certificate for French and historical studies from that body. The other is addressed to me at the same address. There are five pages of Liberal publicity in this literature which was mailed out to I do not know how many people, and never a mention is made of the flag question in any way, shape or form.

I have another piece of Liberal publicity in my hand entitled "The story of Liberalism in Canada". I do not see any date, but it must have been printed since 1958 because it carries two pictures of our present leader. In this piece of Liberal publicity I am proud to read this statement:

The achievements of Mackenzie King and his colleagues were best recorded by the man who succeeded him as prime minister, Louis St. Laurent, who said in 1948:

"In recent years Canada has achieved even more than national unity within her borders. We had the unity required to make a vital contribution to victory in war. We have worked hard for the restoration of peace in the world. We have maintained in our own country a level of employment and prosperity never before known. Most observers, I think, would say that ours is the happiest country in the world".

They are the words of Prime Minister Louis St. Laurent in 1948. He said that "in recent years Canada had achieved even more than national unity within her borders." If we have not unity now, whose fault is it? The Liberal party was in power from 1948 till 1957 and we are now back in power again. I just wanted to bring this piece of Liberal publicity to the attention of the house.

During the course of the recent election campaign a gentleman came to me and pointed out that a booklet had been issued entitled "The policies of the Liberal party; general election, 1963". At the bottom of page 5 of this booklet I find this statement:

Within two years of taking office, a new Liberal government will submit to parliament a design for a flag which cannot be mistaken for the emblem of any other country.

I read this statement in this printed booklet and I asked my friend, a Liberal, "How many copies of this booklet were printed?" About ten copies came to my Liberal committee rooms in Toronto and I never knew one speaker to refer to it. Printed on it is "National Liberal federation, 251 Cooper street, Ottawa," and it is printed by Gauvin Press, of Hull. It contains the policies of the Liberal party. Long

before the bottom of page 5 is reached we see these statements:

> It means adequate pensions. It means better health care, available to all when needed...It means...improving democracy in our political institutions.

It continues:

> The first aim of Liberal policies is a Canadian identity that creates unity without uniformity...
> The second aim of Liberal policies is to increase our national wealth...
> But security, happiness, achievement are not possible for us alone. The fourth aim of Liberal policies is that a growing, progressing, Canada will have a constructive influence for peace and progress throughout the world.

As I say, this statement about the flag appeared on page 5, almost as an afterthought. I have given hon. members the history of it, and I am glad to draw the attention of this house to this point.

Since this flag debate commenced I have spent three different Saturdays in Toronto doing research. I spent one entire morning in the offices of the Toronto *Globe and Mail*, another in the offices of the Toronto Evening *Telegram* and the third in the offices of the Toronto *Daily Star*. I enlisted the services of a very dear friend of mine who served in the first world war and has been suffering from the effects of trench warfare for more than 40 years now. He is a gold medallist in the field of advertising, a man respected in all fields of publicity in Canada. I asked him to note for me all the advertisements which had appeared on behalf of the national Liberal federation in the city of Toronto during the election campaign in 1963, and I have a complete list. With this list in my possession I went to these three newspaper offices and read every one of those Liberal party advertisements which appeared in the three Toronto papers. I have to report to this house that not once was mention made of any change in the flag of this nation.

Mr. Bigg: Same old gang.

Mr. Cowan: On April 8, 1963, we had the election. On the Friday previous, April 5, we had a tremendous meeting of Liberal supporters in the Maple Leaf gardens. I contributed a great deal of money to that meeting and helped make it the success it was. We are supposed to have had 22,000 people present at the Maple Leaf gardens, with an overflow in Massey hall. The Toronto *Globe and Mail* for April 6 said of this meeting on April 5, "Crowd fills gardens and Massey hall. Giant Pearson meeting and the crowd that flocked to the biggest political rally in Canadian history...There was a military band to set the buoyant mood of the evening". But no mention of a flag is made anywhere in that report of the meeting. I sat on the platform and heard every word uttered in Maple Leaf gardens, but not once was there any mention made of a change in our flag.

In the *Globe and Mail* for April 1, 1963, there appeared what are known as teaser ads, but no mention was made of the flag. On April 6 there was a full page ad in the *Globe and Mail* with all our pictures. It said "Here's where decisive government begins. It's time for action. Vote Liberal". But no mention of the flag.

In the Toronto *Star* there is no mention made of a flag in the report of the Liberal rally held in the Maple Leaf gardens nor in the advertising connected therewith. An ad which appeared on April 6 says "Canada needs a majority government."

In the *Telegram* for March 30 our leader is quoted. The report says: he added that the government should spend not a nickel on anything that would not increase production and reduce unemployment. The *Telegram* on April 4 carried a Liberal party advertisement which said "Unless we can elect a government that can restore stability and create the climate for economic expansion, few of the other issues raised in the campaign will be capable of solution. It is first necessary that we elect a stable government with a working majority".

Well, Mr. Speaker, we did not achieve that first necessity, a stable government with a working majority; but the advertisement said that was the first necessity.

The report in the *Telegram* for April 6 in connection with this giant meeting held in Maple Leaf gardens and Massey hall quotes the Prime Minister as saying that it was "the largest and most significant meeting ever held in Canada". Why was no mention made of the flag at the largest and most significant meeting ever held in Canada? The report goes on: "Mr. Pearson said Canada's problems today are too serious to be entrusted to any coalition. He pledged unselfish and effective leadership, not one-man government which breaks apart under strain".

This is the type of report contained in the three Toronto papers to which I have referred, and I can tell this house that no mention was ever made of the flag question. We were told always to vote for a stable government, because there is no alternative to a stable government. We have not got a stable government now, and if there is no alternative

what have we got? That is the question I put to this house at this time.

I would point out there are many references today that "Only by adopting a new and distinctive flag are we going to restore unity to this country. Only by putting up another piece of bunting will we restore unity to this country."

I should like to quote from the front page of the Toronto *Globe and Mail* of August 6, as follows:

> The time has come to reach a decision on the official Canadian flag in the interests of national unity and to give Canadians a much-needed sense of pride and confidence in their country—

That is what Mr. Pearson said.

I should like to point out that I for one have a sense of pride and confidence in this country, as I believe millions and millions of other Canadians have pride and confidence. I have not seen anyone running around with head down, despondent over the fact that we now have the red ensign as the national flag, as it was okayed by the Mackenzie King government in 1924 and again in 1945.

I should like to impress upon you the claim that the Liberal party is supposed to have a mandate in respect of the flag question. We are told that the government of the day has a mandate. I went to the office of the chief electoral officer and spent some time there on two occasions, as well as some time in my office here in the House of Commons doing some research in respect of this so-called mandate. I should like to point out that I am now speaking as though Sherwood Rideout, the late member for Westmorland, were here. The 129 Liberal members in this house do not even have a majority vote in the 129 ridings they represent. If we total up the votes cast against the sitting Liberal members we find they exceed the number cast for the sitting Liberal members. We are told we have a mandate, but I do not see how we can have a mandate on the basis of a minority vote. In looking up the definition of "mandate", it is interesting to find that it means "a clear instruction, authorization or direction." That definition is taken from Webster's third new international dictionary in the parliamentary library. One could also refer to Murray's Encyclopaedic Dictionary, which gives the same definition, and to the 1902 Contemporary Review, December, page 809, which states:

> No practical politician can desire to lay too much stress upon the mandate theory of a general election.

[Mr. Cowan.]

When there are a thousand questions of the day how does one claim to have a mandate on any particular one, particularly when the point at issue has not been mentioned during the course of the campaign?

I should like to refer to an address given yesterday afternoon on the C.B.C. radio hook-up. The program is known to many people in Canada as "Capital Report". Yesterday afternoon Mr. Donald McGillivray of the Southam newspaper service spoke from approximately 2.20 until approximately 2.30. He was speaking on the flag issue. I hope most members heard his address, although I do not suppose many did in view of the fact that members are only able to take vacations on week ends. During the course of Mr. McGillivray's remarks he said:

> Mr. Diefenbaker hasn't got the full support of all members of his party on his flag stand. The Quebec members have been the most unhappy since most of them have little chance of winning on a red ensign platform.

He then went on to say:

> The Conservatives...in their speeches in the Commons have pounded away at two things... And the second is that people believe that the replacement of the red ensign by a new flag is some kind of concession or appeasement to Quebec—
>
> The second is harder to answer because the new flag is, in fact, related to the needs of Quebec. There would be no urgency about changing the flag now if it wasn't for what is happening in Quebec. The Conservatives disagree with him but Mr. Pearson obviously feels deeply that the union jack on the flag is such a standing affront to Quebec that it must be quickly removed if the country is to be kept together.
>
> But this attempt to meet the grievance of one minority group—

I refer to Mr. McGillivray's report because it would be heard from one end of Canada to the other on the C.B.C. network.

I was not in the house on Friday last. I went to Toronto on Friday morning to be present at the opening of the Canadian national exhibition which, I may say, does not enjoy a $47 million subsidy from the federal government but operates on its own. There appeared a report in Saturday's *Globe and Mail* in respect of statements made in the House of Commons on Friday regarding a free vote.

I should like to make some reference to this free vote question. How can we have a free vote in this house when the resolution stands in the names of the Prime Minister of this country and the Minister of Justice? I suggest there could be no free vote under those circumstances. There are individuals in this parliament who hope to be appointed as senators, judges and perhaps to diplomatic

positions. I am not one of those individuals. I am not a lawyer and could not be a judge; I am not a diplomat, so could not be part of the foreign service. I suggest there is no record in Canadian history of a free vote question being introduced in the House of Commons by a prime minister of any day. There have been many free votes, but I suggest it is impossible to have a free vote when the resolution stands in the names of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice. I maintain that in order to have a free vote the resolution should be introduced in the name of someone other than those gentlemen.

Mr. Speaker, if you intend to restrain me I should like to point out that I am dealing with the main resolution.

Mr. Speaker: Without attempting to be too facetious I should like to point out that before we can vote on anything we have to clear up the subamendment. I hope you are going to propose something we can vote on.

Mr. Cowan: I suggest that we vote in favour of the red ensign when dealing with the first clause of the subamendment which reads:

> That the amendment be amended by adding thereto the words:
> "and that in such a plebiscite among the questions to be placed before the people should be the following:
> 1. Are you in favour of the Canadian red ensign?

I ask the voters of Canada to vote yes in answer to that question when the plebiscite is placed before them.

Mr. Speaker, I have so many notes here I will be able to speak for 40 minutes on each and every amendment and subamendment that is proposed. I should like to quote from the front page of the Ottawa *Citizen* of Wednesday, March 13, 1963. The article to which I have reference gave me great encouragement during the last campaign, and gives me a good deal of encouragement now. In the lower right hand corner there is a two-column heading "Pearson doesn't reject red ensign as our flag". I should like to read this report, by Southam news services, under that heading:

> Pearson doesn't reject red ensign as our flag.
> 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.
> This was Liberal party policy and in mentioning it to a group of ethnic editors in Winnipeg he said that "there are people in Canada who think the red ensign can be mistaken for another emblem", such as the naval ensign or the Australian 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. But he did want a search to be made immediately for a unique Canadian flag.

That quotation is from the Ottawa *Citizen* of March 13, 1963, within four weeks of the election in 1963 when this minority government was placed in office. I should also like to refer to a dispatch which appeared in the Toronto *Globe and Mail* on May 16, 1962, written by Thomas Sloan who was reviewing meetings that took place at Chicoutimi. We have this report of a Chicoutimi meeting:

> The fact, however, that the flag is still an issue and not merely a means of getting applause was forcibly brought home to Mr. Pearson at his final meeting of the Quebec trip Monday night. There the Liberal member in the last House of Commons for the riding of Lapointe, Augustin Brassard, publicly pledged that if a Liberal government did not adopt a national flag in two years, "I invite you to ask me to return to private life."

Of course the next month Mr. Brassard was invited to return to private life.

> He received hearty applause for that statement, as he did for another, which was perhaps a little more embarrassing for the Liberal party: "All across this country, Mr. Pearson has promised a distinctive national flag, without a union jack." The Liberal chief backed quickly away from that issue, contenting himself with saying in his address that he favoured "a distinctive flag for Canada which could not be confused with that of any other country." Further than that Mr. Pearson would not go, and he refused to make any comment at all on Mr. Brassard's statement after the meeting.

In referring to these statements with regard to the red ensign, I have shown you that it was not discussed at all in vast sections of the country. I make the statement to the house that this country has not given a mandate to anybody to alter the red ensign, our beloved symbol of loyalty and faith in the future. The *Globe and Mail* of last Saturday reports the hon. member for Villeneuve in this way:

> Mr. Caouette regretted that statements had been made mostly by representatives of the Canadian west, that the proposed flag was nothing more than an attempt to please Quebec.

Of course the hon. member for Villeneuve does not know much about Ontario. He has not got a member from that area. No doubt he paid attention to the loyal speakers from the Canadian west, but I can assure him that on this score the feeling is just as strong in the province of Ontario as it is in the

Canadian west. He is reported as having also said:

> We want Canadian symbols on our national emblem—not the symbols of France or the symbols of England.

What a sacrifice he would be making. The union jack is there, if he wishes to call it a symbol of England. Any symbol of France is not as prominent as the English symbol, as he prefers to call it, but he is willing to make the great sacrifice of ditching two things in order to get rid of one.

I would point out that when we are asked to vote on two flags we have this statement to bear in mind which was made by the Prime Minister on May 26, 1964 appearing in *Hansard* at page 3581, to a question by the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm (Mr. Pigeon):

> Mr. Speaker, there can be only one national flag—

We who like the red ensign and who are willing to scrap for the red ensign agree that there can be only one national flag. A second flag simply muddies the water. My time is running short, but I hope to be able to speak again on this matter when the subamendment has been disposed of. On May 19 the *Globe and Mail* made this comment with regard to the action of the Prime Minister:

> He has chosen to press the divisive issue of a national flag at a time when emotions are already deeply stirred by the question of national unity—or rather, by the lack of unity. . . .It will be a long job, and in the course of it, Mr. Pearson may well find himself persuaded by the people that he made the wrong choice at the wrong time.

I am a convinced Liberal, a man who has always worked for the Liberal party except that I would not vote for Hepburn Liberalism in the provincial field. That is one time I voted Conservative; I voted for Dr. Minerva Reid. She was a prohibitionist Conservative, and they are very few and far between. I voted for Dr. Minerva Reid in Toronto High Park and I make no apologies for having supported her, even though she did not win the election. I say to the house as a convinced Liberal that the red ensign is Canada's national flag, that it should remain as Canada's national flag, and that if any changes are made in it it will lead to a division such as this country has never seen.

The Liberal government won a Pyrrhic victory in 1956 in the pipe line debate. We have not secured an over-all majority in the country since in four successive general elections. The problem is, who won what victory in 1956? Are we going to be like the Bourbons who "never remember and never forget?" Are we going to try to force this divisive issue at this time and have to watch four general elections or more go by without an over-all majority for the Liberal party?

I would ask all members of the house to support the red ensign, which is Canada's national emblem and is known as such from coast to coast. We have not got here in this country a roofless ruin. We are a nation that was built with the support of Great Britain and the support of France.

Some speakers talk about now being the time to cut the umbilical cord that they say is tying us to Great Britain, but even if they cut the umbilical cord they will still want British investment. Canada is the biggest field for British investment. All they want to do is change the family name. I am proud of the family and nation into which I was born. I want to see the jack continue on the red ensign and I believe that to do otherwise will create a division in this country that generations yet unborn will be unable to heal.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rémi Paul (Berthier-Maskinongé-Delanaudière): Mr. Speaker, for several weeks now the house has been debating the flag issue, a debate which should have taken place more than 100 years ago when the Fathers of Confederation gathered to prepare, study and draw the confederation act, as they were anxious to build a great country which would become Canada, an international power. Indeed, by the active part played by its people in the making of a world still faced with the problems of peace, but a world which will finally find the peace promised to men of good will by the Infant in the manger.

In the darkest times in its history, Canada found amidst its people the strength, energy, courage, and generous men who did everything in order to save the Canadian democracy.

Since the beginning of the twentieth century, two terrible conflicts threatened with complete destruction the whole world as well as democracy, pre-eminent source of freedom; political, religious, social and individual freedom, freedom of the press, of speech, of action.

In those stormy periods, many Canadians, both French and English speaking, took refuge under the same flag, the flag of freedom, and there are many who sleep in a soil they loved to the point of martyrdom, smiling in their supreme sacrifice and repeating these words: "We die, but freedom and democracy do not".

I want to pay tribute to all those who gave their lives for the triumph of freedom and

democracy. I salute with respect those many veterans; we have the honour of having in this house a few of them who bear the scars of their courage and heroism.

Those veterans looked up to the red ensign to find the courage necessary to face the enemy. In the thick of the battle, when enemy bullets were whizzing on all sides and their comrades in arms were falling like ripe fruits, those valiant soldiers looked up to that flag which inspired them to charge the enemy with even greater courage and determination. They fought blindly for us, our children, our political institutions, our freedom and the survival of democracy.

Who could blame those veterans for being attached to the red ensign which for them is the very symbol of their present existence? Veterans, I respect you, I admire your courage and I understand you. You have the right to protest because some people would take away from you the red ensign you have coloured with your own blood and which, unfortunately, was too often used to bury a comrade in arms who had gallantly died on the battlefield.

My English speaking compatriots rightly love this flag which reminds them of their mother country. For them, the red ensign symbolizes the history of England, the triumph of the strong over the weak; it represents British institutions and the extension into the North American continent of the English civilization and the British culture which largely contributed to the greatness and prosperity of Canada.

For a great many new Canadians the red ensign means freedom; it is the flag under which they were welcomed in Canada, land of hospitality. They are rightly attached to the flag which meant the promised land of hope and, in some cases, deliverance.

That English flag, the French Canadians cherished it, too. Who, if not the French Canadians, made it possible for England to keep Canada in 1813, at the time of the American aggression? My compatriots cherished this red ensign at the battles of Verdun and Vimy, and just a few weeks ago we were proud to celebrate the twentieth anniversary of the landing in France, and the road to victory was paved by a French-Canadian unit, the Chaudière regiment.

As a citizen from the province of Quebec I could remain indifferent to this matter of a national flag inasmuch as, since 1948, Quebec has had its own flag which the then premier of the province, Hon. Maurice Duplessis, took from the Crémazie monument, in the Canadian metropolis, where it stood motionless. He gave it a new historical meaning and raised it on the Quebec parliament building in February 1948. The fleur-de-lis banner, which the French had abandoned in the mud of the plains of Abraham battlefields, after having been defeated by Wolfe and his men, and which was hiding in its folds the shame of defeat, that banner flies proudly today in the province of Quebec, where everybody salutes it with respect, pride and dignity.

My French ancestors became attached to the fleur-de-lis flag which, for them, was the symbol of freedom as well as the expression of French culture and civilization, and when they abandoned that flag on the smoky battlefield of the plains of Abraham, the French were defeated but not vanquished.

The Roman Catholic clergy instilled into my French speaking compatriots respect for the strongest, love for the new Canadian country and courage in defeat. The French Canadians gathered around the parish church, and faithful to their mother tongue, their culture and their faith, they worked to rebuild the Canadian nation. The French and English cultures found today in Canada are the basis of the moral wealth which our country offers to the rest of the world.

For almost a century, English and French Canadians have lived together under the confederation pact, and they sometimes worked hard to build up this country; like our forefathers, we have laboured to attain national unity. This national unity is deeply rooted in the confederation pact itself, and when every Canadian citizen lives up to the letter and the spirit of the confederation pact, then Canada will know the true national unity which, as far back as 1864, was the proud and sincere hope of Macdonald and Cartier, as well as of all the fathers of the Canadian confederation.

This national unity is going through a real crisis today, because of the flag debate, which may have disastrous results, by arousing nine provinces against the province of Quebec. I protest against the allegations of my English speaking fellow members when they say that this idea of a distinctive flag is one more concession to the province of Quebec. French Canadians never wanted any special privilege. They merely claimed, as they still do today—though somewhat more noisily—recognition of their rights, and they do not want to be considered all the time the cause of everything that happens in this country.

Why try to create the impression in this house and throughout the country that the government, by introducing the flag resolution, only wanted to satisfy French Canadians.

Personally, I have never been as Canadian as I am today, but if this discussion on the flag goes on in the same vein, I shall understand even better why so many of my French speaking compatriots are Quebeckers rather than Canadians.

If I were convinced that the government, in introducing its proposal, wanted to curry favour with French Canadians, I would vote against the choice of a distinctive flag because I consider that national unity must be founded on understanding, co-operation, harmony, good will and justice.

In order to favour national unity, the government has no right to grant one or several privileges to a particular ethnic group, even if this group is French Canadian. The government has a duty to treat all citizens on an equal footing, by allowing each and every one to use its rights in order to make possible the complete development of the Canadian personality.

I protest against those who claim that the fleur-de-lis reminds French Canadians of the most sad and shameful pages in their history. I will be careful here not to accuse my English speaking compatriots who would perhaps be ashamed also if they looked back on the behaviour of their ancestors. I am not ashamed of my history, I respect it; I also respect the historic past of my English speaking compatriots, I am as proud to be a French Canadian as those who claim with equal emphasis that they are English Canadians. I do not disown the historic past of my ancestors and of all the builders of this country when I contemplate the advisability of giving Canada a distinctive flag. The past must be the source and the inspiration of the present courage to determine the well-being and the future life of Canadians.

The "Pearson flag" proposal may be questioned by many, but personally I congratulate the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) for having the courage to put this question before the house. However, I blame the right hon. Prime Minister for trying to make a political football out of this important matter of a distinctive flag.

Why did the Prime Minister introduce his resolution concerning the choice of a distinctive flag with so much clumsiness? Did the restricted group of newspapermen invited by the head of government and who were the first informed of the choice of the right hon. Prime Minister deserve his confidence to such a degree that he neglected to inform in the first place the hon. members of the exact significance of his flag proposal? Because of his behaviour, the Prime Minister prepared the stalemate with which the House of Commons is now faced.

Last May the Prime Minister stated that during the discussion on the flag everyone would be allowed to vote freely regardless of the party line. Later the Prime Minister indicated that he would consider that matter as a vote of confidence in his government. Last Friday the Prime Minister reverted to his original statement to allow a free vote to his supporters on the flag question.

In my group we are free to vote for or against the choice of a distinctive flag. Although the Prime Minister wanted to consider that question of a distinctive flag as a vote of confidence in his government, I was going to vote for a distinctive flag. But I would not want in any way that my vote be interpreted, in due time, as an unqualified approval of the policies of the Prime Minister and of his government. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, putting all partisanship aside, I shall vote for a distinctive flag and in due course against the adoption of the union jack as a symbol of our allegiance to the commonwealth. In accepting the explanation given by the Prime Minister on the resolution concerning the union jack, I ask him whether he would not see fit to introduce a third resolution to indicate our allegiance to the great United Nations family and a fourth to proclaim our participation in NATO activities, etc.?

The house has under consideration an amendment submitted by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) and a subamendment moved by the hon. member for Regina City (Mr. More).

I wish to point out first of all that I respect the opinion any hon. member may have on the flag issue. Some are shocked because a distinctive flag is to be substituted for the red ensign. If they feel it is their bounden duty to fight to maintain the red ensign I say to them: follow the dictates of your conscience. Although I do not share their opinion on the matter, I appreciate their feeling and I will not accuse them of fanaticism or racism, unless proof to the contrary is produced. At first sight, the subamendment moved by the hon. member for Regina City seems to offer an interesting solution to put an end to what looks like a marathon debate on the choice of a distinctive flag.

What could be the result of a plebiscite in the form suggested by the hon. member for Regina City? In my opinion, a majority vote on this issue would be the surest way to proclaim the red ensign the most popular flag in Canada. Would that mean that the red

ensign would be the choice of the majority of the Canadian people? I suggest that it would not, Mr. Speaker. The rabid supporters of the red ensign would vote solidly in the affirmative on the first question asked: "Are you in favour of the Canadian red ensign?" The vote of those who favour a distinctive flag would be divided according to the preference shown for one or the other of the three choices suggested under the subamendment of the hon. member for Regina City.

To really reflect the feeling of the people, question No. 1 on the plebiscite should be amended to read as follows: "Are you for or against the Canadian red ensign as the Canadian flag? If not, which flag do you prefer? Then, the choice should be made among the three other suggestions contained in the subamendment proposed by the hon. member for Regina City. In its present form, the subamendment is dangerous because, on the one hand, it tends to confirm a principle, that of partisanship in favour of the Canadian red ensign, whereas with the three other questions which would be included in a referendum, those in favour of a distinctive national flag would be divided into three categories and the total results of one or the other of the three other categories or selections could be taken into account to try and upset the results obtained from those who would support the Canadian red ensign.

There is also the danger that a plebiscite would separate the younger generation from that of forty years and over. The younger generation, both French and English-speaking, wants a distinctive flag at any cost. As far as national unity is concerned, there would then be a greater cleavage between French and English Canadians. Such a plebiscite would give rise to controversies with regard to race, language, history and religion. Is there a country in the world which was ever called upon to choose a national flag by means of a plebiscite?

I feel that this is the responsibility of members of parliament, who were elected in a democratic way to look after the interests of their constituents, to consider and solve problems, and to adopt or reject administrative matters brought before the house. If the Canadian people were to settle every contentious, serious and important matter by means of a plebiscite, what would be the use of having members of parliament?

Personally, I am not afraid to assume here in the House of Commons my responsibilities in that connection, and if my constituents feel that I was mistaken in taking the stand I intend to take, they will be free to dispense with my services in due course.

Next October, we will celebrate the centennial of the Charlottetown conference, which laid the foundations of the Canadian confederation. Is it not time more than ever for Canada to have its own distinctive flag on the eve of these centennial celebrations?

When I talk of a distinctive flag, I do not necessarily mean the flag with the three maple leaves, but if it is the only distinctive flag proposed to us, I will vote for it. Occasions of discord, dispute, discussion and flagrant injustice are too numerous and too often undermine national unity, for me to support the idea of choosing a flag by means of a national plebiscite.

I have always faithfully voiced in this house the needs, aspirations and feelings of my constituents of Berthier-Maskinongé-Delanaudière who wish, with a few exceptions, that Canada be granted a distinctive flag, without publicly discussing the matter as it would be done if a referendum were held because, in my opinion, this would be disastrous.

It is quite difficult to deal with details without stating my views on the main subject. Mr. Speaker, I am conscious of the bearing of the statement which I want to make on the amendment proposed by the Leader of the Opposition. I am perhaps risking my political career, but in politics and as a practising lawyer, I have never accepted any half-measure, any compromise with my conscience, and that is why I regret to disagree with my leader on the flag issue, and I must add that I will also vote against his amendment.

In taking such a stand, I am renewing my approval of the political platform of the Progressive Conservative party, which also advocated the choice of a distinctive Canadian flag. As early as 1958, I promised the men and women of my constituency that I would strive to give Canada a distinctive flag, and if such opportunity is afforded to me by the Liberal party, I will lay aside partisanship and honour my pledge to my electors; I shall then have the satisfaction which stems from the fulfilment of one's duty.

On January 23, 1961, the hon. member for St. Boniface, Mr. Laurier Régnier, submitted a resolution which was discussed by the House of Commons and which read as follows:

That, in the opinion of this house, the government should consider the advisability of introducing a measure to provide for a referendum concerning the adoption of a Canadian flag.

Canadian Flag

That the questions submitted in said referendum be as follows—Are you in favour of a flag consisting of (a) a green maple leaf on a red and white field, or (b) the red ensign?

At the time, my party should have followed up the Régnier resolution; if it had we would not experience today such troubled circumstances, which may jeopardize not only national unity but also the confederation pact, should the gist of some speeches remain the same. What was bad in 1961 cannot, in my opinion, be better today.

I am critical of my party for worshipping today what it rejected yesterday. This discussion on the choice of a Canadian flag, as it is being carried on, is blameworthy, and I hope that before long we will stop being ridiculous and have enough courage to assume our responsibilities and put an end to this deadlock.

Let us put the interests of Canada above those of our respective parties. Let us put an end to those speeches which contribute more and more to racial prejudice. The people of Canada expect their elected representatives to take definite action on the flag issue. Let us try to find a compromise so that finally Canada may show to the world that is has a distinctive national flag, a flag which will strengthen national unity and enable our country to play the role the world expects it to play.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I repeat that I will vote against the amendment to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Regina City, against the amendment of the right hon. Leader of the Opposition and in favour of a distinctive national flag. The statement I have just made binds only myself; in no way does it bind my Conservative colleagues. They may vote, as I am sure they will, according to the dictates of their conscience. I will have no bitterness against anyone who does not share my views because I am sure even if we resort to different means that everyone here seeks to make Canada stronger and united in spite of the diversity of its ethnical composition. The people of Canada hope for the day when their country will be strong and great and when wheat will grow taller over our graves.

[*Text*]

Mrs. Jean Wadds (Grenville-Dundas): Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in this debate with mixed feelings, as many members of this house have done. First of all, I feel no apology is needed for the length of this debate. This is a subject with regard to which members quite rightly wish to clarify their positions.

[Mr. Paul.]

Since it is a highly emotional subject it cannot be dealt with in a hurried way and no one should be expected to avoid expressing his or her deep personal convictions in relation to it. We have already seen various changes in opinion—changes in the tone and temperature of the debate as it has continued —and it would indeed be foolish of any government to expect so serious a matter as this to be dealt with in haste or in a peremptory fashion.

Certainly, we have all been able to profit from the eloquent speeches made thus far. I have in mind contributions such as have been made by former ministers—among them the former ministers of national defence, forestry, labour and finance. My hon. friend from Digby-Annapolis-Kings (Mr. Nowlan), was the latest of these hon. gentlemen to speak and his contribution, like those of his colleagues before him, could not fail to be helpful. These are all serious, experienced men with deep-seated convictions. I know, of course, that there have been other contributions of a high calibre, many of which I have heard. They are too numerous to mention individually, but I must refer to one speech, that made by the former minister of agriculture, the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Hamilton). He too remarked on the sincerity of many of the speeches made on the subject and drew attention to the dignity they had given to this debate. His own speech added to that dignity, supporting as it did the suggestion made by the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) that a small committee of this house be set up in an attempt to find some way of ending the unfortunate predicament in which we now find ourselves.

I agree with a previous speaker who said it was the responsibility not only of the government but of every member of this house to try to find ways and means of dealing reasonably and wisely with this sensitive subject. I regret very much that this debate is taking place at all at the present time. It has been given priority over other matters which we should be discussing as soon as possible. Despite the well ordered, well worded and conscientious expressions of opinion we have heard, this is a subject on which feelings can easily be aroused; it is a subject upon which misinterpretation can easily be placed and with regard to which misunderstanding can easily arise. The unfortunate incident which occurred this afternoon while one of our members was addressing the house is striking evidence that we are discussing a dangerous and divisive theme.

The hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Starr) was speaking honestly and from his heart when he said it makes him bleed, as a Canadian of other than French or English origin, to find the two founding races fighting between themselves and using this contentious subject for political and partisan reasons. I am one of a great many of English origin who feel the same way as the hon. member for Ontario does. And I am sure there are just as many Canadians of French origin who feel sadness and discouragement at the increasing tensions.

We have a serious responsibility here, Mr. Speaker. An elected group of people naturally have a responsibility to deal fairly with, and solve by discussion and debate, problems which less civilized groups formerly solved by force. But particularly in a federal government we meet here with the recognized responsibility of having to deal with an enormous variety in geography, with many races and religions. We must assume that more tolerance and understanding is demanded of us. We in a federal parliament, to paraphrase a great Britisher, "were not sent here to witness the breakup of a federation". This unfortunately is not an extremist fear as exemplified by the many violent comments and actions. We have the best opportunity of any Canadians to get to know other parts of Canada, to hear about them, to learn of their feelings and their problems. We should therefore be in the best position to give leadership in strengthening confederation.

One cannot help but arrive at a dismal frame of mind when one hears on every hand disrespect for and lack of faith in parliament. I believe the general attitude to parliament has never been at such a dangerously low ebb. We all know from the record of other countries what happens under such circumstances. Respect for law and order deteriorates. People refuse to listen to those who have responsible positions and turn to something new and different. We know that criticism is natural, indeed desirable, and should be constant. But cynicism is not desirable. I am seriously concerned that during this past year the general attitude to government seems to me to have grown steadily worse. We in this chamber seem to have done nothing but disappoint and worry and confuse other Canadians.

We find ourselves in this comfortable chamber very much in the same position as students who have had the opportunity to be sent to a very expensive and very much admired boarding school in that, once here, we spend our time debating the merits of our ancestry rather than getting down to work and studying the subjects which would be useful in solving the problems ahead of us. This is why I speak without any enthusiasm for this debate itself. This is not a subject which should have emergency priority; quite the reverse. While the country is divided on problems of health and welfare, on fiscal and monetary and tax problems which affect the daily life and well-being of each citizen, we are delaying facing this division. We are increasing it, because the longer it goes on the worse it gets and the greater is the need. We are daily opening new divisions and lessening the chances of unity.

The symbol of unity, Mr. Speaker, is not unity itself, any more than the skeleton of an elephant is strength. It needs the sinews on it and the blood in it to have any life or spirit. I think a Canadian flag is most important. I think it is so important that it cannot be forced. I think it is so important that it would be a tragedy if it became the symbol of disunity and, as has already been suggested, a political symbol.

Has there ever been a time before, Mr. Speaker, when we have heard such alarming and shocking talk—talk of one part of Canada separating from another? Have we ever before heard talk of the breakup of the commonwealth, talk of republicanism? This is indeed shocking, Mr. Speaker, in such a rich and young country as ours, which has had an excellent upbringing of law and order, where we should be full of enthusiasm, of optimism, of good will and good temper. I do not believe it is good enough to make political excuses. I do not agree that this is the fault of a minority government. Many countries have operated constantly and for many years with minority governments. A minority government does not need to be ineffective. Undoubtedly, Mr. Speaker, there are people in many parts of this vast and varied country who would like things to be different from what they are at the present time. With time, study and attention I would hope that many of their wishes and hopes will be fulfilled. But this is no reason at all to disrupt our national stability and make another group of people dissatisfied. What kind of future, Mr. Speaker, can we hope to face if we are going to follow a "rob Peter to pay Paul" technique?

The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson) made a wise and mature sounding statement when he said, while speaking in this debate some weeks ago—I believe this closely resembles his words—that, "no one's tears

are to be ignored", the inference being that the striving people of one of our provinces, the sufferers from the yet unnamed and subtle revolution, should receive sympathy. I most heartily agree with this, but I am also much concerned with, and my sympathy equally goes out for, those who will suffer, and are suffering at the present time, from the ruthless and most unexpected discarding of things which they hold very dear.

If the hon. member for Leeds is right—and on this particular point I think he is right indeed—when he says that every tear is important, then I would suggest to him and his party that serious consideration be given to the tears of loss that many people will shed as a result of this proposal. It seems to me cruelest of all to toy with the intangibles of life. The hurts of extra taxation, the hurts of taking from people material things, can be repaired. They can be reasoned with; they can even be discontinued. But you cannot reason with someone who has lost a son or a father or a brother and who wants to keep what is to them—and no one can change it—the symbol of that sacrifice.

Canadians, Mr. Speaker, are very reasonable people. We are called reasonable people throughout the world. Canadians will compromise, will understand and will give in to a majority if they are sure it is a majority. But it is only fair to give them time to find this out. Pushing this debate, threatening no recess of parliament until it is through, gives an unpleasant impression of coercion which is neither useful nor sensible. If any unity can come, if any unity can be achieved by creating a distinctive flag, then by all means let us put our minds toward achieving it. But let us not merely replace one dissatisfied group of people with another equally dissatisfied group. Are all the facts of history going to be changed? Are we suddenly going to arrive at a new, mysterious understanding just because we fly a different flag which no one has ever seen before and which many people dislike? Far from it.

I am intrigued, Mr. Speaker, with the new horizons of understanding and the possibilities we now face for tolerance to and understanding of other countries and nations of the world. How are we Canadians going to achieve this understanding of other countries and other nations if we cannot reach some compromise between ourselves, and understand one another? How can we give the leadership to attain this goal of a modern world if we cannot get along together? I do not think that the presently proposed flag is any contribution toward solving our problems in any way whatsoever. I regret to say that I find this whole debate ill-starred and ill-timed. It seems to me that we will not only end up with the cart before the horse, but we will end up with no horse at all. We are dealing with a catalyst, in itself a harmless bit of material, but once dropped into the chemicals smouldering in Canada, no one can possibly foresee the result. Mr. Speaker, such a gamble is not the course of wisdom, not even the course of common sense.

Mr. D. R. Gundlock (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, in rising today to take part in this debate concerning the flag, a plebiscite and the particular design proposed, I find myself slightly confused. I prepared my speech some time ago. However, at the end of last week there was an obvious change in the attitudes of the leaders in this house, with some hope of co-operation. I may say this is a very welcome attitude.

A great deal has been said about this flag issue throughout the country, and particularly in this house. Many volumes of *Hansard* have been filled with speeches against and in favour of the proposed design. I should like to quote some of those words later on today. Many representatives of the people of Canada have risen in their seats in this chamber accepting the right, privilege and duty to express the feelings and views of their constituents. Many of these individuals have appeared as delegates rather than members.

As I have said, I was happy to witness the change of heart, if I may use those words, on the part of the leaders of the parties in this house, and particularly on the part of the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson). At an earlier date the suggestion was made that the vote on this issue would be a free vote. I think that suggestion was made even before the resolution was placed before us. After the resolution was made public we were informed quite clearly that the government would stand or fall on this issue. We were told we would have to accept the specific design proposed, whether we were in favour of it or not. Many viewpoints have been expressed by representatives of the people, and as time has passed there has been an obvious change. The Prime Minister I think finally began to realize that Canadian people were not willing to accept a specific design without having the opportunity of expressing their feelings. Many individuals have taken exception to the proposed design while others are prepared to accept it. Some people like the design, although I think they

represent a minority, particularly in my riding.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could point out the feeling in my riding by reading some of the vast number of letters that have been written by representatives of town councils in places such as Cardston, Lethbridge and Nobleford, as well as by secretaries of the various branches of the Canadian Legion. I could go into great detail to point out how strongly people feel about the red ensign. I must admit that there are some, particularly the younger people, who favour a flag with a maple leaf design, either that proposed by the resolution or one that has been suggested since, having only one maple leaf. The percentage of people in my riding who favour the design proposed by the Prime Minister is very small, approximately 8 per cent. The group which favoured a single maple leaf design amounted to approximately 16 per cent. The great majority favoured the retention of the red ensign. The great majority of the people in my riding are willing to co-operate, and will accept a distinctively Canadian flag other than the red ensign, although one having a similar design.

Mr. Speaker, very much has been said about this country being divided in two, one side in favour of the government proposed design and the other in favour of the retention of the red ensign. The meetings which took place last week apparently resulted in a willingness to co-operate. I am sure a solution to the obvious difficulty has not been found but I am very pleased to observe this willingness to co-operate.

Mr. Speaker, I must apologize for taking up the time of this house, but as I pointed out earlier, I feel it is my duty and privilege as a delegate of the people in my riding to bring their views to this house. It seems apparent at this stage that there will now be a free vote in this house, and I must point out, that being the case, that the people will not accept a distinctively Canadian flag adopted by this parliament without having the opportunity of publicly expressing their opinions. They wish to have some voice in the choice of a design, and I think that is their right, Mr. Speaker.

I did mention the free vote, Mr. Speaker, and I should like to say a few words about that subject. This means something to the Canadian people and to members of the house but, quite frankly, what it really means I am not too sure. I said earlier that the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) indicated a long time ago there would be a free vote. Then he reversed his position and said the government would stand or fall on this issue. Last Friday he said there would be a free vote. Members of the house know that a free vote means certain things. If you look back through history and examine the precedents you will find that a free vote really does not mean a vote on something brought forward by the Prime Minister of the country and seconded by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau). How can the house vote freely on a resolution brought forward in this manner? I sincerely hope this can be so. I am very optimistic about the trend that negotiations between the party leaders have taken and the trend that the debate in the house is taking, but I fail to see how we can really expect a free vote on a certain design at this late date.

I said earlier that there are people who are quite willing to have a distinctive flag. In fact, generally speaking I think all Canadians are quite willing to have a distinctive flag although their ideas as to the design may vary. As I came up to parliament hill this morning I noticed the flags of the commonwealth nations on display. There are many beautiful flags there and some I am quite sure we would like, but I was quite proud to notice the Canadian red ensign flying there. I thought it looked very beautiful and there are many people in Canada and many members of the house who think the same way.

I think the designs set forth in the sub-amendment are suitable for presentation to the public in a plebiscite so they may make their choice. As far as I am concerned, what I think I would probably do would be to take the red ensign and replace the union jack in the corner with the complete red ensign. There would then be a lot of room in the fly for green maple leaves, red maple leaves, a big golden maple leaf or a peace pipe as has been suggested by certain Indians. The views of the Indians have had very little representation in this house. I believe I have mentioned before that I represent the largest Indian reservation in Canada, the Blood reserve at Cardston, Alberta, and among my constituents is an Indian who is a member of the other place. These Indians have very strong views in this matter.

There are other Indians very close to Ottawa on the Six Nations reserve who pride themselves on having been allies of the Queen for many years. They consider themselves to be a nation and feel that they should be heard. They also pride themselves on the fact that many, many years ago they formed the first successful league of nations known

to the world, and I think they should be complimented for this. They have their ideas about designs for a flag if there is to be a new one and have suggested that a peace pipe might be included in the design; but not for one moment have they ever considered doing away with the union jack completely. In the opinion of many Canadians this is one symbol that must be included in any new design.

I have found that in the interval since the flag debate began up to the present time many people who were actually in favour of a new design, and particularly in favour of the one presented by the government, have been having second thoughts about the matter. I have realized from speaking to them that they have had little conception of what the union jack really meant, not only to the various provinces and areas of the country but to Canada as a whole. I could go into great detail in talking about the various crosses that make up the union jack, but I will content myself by pointing out that when you honestly and sincerely sit down with people and discuss this matter at length and in depth you find that many who had strong feelings earlier in favour of the new flag do not feel that way at this time, and quite rightly so. You talk to them about expressing the Christian idea in our flag and having a Christian emblem and many people ask what you mean. When you discuss this matter with people who do not understand and have not taken the trouble to find out, their reaction is one of amazement and they have very little criticism for the ensign. As a matter of fact, they wish they had not been so sure that they wanted to get rid of it.

I said earlier that much has been said in this debate. I should like to quote particularly a statement made by the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette) in concluding his speech. As found on page 6532 of *Hansard*, he said:

> I say and repeat that we have everything to gain by remaining within confederation. We will be better off financially, and the opposite is untrue.

That is what I want to say to the house. I commend the hon. member for bringing this point to the attention of the house. There are many others in the house who feel the same way, myself in particular. I am very glad that such a statement has been made because there has been so much talk about the differences between east and west and increasing the cleavage between the races. I deplore this kind of talk. Words such as I quoted from *Hansard* a moment ago are what we need in this debate and every other debate in the house. It is this sort of co-operation which crosses party lines and races, Mr. Speaker, which will bring us forward not only to the designation of a distinctive flag but on so many other matters that face Canada today.

I wanted to point out as well, Mr. Speaker, along the same line, that there has been a great deal said about the cleavage between the races, the differences between east and west. It has been said that maple leaves do not grow west of the great lakes and that there should be all kinds of other symbols on our flag. I mentioned that in so far as the Indians are concerned we could have a peace pipe or a beaver. We could have many other things. Frankly, I like the maple leaf design very much, but not particularly the three leaf design. I believe it would be better to have a single leaf design. In spite of this adherence to the maple leaf I just cannot see throwing away the emblems of our heritage. In my opinion, we are just like a family. It does not hurt the younger members or any members of a family to have some sort of respect for their elders. Some people take exception to the fact that we want to keep our ties with certain countries. I know there can be a lot of arguments advanced and a lot of red herrings drawn across the path, but the fact we have the British North America Act which grants certain rights to people is a rather unique situation in this world today. It is something of which we ought to be very proud. If it had not been for the protection of the union jack I doubt very much if we would be in this house or have the British parliamentary system of which we are so proud. It must be a good one because it is about the oldest parliamentary system surviving in this world today.

Certainly, this constitution was given to us under the union jack and guaranteed to us by the union jack. It was given to us at a time when we certainly needed a guarantee. I just cannot see how the Canadian people can scrap this sort of thing and along with it the fleur-de-lis. When we talk about certain laws and principles, we must recognize our heritage from France. We have it in our language, not only in French Canada but in our English language. If you look for the definition of a word in the dictionary you often find that it is a derivative of a French word. I am speaking frankly and very honestly right now. It is difficult for me to understand French Canadians wanting to throw away the fleur-de-lis and the union jack, if for no other reason than their mother tongue

and the protection and guarantees which account for their very existence today.

I should like to say also, Mr. Speaker, that I am very optimistic at this point. I think that before long we will have co-operation which will not only bring an end to this debate but may even lead to some co-operation on the design of the flag. I have tried to point out time and time again that we are not adamant. I do not believe there is anyone in Canada who would not be willing to co-operate a little bit on a design for a distinctive flag provided, of course, that we keep certain emblems. We have noticed students travelling across the country, many being present here in Ottawa, and as a matter of fact in the galleries. I was back in my area, in the city of Lethbridge, for a couple of days. I was not on holidays, as I hoped to be, but I attended a civic reception. In that civic reception were 20 high school students from the city of Montreal who were visiting 20 different homes in the city of Lethbridge. As a matter of fact I sat beside the premier of Alberta, Premier Manning. I do not mean to give the impression that I am any more than personally friendly with Premier Manning, because he is of a different political stripe than I am.

I have always felt about Premier Manning in the same fashion as was indicated by the prime minister of Iceland. He was holidaying in Banff and I should like to quote from the *Globe and Mail* for August 12 a statement he made:

> Prime Minister Bjarni Benediktsson, of Iceland, holidaying here during a cross-Canada journey, says he is puzzled by the Alberta political situation.
>
> "There's nobody against the government," he said. "It's rather an odd situation when you have a 63-seat government and only three opposition members—and so far I have discovered only one person who openly supports the Social Credit party."

I am only quoting this, Mr. Speaker, to point out that I am not that kind of politician. I do admire our premier, though, and I did attend this civic reception with him. These students were there. This was a good thing. The students were visiting 20 homes in the city of Lethbridge. I have not heard of another city in Canada that is carrying on this type of program. I am very proud of it. I mentioned something about co-operation, and here is a very good example of it. Upon further investigation I found that this was not an isolated instance, but an exchange of students took place every two weeks from the time school closed until it opened. The public school board and the separate school board of Lethbridge co-operate in sending 20 students to Montreal and they are replaced by Montreal students who go to the homes these students have left. I am sure that this type of co-operation will bring about the understanding that Canadians need.

In spite of the extreme partisanship that my constituents have they are trying hard to understand other people's viewpoints, and not only are they trying but they are doing something about it in a very concrete manner. This is the way we will make progress on this matter. I would like to say I was never prejudiced, but there was a time during this debate when I almost was prejudiced. However, I am glad I was very patient and, as I said earlier, I feel much happier now.

Some 25 years ago I remember installing a heating system in my house. I ordered the apparatus from Montreal. It was a good deal, almost as good a deal as I could have had other places, and I felt as a true Canadian then, at a time when I had not the slightest idea I would ever be standing in this chamber talking about different flag designs, plebiscites and everything else. But I have always had that little feeling for my country and I am proud to stand here today and point out what my constituents think. It we talk a little more I think we will arrive at a distinctive flag that will make many Canadians happy and feel it is what it should be.

Surely the Prime Minister, the government and all hon. members opposite will listen to this sort of plea, and I put it in the form of a plea, that we do this thing. If we do we will not find complete agreement in every part of the house but we will have sufficient agreement so that we can go ahead and give the Canadian people a distinctive flag. Frankly, as I said earlier, I believe the people probably should have a choice, and various designs can easily be worked out when we come to that point. Some choices are indicated in the subamendment and others may be incorporated.

This is something I could not say several weeks ago because at that time this proposal was, to me, a political one. The three maple leaf design was definitely a political design and at that time I could not imagine its being associated with anything but a political flag because of the manner in which it was introduced. It was the design of one person, the leader of the Liberal party; but now I am happy to see the progress we have made.

Some people have been critics of this debate and have called it a filibuster, but if we in the great Conservative party had not taken this stand—and I do not agree it has been a

filibuster—we would not have reached our present point of progress. There is a much more happy atmosphere in spite of all the things that have been said, and if this party is to go down in history as being accused of a filibuster I emphasize once more I am glad to have taken part in it because, without it, we would not be at the point where we are today. I look forward to a time in the very near future when we will have a distinctive flag that will unite Canada and which will be of a design that is very acceptable to most Canadian people.

Mr. C. O. Cooper (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, my remarks will be brief, but in view of the many letters I have received from my constituents I would be remiss in my duty if I did not make their views known to the House of Commons. I know other hon. members have received as many letters as I, and when they have spoken the papers have screamed "obstruction," "filibuster" and everything else. As a matter of fact one of the hon. members from Halifax used that term "filibuster" in his broadcast yesterday. But I point out that this is not a filibuster; it is merely bringing the views of our people before the House of Commons.

I have brought one letter along with me as a sample of the many I have received. It states:

> Mr. Pearson, in his latest speech on the "Nation's Business," stressed two points: 1, the need for Canadian unity; 2, the need for a "distinctive" Canadian flag.
>
> Regarding the first point, that is, the need for Canadian unity, everybody knows that the public controversy aroused to date by the introduction of Mr. Pearson's flag has reduced Canadian unity to the lowest ebb in our history.
>
> Regarding the second point, that is, the need for a "distinctive" Canadian flag, only Mr. Pearson seems to be unaware of the fact that we have in the red ensign one of the most distinctive flags in the world. Where it flies on Canadian embassies, no one fails to recognize it as Canadian. Only Mr. Pearson seems to doubt this. Yet Mr. Pearson's flag—

Mr. Hellyer: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, is it not the custom that we do not refer to hon. members by their surnames but rather by the constituencies they represent?

Mr. Cooper: I am reading a letter.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member, as I understand it, was referring to the text of a letter.

Mr. Cooper: This is a letter I received and I have brought it before the house as a sample of all the letters I have received. I shall continue:

> Only Mr. Pearson seems to doubt this. Yet Mr. Pearson's flag possesses no distinctiveness whatsoever, and can in no way be compared with our nation's flag, the Canadian red ensign.

I think it is time, Mr. Speaker, that you know I stand for the red ensign and I am proud of it. Of all the samples and designs I have received at my office, the one suggested by the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) is the most vacant looking. I think the right hon. gentleman is way off the beam in throwing away our red ensign, together with all our tradition, and proposing this new flag. I stand for a vote, and the sooner the vote can be brought about, the better. Let the people decide what they want. I do not believe that at any time in Canadian history one man has backed a certain design and forced it on the people of Canada. Therefore, I am in favour of the amendment and of the subamendment. I think we should hold a plebiscite and let the people of Canada express their views on this subject.

Just as an example of the publicity this flag is getting across Canada, and possibly to let us all have a little laugh, let me tell this little story. In our town, not too long ago, a man came out of a corner tavern, really loaded, and said in a drunken voice: "I am for a maple leaf flag. It has a bar at each end". That is an example of the publicity this flag is getting across Canada.

I know many who are present in this chamber will recollect the old song "We'll Never Let the Old Flag Fall". That promise is being broken by members on the government side—a promise which was sung with all our hearts in the first world war. No doubt most hon. members can recall, also, the poem by Dr. John McCrae, with its moving lines:

> If ye break faith with us who die
> We shall not sleep, though poppies grow
> In Flanders fields.

Today in the House of Commons the government is breaking the pledges and the promises which were made in two world wars.

Our flag, with the union jack in the corner is a symbol that we belong to the great commonwealth of nations. I have been down in the United States on a few occasions in connection with defence installations, a joint effort by our two countries. On these visits I saw our red ensign flying side by side with the stars and stripes. I must say it did look

very good. It made me proud to have a part in that flag.

I know the maple leaf is Canada's emblem. But I should like to point out that the sugar maple is grown in only a small area of Canada, and that west of the great lakes we shall have to tell our children what those red blobs are on that flag—they have never seen a maple leaf. In fact very few maples are grown in western Ontario.

I am a westerner. I am a wheat farmer. Canadian hard red spring wheat is known all over the world and it is grown in every province in Canada. I think a sheaf of golden grain would be more appropriate as a Canadian symbol than a maple leaf.

An hon. Member: How about a fish?

Mr. Cooper: With these few remarks, let me indicate my intention to support the amendment. In my opinion the red ensign is more symbolic of Canada than any flag which has been shown to me so far. A Canadian can look with pride on this beautiful old flag and be proud that he has a part in it. I might go back a few years to the turn of the century when the western provinces were formed. People went there from every part of the world, from dozens of countries. We have a mixed population out there. And just ten years later they were called to fight for their country. We saw this mixed population take arms and go overseas to fight for the land of their adoption, with the red ensign flying before them.

It was only a generation later that their sons and daughters were called upon to cross the seas and fight for the land in which they were born. I say with great pride that the province of Saskatchewan, with its small population, contributed the largest number to the armed forces of any province of Canada on a per capita basis. This is something we are proud of.

I said my remarks would be brief, Mr. Speaker and I will conclude by saying once again that I will certainly support the sub-amendment before the house.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Albert Béchard (Bonaventure): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian parliament is now writing a very important page in its history. The debate on this resolution and its happy conclusion, with the adoption of a distinctive national flag, will stand as another milestone on the road leading to the independence of our country.

Following the Statute of Westminster and other important legislation passed since then, it will be a positive action taken by a truly responsible government and parliament and proof of our maturity.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep emotion and pride that I rise to express my humble opinion, as well as the views of my constituents, on the resolution under consideration, the purpose of which is to adopt a distinctive Canadian flag, as indicated in the resolution.

As could be expected, an amendment was tagged on without delay by the official opposition and it did not even wait for the house to vote before it moved an amendment to the amendment.

Having followed the debate from the beginning and especially last week, I will no doubt be allowed to say that I am completely against the idea of a plebiscite as suggested in the amendment of the right hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker), for two reasons.

First of all, if the national flag issue were dragged on the public and political hustings under the present circumstances where unfortunate statements and speeches are being made both here and outside, that would create disunity instead of strengthening national unity, which was the prime reason why the government introduced this resolution.

The second reason is that the Canadian people have elected in a democratic way representatives who received proper mandates to deal with the business of the nation. Consequently, the members of this house have the responsibility to execute the specific mandate entrusted to them. Settlement of this matter by a plebiscite cannot be seriously contemplated in a parliament where there is a responsible government.

The rare examples of such a measure in Canada repudiate any further application thereof, and especially in this case. Besides, we have the words of the leader of the official opposition himself to convince us of the inadvisability, uselessness and inefficiency of this procedure. Indeed, at time of the debate in this house in 1942 on the advisability of a plebiscite to relieve the government of previous commitments concerning the recruiting of soldiers for overseas, the present leader of the official opposition who was then member for Lake Centre stated, as recorded on page 186 of *Hansard* for January 30, 1942:

> Allow the members of parliament to vote on this question. Do not submit the question to the people of Canada, for in my opinion the taking of

a plebiscite at this time may well destroy the unity of Canada.

And the same person added later, when the decision was taken, as one can read on page 836 of *Hansard* for February 25, 1942:

A plebiscite is to be taken regardless of the fact that in the long history of Great Britain, with all the constitutional changes which have taken place, no government has ever submitted any matter to the people by way of plebiscite.

I could quote other testimonies as bitterly eloquent and perhaps even more so on the part of members of the Leader of the Opposition's Conservative family, but I am short of time. I will only remind the house, and more especially certain members opposite, of those words of the acting leader of the Conservative opposition of the time, Mr. Hanson, who stated during the same debate in 1942, as recorded on page 26 of *Hansard* of January 26:

Let this government rise to the level of its duty; let it not be afraid to lead. A plebiscite is not a policy; it is the negation, it is the avoidance of a policy. It is merely an unworthy expedient to avoid facing a vital issue. Its purpose is to avoid facing a vital issue. Its purpose is to avoid rather than to face responsibility; it is to avoid rather than to enforce the performance of a duty. It is not a declaration of faith; it is a declaration of impotence.

I know that those historic words have already been quoted in this debate; that is why I wish to do it myself in order to point out to the official opposition, and to its leader in particular, the strange, curious and contradictory position in which it now finds itself.

What more will the subamendment proposed by the hon. member for Regina City bring? Nothing more than the confusion which the latter has spread in the debate, turning it into an open, concerted and unfortunate attack against one of the founding groups of this country. That is obvious if you just refer to some of the speeches made in this house over the last week.

To those who, faced with their disappointments and their blunders, clamour in this house and elsewhere that the proposed flag with three maple leaves was designed to appease the province of Quebec, I will say that they are wrong to spread such untruths and to say such things because for a long time the people of Quebec have longed for unity within confederation. If for years they have been asking for a distinctive national flag, it is to strengthen that unity without which we cannot develop fully as an adult nation. That is why, although they are very proud of their origins, the people of Quebec want for Canada a truly distinctive flag which will not bear any sign of subservience to either of its inhabitants' mother countries.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that in an adult country such as Canada, which is recognized as such throughout the world and by all international bodies, it is superfluous to discuss in 1964 the need for our country to have its own flag which will show in Canada and abroad that we are a sovereign state, an independent state, a symbol which will identify us everywhere and in all circumstances, as is the case for France, England, Ireland, Italy and all the countries of the world which can easily be identified by their distinctive flags.

Last week, I had the opportunity to meet delegates of the various commonwealth countries to the conference on education now being held within our walls. Without exception, all of them expressed the greatest surprise over those endless discussions concerning a distinctive flag and over the fact that our country is still without a truly distinctive flag. Among them was a representative of Ghana who could not believe that this whole debate was taking place. As hon. members know, Ghana is an African country and a member of the commonwealth which obtained its independence in 1957 and which has its own distinctive flag. Would Canada be lagging behind Africa? Unfortunately, we must admit that such is the case, at least in that respect.

Symbols play an important part in the life of a nation and the most important of those symbols, in my opinion, is the national flag. Now, a national flag must be distinctive, in this sense that it must not be confused with the flag of another country on account of any of its characteristics. That is why, with all due respect for the red ensign, which a 1945 order in council gave authorization to fly pending the adoption of a distinctive flag, we have to admit, with regret, that we never had and do not have yet a truly Canadian flag, symbolizing Canada as a whole and constituting the emblem of all Canadian citizens.

I think the time has come for Canada to have a flag which all Canadians, without exception, can contemplate with pride, a flag which could symbolize our great country, be the object of our affection and loyalty and become a rallying and unifying emblem, insuring for the future the greatness of Canada from coast to coast. In my opinion, such a symbol could not be put in better concrete form than is described in resolution 44A.

Indeed, are not the three red maple leaves on one stem the symbol which His Majesty George V attributed to us by royal proclamation on November 21, 1921? Before that, Queen Victoria had by proclamation dated May 26, 1868, conferred to the province of Ontario three green maple leaves on a golden ground which we find again on the escutcheon of the province of Quebec. The royal proclamation of 1921 which was issued at the request of Right Hon. Arthur Meighen, who was Conservative prime minister at the time, was the logical result of serious and deep-reaching studies and of the recommendations made by the special committee appointed after the first world war by Sir Robert Borden, another Conservative prime minister, to study the problem of Canada's symbols, which was considered of great importance. That committee, which, as far as I know, was composed exclusively of brilliant and prominent Conservatives like Major General Willoughby, G. Gwatkin; Thomas Mulvey, under secretary of state; Sir Joseph Pope, under secretary of state for Foreign Affairs; and Arthur G. Doughty, Dominion Archivist had considered the matter for several months. Whom of these hon. gentlemen does the right hon. Leader of the Opposition have in mind, when he accuses this government of breaking with the past; does he mean Mr. Meighen, Mr. Borden, Mr. Gwatkin or anybody else?

When suggesting to the Canadian parliament the adoption of symbols, and a distinctive Canadian flag, no hon. member in this house should try to express narrow nationalism. And the suggestion of a distinctive flag must not be interpreted in this way by anybody not sharing the views of those who favour this symbol of our maturity, that is, a distinctive Canadian flag.

It is not a question of denying our past, our history or our institutions. Quite the contrary, we must respect, and we do respect our past, our history and our institutions, and I believe that the adoption of a distinctive flag is the logical consequence for a nation which has reached nationhood; it is the greatest tribute we can pay to our past, to our history and to our ancestors who have built for us this great country of ours, so that we can, in 1964, live in a mature and sovereign country possessing the rights of a state which has reached its political majority.

To give our country a distinctive flag is to give the whole world, all international organizations to which we belong, all nations and all Canadian citizens in the first place, the proof that we are proud to be Canadians. Also, we are only attempting—and that is very important—to give to the spirit of our people, to the enthusiasm of our citizens, an emblem around which and under which our youth and the whole Canadian people can rally in adversity as in joy, in peace as during the dark days of war.

All Canadian citizens of any origin, of any language and of any creed, born on Canadian soil or who, voluntarily, sometime during their life, have adopted Canada as their new country, without repudiating their origins, have decided to leave the flag of their birth country and to rally under the banner of their adopted country to form with their new countrymen the great Canadian family which they and we want great, strong, independent and respected *a mari usque ad mare*.

Our forefathers worked too hard to pioneer and to develop this land, soaked with their sweat and fertilized with their blood, a land now the home of close to 20 million people, a country with all modern communication facilities, great natural resources, etc. etc., that this country should not have the right and the legitimate pride to display the distinctive signs of its majority.

To continue such wonderful work, I shall contribute to it with those of my colleagues who believe in the necessity for our country of having a distinctive flag, in voting with pride for resolution 44 (A) that is for the flag with the three leaves.

[*Text*]

Hon. J. W. Monteith (Perth): Mr. Speaker, I rise to participate in this debate because, like so many other people in Canada, I feel very strongly about this whole issue. I should also like to mention the fact the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) acknowledged his feelings that hon. members would wish to present their opinions on this flag issue at the time it was being considered. I should like to emphasize that fact and deny the suggestion that we are partaking in a filibuster. I certainly do not admit that this is a filibuster and I will give more detailed reasons at a later time.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to make one or two remarks about that what was said by the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Béchard). He admitted that this was an important debate, and he is one of the few members on the government side who have participated in it. He said we were taking one more step towards independence. I suggest that is an expression of utter nonsense in view of the fact this country is completely

independent at this time. There is no subservience on the part of this country to any other country in the world. I should like to ask that hon. member what he means in this regard. Does he mean by any chance that this is a step towards the removal of our sovereign as Queen of Canada, so that Canada will subsequently become a republic? I should like him to answer that question.

With all due respect to the people of Canada I am sure they will laugh at the suggestion made by the hon. member for Bonaventure that Canada is at this stage something other than completely independent. This country of ours has been a country since 1867 and has, during these past years, become completely independent. I do not understand how the hon. member can compare this country to Ghana. I suggest the circumstances are entirely different.

Mr. Speaker, I intimated earlier that I am taking part in this debate because I feel very strongly about the flag issue. I should like to point out that resolution 44 (A) states:

> That the government be authorized to take such steps...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. More.

Mr. Speaker, I have read the resolution in an attempt to point out that prior to June 15 the resolution up to the end of the word "flag" in the second last line formed part of a whole resolution worded in such a way that the red ensign was going to disappear entirely. Under the present alignment of two split resolutions it is still to disappear completely. Apparently to some this might appear desirable, Mr. Speaker, but I must insist that to millions of people across Canada it is next to sacrilege.

I have heard it said, as I mentioned earlier, that the red ensign denotes some sort of colonialism or subservience to Great Britain. Utter nonsense. I think it is well worth pointing out though, that while under these two resolutions the red ensign is to disappear completely from the picture as far as the people of Canada are concerned, the union jack is to be retained to be flown on certain occasions to denote our commonwealth relationships, or something of that nature. If one stops and examines the picture it would seem that for those who did have any idea there was any kind of subjugation or what have you by Great Britain, the flying of the union jack under such circumstances would not be as acceptable as the red ensign. I know we are not discussing the second part of the split resolution but I do want to point out that the union jack is the flag of one country, Great Britain, and under those circumstances how can it be flown by us without denoting more subservience of some kind to that country?

I admit I have not made a study of the complete history of the Canadian red ensign. Others claim to have done so. I cannot cite certain dates on which it is presumed to have originated. All I know is that during the course of the debate it has been pointed out by many members on this side of the house that it has been flown as the flag of Canada for many years, certainly longer than I can remember. This whole question is not one of dates and figures. It is a question of the heart. It is the most emotional issue that could be brought before this house. I admit I am emotional about it but so are millions of other Canadians. That is why I insist that this whole flag question should not be before the house at this time. But, Mr. Speaker, as long as it is before us I for one propose to fight for our principles in this issue.

I know certain newspapers and other news media have taken it for granted that the result is a foregone conclusion. It has been said that no matter how wrong the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) may have been in bringing this issue before us at this time, no matter how many people may dislike the Prime Minister's personal choice of a flag, or how much, we should fold up and accept this dictum. No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot do that. I feel very strongly that in an issue such as this it is my duty to fight this coercion in every parliamentary way possible.

I do not accept defeat of the principles under which I grew up in this country. I do not accept the suggestion that having to fly this proposed flag is a foregone conclusion. I do not believe it is inevitable. It cannot be suggested for one minute that discussion of this issue is holding up the country's business. That is just not so. The Prime Minister has indicated that a recess can be had when this debate is over. We are not delaying the business of parliament. I admit we are delaying our own vacations but I for one am happy to forgo any vacation to prevent if I can this high handed, arbitrary action which would divide our country irretrievably for years to come.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp) spoke the other day, and certainly

he showed a great deal more concern for the Conservative party than for his country. I suggest that he pay particular attention to his own party. No one has any mandate to bring in a distinctive national flag, particularly without the union jack on it at least in some form.

I was not present this afternoon for all of the speech of the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) but I am told that probably never before has a greater indictment been made of the government than was made by that hon. member. I feel that this whole question is one that should not be before us. I am repeating myself, but I feel so strongly about the matter that I say: If unity is wanted in this country, for goodness sake take the flag question out of parliament. May I call it six o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Monteith: Mr. Speaker, before the dinner recess I had dealt with the fact that, in my opinion, the Prime Minister's choice of a flag is not inevitable, along with some other facets of the flag question. I had pointed out that I did not believe the question should be before parliament at all. I should like to mention one or two other thoughts I have had in connection with this matter.

I have had the honour and privilege of representing my constituency for something over 11 years. During that period of time I believe the citizens of Perth county have trusted my judgment on most matters that have come before parliament for consideration. I feel that they have sent me here to do my duty as I see fit. In all honesty, I feel that for certain matters, such as economic, fiscal and many other matters of this type that come before us, I am probably in a better position to pass judgment than a lot of the citizens of my constituency simply because I have ready access to the pertinent information. I feel it is my duty, after weighing all the considerations, to make up my own mind and act accordingly. To me, sir, this just makes good sense.

However, Mr. Speaker, on such a fundamental problem as the choice of a new flag, my opinion should not carry any more weight than that of any other citizen of my constituency. Their feelings on this divisive question are just as sincere as mine. I feel that certain attitudes expressed to me, particularly by those who have served in Her Majesty's active forces, should carry as much or more weight than my own. The representations made to me, particularly by returned men but including many organizations and hundreds of individuals have, by a huge majority, been in favour of the retention of the Canadian red ensign. I admit that I have had some three or four letters indicating that the individuals concerned would be in favour of the Prime Minister's suggestion. I believe the huge majority, not only of my constituency but of all Canadians, would accept a modification of our present flag but certainly not the complete destruction of it.

I mentioned earlier that I had represented this constituency for some 11 years. Prior to that I had some municipal experience. I think that experience has led me to believe that on certain questions a plebiscite is a good thing. I was reminded just recently of an incident in my municipality which has had long range benefits to my city. Many years ago the Canadian Pacific Railway wished to bring a line into Stratford. Many business interests were in favour of this. They wished to have competition against the old Grand Trunk Railway which had given good service. The tragedy of the whole matter, Mr. Speaker, was that Canadian Pacific wished to have their roadbed come in along the river flowing through the middle of the city of Stratford. They wished to have their station in the middle of the downtown section, which is right in the heart of our parks system. This matter caused concern in the city. A plebiscite was held and those dreamers who could see the future of our parks system won out by a narrow margin.

I only mention this to show the benefits to be achieved by a plebiscite under certain conditions. I think anyone who has seen the Stratford Shakespearian festival would agree to two things. First, I do not believe there is any more beautiful parks system in any city in Canada, similar in size at least. I believe this was only possible because this plebiscite was defeated. Second, there would not have been a Stratford Shakespearian festival if we had not had this beautiful parks system to encourage those who dreamed. We all fully realize, I am sure, what that festival has meant to culture all across Canada. To me, Mr. Speaker, this is a concrete example of the long range benefits of a plebiscite.

The subamendment reads:

That the amendment be amended by adding thereto the words:

"and that in such a plebiscite among the questions to be placed before the people should be the following:

1. Are you in favour of the Canadian red ensign?
2. Are you in favour of the Canadian red ensign with changes made thereon to show the main heritages of both founding races?
3. Are you in favour of the three maple leaves design?
4. Are you in favour of a one maple leaf design?

This subamendment moved by the hon. member for Regina City (Mr. More) sets out four choices from which a flag for Canada may be selected. I have indicated, and I indicate again that my personal choice would be the retention of the red ensign, and there are many reasons for this which I will deal with in more detail later in my remarks.

This whole question is so personal and is of such a type that I do not feel the opinion of the most studied student of heraldry is worth more than mine or those of many, many millions across Canada. As a consequence, I feel these four choices should be at least presented to the electorate so that they would have an opportunity of showing a preference.

It should be noted that the subamendment states:

—and that in such a plebiscite among the questions to be placed before the people should be the following:

And it goes on to list the four choices. There are other choices which could be included if the subamendment carries, and such other choices might be decided by a joint committee of the Senate and House of Commons. This has been dealt with in some detail by the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt), the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Hamilton) and several others during the course of this debate.

Mr. Cashin: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Monteith: No, not at the moment. You can make your own speech whenever you feel like it, and there are many other people on your side of the house I would like to hear speak also, like the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Harley), the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Beer), and the members from the Toronto and York ridings. I think they would be very interesting.

If the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) would only refer a study of this matter to such a committee it would provide a cooling off period, which I believe to be vital to the unity of Canada. Many hon. members in this debate have made just about the most impassioned speeches I have heard since I entered the House of Commons. They were all from the heart. I ask the Prime Minister not to let them fall on deaf ears.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Monteith: Mr. Speaker, I hear words of contempt, one might almost say of derision, from the other side of the house when I make these statements. I am serious. It is time some of you people got a little serious. I claim that this is no way to develop unity in the country.

Now I would like to say a few words on the various clauses of the subamendment and I shall first deal specifically with choice No. 3, the question dealing with the three maple leaves. I feel this is a reasonable choice to put before the people of Canada. The Prime Minister has indicated his adamant approach to this flag design. Indeed there has been a great campaign going on, and I am assuming this is backed by the Liberal party, to try by high pressure methods to sell this particular suggestion to the people of Canada. We have seen buttons, we have seen flags, we have seen miniature flags, and we hear of the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Dupuis) placing an order for 100,000 bumper stickers. If this is not a campaign I do not know what it could be called. Mr. Speaker, this commercialization of something which may never come about is to me deplorable.

I feel this is doing a great injustice to our present emblem, but despite the fact that there has been so much discontent shown in regard to this suggested design, I do believe that it should be included in a plebiscite from which a choice could be made.

I now mention clause No. 4 in the subamendment which deals with one large maple leaf in the middle of the flag, instead of three, and otherwise is practically similar in design to the three maple leaf design. I believe there are some who have indicated a desire for this particular pattern. Many representations have been made suggesting that even though preference might be for the red ensign, or a modification thereof, at least a one maple leaf flag would be better than a three maple leaf flag.

However, Mr. Speaker, I have to admit that the foregoing two suggestions—that is, the three maple leaves and the one maple leaf—do not move me in any way whatsoever. I fail to see how either of these two examples could be representative of all Canada. First, we know that there are many varieties of maple trees in Canada, and I would ask just which one is this? Also we

are aware, as the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Cooper) mentioned this afternoon, that maple trees are not a natural tree in the western provinces. Further we know the maple tree is much more prevalent in certain areas of the northeastern United States than in some areas of eastern Canada. To me it just does not have any heraldry or tradition behind it. Both designs leave me cold.

I now come back to the red ensign which is listed as No. 1 in the subamendment. It is not my intention to put a lot of quotations and detail on the record. I was, however, particularly moved and impressed by an article written by Mr. Stafford Johnston, the associate editor of the Stratford *Beacon-Herald* on May 26 last.

I do not intend to read the whole article but I would point out that it was written on May 26 last and shall give it in summary form. The writer started out by pointing out that 20 years ago that day he was in the line of vehicles, many miles long, heading for Portsmouth, about to go aboard ship for the landings in Normandy. That is in summary form. The author gives details of his experience during those days. This, for me, has great bearing on the feelings of many people across Canada, so I should like to read some of these details as given in the remainder.

The day we have been remembering lately was not D-day, but D-plus-5, when we came to the first moment at which I can remember any letdown.

On Sunday, June 11, 1944, our brigade headquarters was in the village of Le-Fresne Camilly. The invasion beaches were seven miles behind us, and the enemy three miles in front. The seven or eight vehicles that made up the headquarters were parked around three sides of a courtyard. The home of Mme Jeanne-Marie de Gastebled occupied the fourth side of the square. It was a big house, and it needed to be; one result of the invasion, inevitably had been the shooting-up, and bombing of a good many houses, and a lot of doubling-up of families in other houses. We never did get close to a count on the number of people then sheltered under Mme de Gastebled's roof, but when all the children came out in the morning to see the soldiers, the place looked like a schoolyard.

Some time during that day the Brigadier emerged from the truck which was his home and office, and took a look around. It was probably the first relaxed moment for him since the run-in to the beaches five days before. He noticed a flagpole in the middle of the courtyard and that gave him an idea. "Run up a Canadian flag," he said, in an off the cuff order.

This was, of course, a silly order. Modern armies don't carry flags into battle. During the weeks before the channel crossing we had all listed and checked, and counted and rechecked every item of equipment, and stowed and restowed it in the vehicles, and the lists certainly did not include anything as unnecessary to battle as a flag. It was easy enough for the boss to toss off an order, but to us underlings it seemed obvious that the order could not be obeyed.

However, the signallers had an idea. They rummaged in a locker where they had signal flags stowed and, by a minor miracle, they found a Canadian flag mixed in with the kind of flag the signallers use for wigwagging. We found some rope, and somebody shinnied up the pole.

The French children watched all this, and some of them must have reported to their mothers and their aunts. By the time the flag was ready to run up the pole, we had quite an audience of French civilians, women, children and old men. Madame herself emerged from the house, followed by a younger woman carrying an immense silver tray with glasses of wine. Madame made a short speech, and while we did not follow the words, we got the general idea that Canadians are a good thing. The brigadier, when he felt the atmosphere getting emotional, turned coward, and retreated to hiding. The rest of us tried to pretend we did not feel moved by seeing the flag go up.

It was the Canadian red ensign, of course.

The people, three miles away at the time, who might have wanted that flag to be pulled down, consisted of the two German divisions then opposed to 3rd Canadian division. The 21st Panzer division was a top rated division of the regular German army. The 12th S.S. division was one of the fanatical outfits in which every man was a nazi party member. For another month they fought us to a standstill, before we finally broke out of the bridgehead.

Hitler's elite troops couldn't make us pull it down, but now, 20 years after, it seems that a resolution of parliament may. Defeat comes strangely.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to repeat that last paragraph:

Hitler's elite troops couldn't make us pull it down, but now, 20 years after, it seems that a resolution of parliament may. Defeat comes strangely.

I should like to leave it—and I am serious about this—with you and the house for contemplation.

Now, we come to item two of the subamendment. It reads:

Are you in favour of the Canadian red ensign with changes made thereon to show the main heritages of both founding races?

I, personally, could accept this suggestion. I feel the majority of Canadians would accept it and I honestly believe it would be the best compromise and the one most acceptable to our people. The fly might contain a large fleur-de-lis, or maple leaf, or the designer might put forward a design where both appeared. We could then leave the union jack in the corner. This would please all those who are in favour of retaining the red ensign while at the same time indicating to the rest of the world the value of the great contributions which have been made to Canada's history by those of French origin. We could be

proud of such a combination of symbols which would, at the same time, indicate the freedom under which we have always lived, and pay tribute to the heritage and tradition to which we have all grown accustomed and in which we believe.

On the evening of July 1 on parliament hill those present witnessed a sight which, I believe, will always live in the memory. At least, it will live in mine. It was a beautiful sight. There were some 66 red ensigns around the grounds whereas usually there are about 22. I admit the display caused me to become somewhat emotional, and I am not a bit ashamed of it. I was disturbed. I was frustrated. And I was angry at the people on the other side of this house who are trying to tear this flag down. It was a memorable setting, and to think there was any possibility of such a sight disappearing aroused strong feelings in many others beside myself.

I pass the garden of the provinces twice each day on the way to and from this building. I wish hon. members would go out there and take a look at the ten flags which are flying. There are three which have white backgrounds and insignia of some sort in the middle. I am sure all who saw them would have to agree that they cannot compare, in distinctiveness, with all the other flags flying there—the other seven flags. I do not say this with any disrespect for the three flags concerned and I certainly do not claim to have any aesthetic virtues. But I do claim that a flag with a white background is not good enough to be a flag of Canada.

I admit that certain people do not have the same feeling for the red ensign as I have. Some time in the future, when the present generation of older citizens has been replaced, it may be that some change will be more readily acceptable. I repeat that nothing could be more divisive than bringing forward this flag issue at the present time. It is one which strikes at the very roots of all of us.

I remember when audiences in Canada did not stand up to a man for the singing of "O Canada".

Today this is generally accepted, and one would say that such hesitancy would be an irreverence and unheard of. Only time has accomplished this meeting of minds across Canada. The time may come, and conceivably before too long, when much more unity of purpose can be achieved in coming to a decision on a new flag or even a modification of our present one.

[Mr. Monteith.]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): I must advise the hon. member that the time allotted to him has expired.

Mr. Monteith: Mr. Speaker, I do not think I started until at least five minutes after, but I should like to repeat one story to finish. While in discussion the other evening with the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Starr) he mentioned a friend of his had been requested to ask the blessing at a banquet at which the hon. member was present. The words had impressed my colleague as they did me, and I trust he will not mind my passing those words on for the thoughtful consideration of the house. They were simply: "Oh Lord, help us to stand for something, so that we will not fall for everything".

Mr. Reg. Cantelon (Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, after having listened to so many excellent speeches on this topic I am afraid this one may bore you very much. However, as you have listened to so many I hope you can put up for a little while with some of the same ideas repeated in my own language. When one is making a speech, which must be about the one hundredth speech on this topic by now, surely no one would expect any very great originality or very much new material, and I claim neither for this one. However, since this is an emotional and historical topic and one on which one might be expected to have an opinion, as well as one on which one's constituents also have opinions which, as members, we ought to respect, I should like to state what are my own views and what I conceive are those of my constituents.

It is quite certain that the original reaction of my constituents to this proposal to change the red ensign to a new and distinctive design was one of amazed disbelief. This point has been emphasized over and over again. Is it true that the Liberal party did in fact pledge itself to introduce a new flag within two years of taking office? If it is, it has certainly never been brought to the attention of my constituents. Nor, as has been pointed out on many occasions, was it brought to the attention of the constituents in eastern Canada. This fact was emphasized very much this afternoon by the Liberal member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan), who stated that not a single advertisement placed by that party in the election of 1963 and published in Toronto had to do with a new flag. I doubt whether anyone in the west noticed that promise either. If they did I think they all thought this new and distinctive flag would merely be a new form of the red ensign. Or perhaps

they thought it might be a formal declaration that the ensign would be adopted.

After all, there is no reason why they should think otherwise. In 1946 the Liberals had been in almost universal approval of the red ensign. When the order in council at the end of the second world war during the term of office of Mr. Mackenzie King proclaimed the red ensign, that flag then began to have an even more general acceptance than it had had before. It was flown from public buildings, from schools under provincial jurisdiction in my own province, and largely substituted for the union jack which had generally been flown up to that time.

In these circumstances one can see why the Liberal promise had no impact. One can see why it was thought that the implementation of that promise was to be merely a confirmation of what was becoming an established practice. This view is again confirmed by the comments of the hon. member for York-Humber this afternoon, whose documented facts are well worth remembering. There was shocked disbelief on the part of the great number of my constituents when they realized that the interpretation by the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) of a distinctive Canadian flag was one of a flag which had no element of familiarity or any historical significance. They reacted to this fact, as I said previously, with astonishment and then in many instances, I am sorry to say, with a great deal of anger. I received petitions containing literally hundreds of names requesting, and in some cases demanding, the retention of the red ensign. Demanding is a rather strong word in the English language, but it shows their belief that the red ensign has for many years been recognized as Canada's flag. Not one single letter of approval have I had from my constituents for the new maple leaf design.

Those of my constituents who are members of the Canadian Legion were among the strongest opponents of the new flag, which of course is quite understandable. Certainly they have a very strong belief that the red ensign is Canada's flag and that it was the flag under which they fought. No arguments from our Liberal friends can change that incontrovertible fact. I would not like to say that they fought for a flag, they fought for their country, our country. But to them that flag represented their country and they do not like to see it done away with and, rightly or wrongly, done away with at the whim of one man. He is unfortunately a man who has demonstrated that he is incapable of organizing the business of this parliament; a man who does not have the genius for compromise which is so essential to the leader of a party. He is said to have had training as a diplomat. Heaven help us if our present diplomats are no more conciliatory or appreciative of the effects of stubborn, intractable action than is the Prime Minister, with his stubbornness on this flag question. I suspect that at 68 years of age he is in fact years older than the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) who chronologically is one year his senior. This could account for the odd things he does, like saying to his supporters that they could have a free vote and then emphasizing that his government would stand or fall on the result of that vote. Of course, he has now modified that stand. However, irrational attitudes are characteristic of the aged.

In putting forward the views of my constituents I would like to quote from a letter I received from a resident of Eston on May 21. He says, amongst other things:

> Well, I am like a lot of the rest of the people of the west. I think the old flag should be left the way it has been for so long, as the Legion fought two world wars to protect it. So I hope the Conservative government—

—he was a little out there—

> —will see that this is put to a vote of the people of Canada and find out for sure what flag they want. I don't like this thing of Mr. Pearson shoving or showing off. I think there is lots of other things Mr. Pearson could be doing besides worrying about a new flag. I have never heard of the U.S. wanting to change their flag and I don't think Canada should either.

This is the general attitude of the letters I have received. Rightly or wrongly, nearly all opponents of the new distinctive flag refer to it as the "Pearson flag". To illustrate this point I should like to quote from a telegram I received on June 16 from Tompkins:

> Vote no on Pearson flag. Reasons, leaf design not distinctly maple. Jack absent.

I think these quotations emphasize very clearly what is the general attitude of my constituents. Those of the Legion who attended the recent national convention held in Winnipeg were incensed at the poor taste of the Prime Minister in making a controversial announcement to introduce a new flag at what they consider was a service of dedication and remembrance on a Sunday night. Why was not the announcement made at the opening session on Monday morning? This is the logical question they ask. And I ask the same question: Why had it to be done at that service, at what was a service of dedication? Did not the Prime Minister realize how controversial an announcement

he was making? Is this just another example of his poor judgment?

The legionnaires present on that Sunday night were indignant at the attitude of the press, who magnified a small disturbance into a major incident. Why did they do so? Was it to make the Prime Minister a martyr to those nasty legionnaires? While the legionnaires admit that some disturbance was created by a few, and I think under some provocation as a result of the Prime Minister's announcement, they consider that very little disturbance did occur. They cite the fact that the Prime Minister was able to deliver his whole speech as proof of the good manners of their members. When we remember the ill-mannered boorishness of an organized demonstration against the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) in Vancouver we can see that the legionnaires were well mannered by contrast and that the Prime Minister was bothered very little.

The Prime Minister has now precipitated into the political arena an issue which, in my humble view, time was solving for us. Very seriously his manner of attempting to substitute another flag for the one we recognized as ours was tactless and ill considered, and it was especially ill considered at a time when we have rumblings of separatism from Quebec. This is a time when the rest of Canada should not have its antagonisms aroused against Quebec, and yet this is just what this new flag is doing. Instead, we need a calm reappraisal of our attitudes and a sympathetic understanding of Quebec's problems. Surely the Prime Minister does not feel that his flag is going to contribute to such an understanding. It may please Quebec, but it will harden opposition to what may be Quebec's legitimate demands. From personal experience as the result of the few visits I have made home in the last four months I can confirm that this indeed is exactly what it is doing.

Whether he likes it or not there are many Canadians who think and say that this flag is just a sop to Quebec. I hasten to add, my party does not say this. I do not say this. I could not and would not, because if you will examine my name you will see that there is more than just a stirring of French ancestry in my past. It is true that may have been many hundreds of years ago, but I still have a very soft place in my heart for my French ancestry, and I resent any such thing being said. I would not accuse the Prime Minister of such political opportunism, but the accusation is being made by others. The Prime Minister could meet those charges with better grace if the flag had not been selected as it was selected by the cabinet and, hence, many people think by the Prime Minister himself. Indeed, the Prime Minister made it very plain that this flag was his personal choice. He alone then must accept the responsibility for the design and for the lack of judgment and foresight in introducing it now. There were many other ways in which a flag could have been selected and this suspicion avoided. Why was not an all party committee set up and either a single selection or a small variety of choices submitted to parliament. If this had been done parliament would have selected a useful compromise, no one could have called the flag a Pearson pennant, and it would not have been subjected to the ridicule which is now being applied.

I should like to quote from an article written by Eric Nicol which appeared in the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix* of August 17, 1964. He stated:

> Mr. Pearson's design for a new Canadian flag—the one with three maple leaves rampant on a field of whiter wash—has been greeted by a variety of noises, mostly rude.
>
> That's the trouble with "making up" a flag. It's too arbitrary for most stomachs. We want a flag to have a background of tradition, history, battlefields and glory. The only way the P.M. is going to sell his flag is by leading a charge with it across parliament hill, inviting volleys of shot from a dug-in battery of Old Sweats, and going down with the bullet-shredded banner still in his hands.
>
> Then, if he likes, he can call an election.

I do not intend to read the whole article but I should like to read one or two more excerpts. Mr. Nicol continues:

> If Mr. Pearson is saying "Let's run it up the flag pole and see if anybody salutes," I think his design will run a poor second to the packaging of soapflakes.

The last paragraph concludes as follows:

> Today when Canadian soldiers go into action it is under the flag of the UN, and a very fine flag that is, too. Why we need a third flag, except to shine the spotlight on at Maple Leaf Gardens, is not clear.
>
> I fear that Mr. Pearson is going to be stung by his blue-tailed fly. And only one jack is apt to be jolly: J. Diefenbaker.

Now that the Prime Minister has forced us all into the unfortunate situation of accepting his personal flag or none at all, the hon. Leader of the Opposition proposes a way out. He proposes a referral to the people. It is a sensible way for an emotional issue like a flag to be decided. For this is purely an emotional issue, this has been emphasized over and over again, and one not to be decided

by reason except as applied to the emotional overtones of the issue. The hon. member for Digby-Annapolis-Kings (Mr. Nowlan) was, I think, the last hon. member to emphasize this very clearly.

One of the government members attacking the Leader of the Opposition's amendment said that it was just a smokescreen, that one could just as reasonably settle the pension problem by a referendum. This is a stupid comment. Is the member too obtuse to recognize the difference? The Canada pension plan is not an emotional issue based on the preconceived and basic stereotypes of a person. A member of parliament, or anyone else for that matter, should be able to debate unemotionally, and apply intelligent discussion to arrive at a reasonable solution of a monetary and social problem like a pension. He ought to have, if he studies the matter, a better informed vote on the pension issue than most of his constituents. But the flag issue is not in that class. No amount of study will make an M.P. better informed than his constituents on a matter that has its only foundation in emotion. Here, no reasonable explanation will sway many of the people. In fact, the only appeal to reason that can be made would be the one that, rather than cause trouble one ought to accept the new distinctive flag. Not a very cogent reason, but one which is sure to affect those who do not have very strong opinions, and I am afraid there are not too many of them. Perhaps the Prime Minister knows this and is acting accordingly. But if there was a referendum, no accusations that this was a politically chosen flag would have validity as they do today. Surely the Canadian people have the right to a flag free from political stain. The only way they are likely to get it is by a referendum or by a unanimous decision from a parliamentary committee dealing with the matter, which seems to me the most reasonable way to attack the problem.

Then too, the people have a right to a better selection than the one which is suggested. The proposed flag is a bad selection for it does not have artistic appeal nor as it flies does it have what I, for want of a better term, will call the clarity or stand-out quality in the air that one recognizes in the red ensign, the union jack, the French tricolour and the American stars and stripes. As one hon. member pointed out this afternoon, if you go over to the west block and look at the commonwealth flags flying there you will see that they have this quality too. They are clear-cut and stand out well in the air.

To illustrate further what I mean, some weeks ago when the new flag began to flutter from car aerials in this area one week end I sailed through the Thousand islands. There the Canadian boats all flew the red ensign and the United States boats the stars and stripes. Against the background of the shimmering water and the deep green of the shores these flags stood out clearly. They had clarity. As we returned to Ottawa we saw again the three maple leaves flag. It was colourless and insipid compared with those we had just observed. It does not have clarity in the air. Half a mile away it fades completely into the background. One might almost say it camouflages itself.

I wondered as I looked at it why the government did not select, if they had to have a flag of this type, the A. Y. Jackson flag. In that flag the blue bars were placed at the top and bottom of the flag instead of at the ends, and the red maple leaves were placed in the centre. Consequently this flag flies much better. It can be seen because it stands out against the sky without the white break in the middle which destroys the design we are asked to accept. It certainly is a much better looking flag, and this we might expect since it was prepared by one who is recognized as one of the foremost artists that the dominion of Canada has produced.

Mr. Matheson: May I ask the hon. member if he would—

Mr. Cantelon: Later.

Mr. Matheson: —vote in favour of the A. Y. Jackson recommendation?

Mr. Cantelon: Later, please.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order.

Mr. Cantelon: The flag is not an issue on which an election should be fought. To do so will arouse strong feelings between various regions of the country and create wounds which will be a long time healing.

Personally I much prefer the red ensign. We have had it as long as I can remember. It has grown to symbolize our traditions of fair play, our heritage of civil justice and our type of parliamentary government in which we all take our part. In Canada our flag has also meant freedom for many who have come to our shores from other countries with less happy governments. It has meant equality of opportunity for these people so that in the House of Commons the hon. member for Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Rapp), the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Nasserden) and the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Korchinski) can sit on the Conservative benches

along with a sixth generation Irish Canadian like myself and a Dutch Canadian like the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker).

The peculiar genius of the British parliamentary system has long been the capacity to compromise. Like many other systems have done, our parliamentary system would have perished long ago without that capacity. Indeed, it was because they knew of the justice and equality that existed under that system that so many immigrants have come to Canada in the last hundred years, and still come today.

Our French Canadian friends have been indebted to that capacity to compromise, allied with justice and fair dealing too, because their rights and their equality have always been recognized in our constitution and in our government. All we have to do is to look at our history, at the terms of the Act of Union, the Quebec Act and the act of confederation, to recognize that that capacity for equality and respect for others is demonstrated in this country today.

Only the strong, secure in their own strength, are willing to compromise. I would hope that the leaders of all the political parties have the strength and that the first element of that compromise can be set up in the acceptance by all parties of the suggestion to submit this whole question to a committee of the house. Without this first step there can be no compromise. I should like to refer to an editorial in the Ottawa *Journal* of August 19 which is headed, "Concession No Surrender" and reads as follows:

> Politicians, the public, the press and the pundits of broadcasting hinder a solution of the flag issue by emphasis on "breakdowns" in negotiations, "escapes" for the leaders and the importance of "face saving". It is preposterous to argue that a concession is a surrender, or that to suggest an alternative is to be a quitter. The country is the loser if an impasse on the issue continues and divisions become so deep they cannot be bridged. The leaders, themselves largely responsible, should be thinking more of country than of party and those who encourage them in bitter conflict serve their country ill.

Without compromise the nation will be divided. I do not want to be a member of the parliament which does that. Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for the amendment and the subamendment. I cannot vote for the resolution as it is today. It must be modified. It must be submitted to a committee for a compromise that can receive the approval of this house.

Mr. H. A. Moore (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, at this stage of the debate I do not wish to speak at any great length unless, of course, I get carried away. We have heard cries of "carried" from the other side on numerous occasions. I wonder if they are aware of what we are discussing here. I was of the opinion we were speaking on the subamendment and I am quite sure they do not want the subamendment carried. They must be thinking about the main motion.

Over and over again during the course of the debate we have heard that we were elected to take the burden of decision. I think the last person who said that was the leader of the Creditiste party. I accept that, Mr. Speaker, but I will not agree that we were elected to decide on a new flag in this manner. As members we were not even asked our opinion. The Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) brought forth a design with an accept it or else attitude. This we might accept in a dictatorship or a republic but certainly not in a democracy.

As far as the design is concerned, many people seem to forget one fact. We have a flag which many of us cherish, and along with most citizens of countries outside of Canada, we feel it is a truly distinctive flag. If we felt that we had no flag, then almost any design would be acceptable.

An hon. Member: Dispense.

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Mr. Moore: Don't be in a hurry, you will get your chance. Surely the Prime Minister, with a better than average knowledge of psychology, could see that people will often accept gratefully something they have never had before, but will fight to the end to retain something they already cherish. To me, Mr. Speaker, the promise that the vote will now be free is commendable, but it has a bit of a hollow sound at this late date. We had this promise once before when it could have meant something, but it was withdrawn by the Prime Minister when he decided that course would help his cause. I believe I have said enough; I think you all have the message.

A referendum at this time would at least be one way of finding out how the people of Canada feel. It has been suggested that a committee might be another method. Why the insistence by the government that there must be a time limit on the debate on the findings of the committee? Certainly if the committee came up with a decision the members would accept it with very little debate. Perhaps I am of too suspicious a nature, Mr. Speaker, this attempt to limit free debate bothers me a bit; I do not like it. I should

like to make something clear right now: I do not look upon this proposed flag as a concession to the people of Quebec. I look upon it as a concession to the Prime Minister. Before coming to Ottawa in 1962 I had met very few Canadians from Quebec. Since then I have been impressed by their friendliness, their ingrained politeness and their moderation when controversial matters have arisen. Forgive me if I say there are one or two exceptions, perhaps. I would not presume to dictate to those Canadians what designs or emblems they should expect as a contribution to the make-up of our flag. I do reserve, however, the right to stress my own feelings in this regard and those of millions of other Canadians. We feel that those emblems which mean a great deal to us must be retained. This is why we are carrying on this debate. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is that not reason enough?

I should like to read a paragraph from a letter I received. It is not from one of my constituents, but I think it covers a very important point and possibly shows the feelings of some people in Canada. I quote:

> Friends and relatives who have been motoring from the eastern seaboard of the U.S. via Ontario and Manitoba told us last month that they had never seen so many red ensigns flying from every city, town, village, farm, barn and hamlet before. Other relatives who have just returned to Winnipeg from a motor trip to B.C. via Alberta, Saskatchewan, and of course, Manitoba, said that they had questioned many people on the way and where they stopped, and everyone was strongly in favour of the red ensign. All who did the questioning were young (thirtyish) university graduates with responsible positions and much common sense, so I feel their report carries some weight.

For those who would wipe the union jack or any other connection with Britain from our flag, I would say this—and I have no English or French blood in my veins but a mixture of three other races: To me, the union jack on our flag has no connection with imperialism, subjugation, slavery or any such thing. The very thought of this is ridiculous. It signifies only that our system of government is patterned after the British system which took possibly a thousand years to evolve. Our system of justice is also patterned after the British system. Is this not why millions of immigrants have come to Canada, because they realized they would receive the fair treatment here which that flag has come to symbolize? Otherwise, they could have gone to the south sea islands where, perhaps, the climate is better.

It is not possible for me to say how all my constituents feel on the flag issue. It is not possible to talk to everyone in an area comprising many thousands of square miles, especially when we spend the recess in the House of Commons. Since the government has adopted the tactic of using controversial legislation as a club—they say, pass it or no recess—we are not likely to see much of our constituents. Unlike some of my colleagues, I am afraid I cannot say that every letter I have had has protested the maple leaf flag and favoured the red ensign. I can say truthfully that all but one have, and I have received well over 100 letters in that vein.

I feel that now I should read a few excerpts from these letters. I shall be brief and I have tried to choose those that deal with the amendment in question. This is the first one:

> When I first went to school in Canada I was taught that the red ensign was the Canadian flag. It is one of the most beautiful flags in the world and has such a wonderful history behind it that I cannot understand the mentality of any true Canadian that wants to replace it. We do not need any other flag but it; it covers everything.
>
> Please do everything to keep it. Nothing could replace it.

Here is another one:

> I feel so strongly about the flag issue, I could scream.

Obviously, this one is from a lady.

> It is only the thin edge of the wedge. If it passes, what next? The Queen? I feel Mr. Pearson is "playing politics" with the issue. I deplore such tactics. One does not just dump a flag and all it stands for—it is our very heritage. Fight for it.

This is the next letter I wish to quote:

> Because I have very strong feelings regarding the flag issue I felt the best thing to do would be to express these ideas to you, as our member from Wetaskiwin. Please let us keep the flag we have grown to love and respect. Let us not just take a piece of cloth and put anything that may come to mind on it and fly it across our country and expect people to love and respect it.
>
> We have grown up with our present flag. All the traditions and memories associated with this flag cannot be wiped out overnight and thrown aside. These memories and traditions that weave themselves into our country's life are very important to the morale and greatness of our country. If we must make it more distinctive, let us add to it, not take away.

This is a statement with which I agree.

> The flag is for all our country, not parliament, so all the people should voice their feelings.

In other words, this lady is in agreement with having a plebiscite. I think that points out very well what some of my constituents feel. Here is a short excerpt from another letter:

> It must be tiring to be battling away for ideals in the heat and humidity of an Ottawa summer, but it is proof that a large number of our M.P.'s

really and truly care for their lovely Canada and its future. Don't ever give up the fight.

It has been said, Mr. Speaker, that possibly the older people in Canada do not want to give up their flag but the young people are all for a change. During my last trip home I was interested in talking to a girl in grade five. She said that in her grade they had a vote on the flag question. In other words, a question was asked, do you favour maintaining the red ensign or do you favour the new maple leaf flag? This was the result of that vote, and it surprised even me. There were two who favoured the new flag and all the others in this school room were strongly in favour of retaining the red ensign. This gives you some idea of what some of the young people in my area feel.

I should like to make a short comment on the subamendment. In a spirit of compromise, we may have to modify the red ensign. If that is the case, it is covered by the second question. I believe this situation was explained very well by the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Monteith). This afternoon, while listening to the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Béchard) I heard him refer to the flags flying in front of the west block for the commonwealth conference on education. If I remember correctly he said that some of these delegates could not understand what the fight was all about. They had their distinctive flags and they could not see why we did not want one. In looking over those flags, I noticed that four of them, in addition to the flags of Britain and Canada, contained a union jack. I wonder what the peoples of those countries thought? Did they think that they did not have a distinctive flag? Did they also think they should get rid of the union jack?

If I remember correctly, he also mentioned that we should accept the symbols given to us by George V and Queen Victoria, in other words, the three maple leaves on one stem. It was my understanding that that was the reason for getting rid of the union jack and all other symbols—because they pertained to Britain; but here they are using this as an excuse and they want to adopt the symbols given to them by the British. I fail to follow this type of logic.

One of the reasons given for the choice of the maple leaves was that the army adopted them and used the insignia of the maple leaf. I, along with many thousands of Canadians, wore the fleur-de-lis proudly in my buttonhole for many years, as a boy scout. Is not this a possible reason for adopting the fleur-de-lis as a symbol. One argument seems as sensible as the other. If this gentleman is so sure that all the ethnic groups want a new flag, and I think he said that, why is he so worried about a plebiscite? I think he is in for a surprise.

The three maple leaves are not too distinctive because I have seen many Esso flags flying over service stations, and under some weather conditions they are very similar. One constituent of mine suggested to me that we have a five cent stamp with three maple leaves on it and now we are in danger of getting a five cent flag with the same three maple leaves on it.

Further, the one leaf design is not too distinctive either, and is not easily distinguishable from the Supertest pennant. In closing, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that both these companies have vast quantities of gasoline and therefore can afford to have a white flag and keep it well washed.

Mr. Lawrence Watson (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I find it a little difficult to rise and speak on the flag issue after listening to so many eloquent speeches during the last few days, but I am taking this opportunity to speak as the representative of Assiniboia constituency because the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) extended an invitation to all members of parliament to speak on this matter.

At noon today I went outside my office in the west block and noticed all the commonwealth flags in front of the building, and I can truthfully say I believe any Canadian or any member of the House of Commons would be afraid to stand up and say that we do not have a beautiful flag in the red ensign. At the beginning of my speech I would like to repeat a few words which the hon. member for Portage-Neepawa (Mr. Enns) used in his opening remarks the other day, when he said that a nation should be proud to unfurl its new flag and this should be a time of excitement and enthusiasm. I feel if we were to have a new flag unfurled at present this would not be a time of rejoicing after all the controversy there has been over the present flag.

I have with me a copy of the *Leader-Post* of Wednesday, August 19, which had a report dealing with the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Sharp) and the headline says, "Sharp urges P.C.'s to end Filibuster." I do not consider that by taking part in this debate I am filibustering, because I feel that the Conservative party today stands alone in trying to save the Canadian red ensign as our national flag.

A short while ago the Prime Minister said there were six important items that had to

be attended to by parliament before a summer recess. If my memory serves me correctly, we are now on the sixth piece of legislation, and therefore members of parliament are dwelling on the flag issue on their own time in lieu of a recess. This brings to my mind a cartoon I saw not so long ago in the London *Free Press* where it showed a member of parliament with a shackle around his leg, tied up outside one of the windows of the parliament buildings, and the caption at the top read, "Hello Voter, Hello Nation, I'm in Camp Concentration." It showed all the tourists going by with those big carriers on top of their cars, with a little pup trailer behind, all going over the hill and out to the lakes, while we were sitting here. I feel we are doing this on behalf of the citizens of Canada who feel that we should retain the Canadian red ensign.

One of my reasons for taking part in this debate is because I believe a plebiscite is necessary on the flag issue. I am one of those who feel that whatever flag is Canada's we must all be proud of it and be proud to fly it, whether it be the Canadian red ensign as it is today, or another design which is the choice of the people; but like most Canadians I do not like to be handed an ultimatum, as we were in the case of the maple leaf flag. Under these circumstances I feel it is absolutely necessary to have a plebiscite in order that people all across Canada can have a voice in this matter, and in a democracy such as we have in Canada we realize that the people will accept the decision of a plebiscite.

I have also felt for a long time that the whole flag question could have been settled in a manner by which it would never have reached the point of disunity that exists at present. Had the Prime Minister called the parties together and said, "We want a modification of our new flag; you make the decision as to the type, but this must be settled," I feel it could have been settled by a certain amount of compromising in all parties. I realize that this may have been achieved, partly, in the last few days. The only regret I have is that the move toward agreement was so late in starting; too much feeling may have been engendered, one way or the other. If the present government continues to feel we must accept the proposed flag, then I think the adoption of the subamendment providing for a plebiscite is the only course I could support, providing, as it does, a way in which the citizens of Canada can express their wishes and offering the only means by which they will accept a change of flags in our lifetime.

I should like to draw the attention of the house now to a series of quotations, all of which have a bearing on this issue. First, from an article which appeared in the Toronto *Star* on May 20, 1964:

> As the drinks were served and the newspapermen nibbled on sandwiches, Mr. Pearson brought out several flag designs on cardboards, selected one with a cluster of three maple leaves and two blue bands and placed it on the mantlepiece as his choice. He said he was prepared to have the government stand or fall on the maple leaf flag. The Prime Minister was careful however to make it clear that the flag on the mantle was his personal choice.

Then, as recorded at page 3164 of *Hansard* of May 12, 1964, the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) stated:

> 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 would be no question of confidence or non-confidence in a party sense.

The Toronto *Star* of May 20, 1964, also had this to say:

> One week later he stated he was prepared to have the government stand or fall on the maple leaf flag.

Then, only last week, we heard it had been agreed that there is to be a free vote in this house on the flag issue. If there is to be a free vote, the best indication how members of parliament are thinking on this subject would be for all of them to get up and express their opinions regardless of which political party they support. In this way we would have an expression of the feelings of all members before the house. I believe the majority of the people of Canada would feel that some sort of justice had been extended to the minority, whichever it might be. All members would have been allowed an opportunity to express themselves in a democratic way. I realize that majorities have rights in our country, too.

This afternoon the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas (Mrs. Wadds) referring to the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson) said there would be some tears shed on one side or the other. I think that is true. But I am completely confident that if this matter were placed in the hands of the people of Canada they would accept a decision reached as a result of a plebiscite. I see an hon. member on the other side shaking his head; presumably he does not agree with me. But I say the only reason the present government is

against the amendment supporting a plebiscite is that they know, themselves, that the majority of the people do not want the new flag design, and they fear the result of such a plebiscite.

I have had several discussions with hon. members on the other side of the house who have spoken in favour of a distinctive flag which has nothing to do with the past. I see one such hon. member present in the house this evening. I asked him: Are you not proud of your name? And he should be. I asked him: Are you not proud of your parents, your grandparents; do you not feel there is some tie between yourself and the past? I will not put on record the reply he gave me. But I feel very strongly that we do have ties with our families and our grandparents and we also have these same ties with Canada and our motherland, regardless of whether we come from England, Ireland, Scotland or France or wherever it might be. I do not think there is a person alive who does not feel some loyalty for his mother country.

I am one of those who are not ashamed of Canada's past in any way. Nor am I ashamed of the future. And I have every hope and confidence that Canada's future will be bright. I may add that I believe the sooner the people of Canada get back to having a majority government and two major political parties the better, for the biggest part of our problems will then be solved.

I should like to say a word or two about the word "distinctive". "Distinctive", properly used, means "distinguishing". As applied to the red ensign, it means that the latter is readily distinguished as Canada's flag. As no other country flies the red ensign, and as it has become known all over the world for over half a century, it is Canada's distinctive flag. The union jack on it signifies that we are part of the commonwealth—which we are indeed, in spite of the wishful thinking of some segments of people in Canada.

The true meaning of a free vote in parliament is one in which the members are free to vote as they wish, but in which the life of the government is not at stake. To say, as the Prime Minister does, that the coming vote is a free vote but that the life of the government is at stake is therefore a misuse of the word "free" as applied to a vote in parliament. Again, I realize the Prime Minister has now modified that position and has stated that we are to have a vote in the House of Commons which, even if the motion were defeated, would not mean the fall of the government.

I can truthfully say I would regret very much going to the people in a general election in Canada on an issue such as the flag issue.

I have here an article which I believe all members of parliament received. It is called "Remembrance Day" and I should like to quote three paragraphs. It begins:

> Canada was not built in a straightforward, cut and dried manner, but rather has suffered cuts and bruises in its growing up. We are not a new country without a flag. Many countries have taken centuries to accomplish what we have done in 97 years—strangely enough much of it is under the ensign. During these years of growth Canada has always tried to make the world (as her men are serving today in many parts of the globe) a better place for all of us in which to live...
>
> What surely could be more uniting than when persons who have worked side by side—Indians, French, English, Negro, ethnic and Jew, to build this great country in one century; who fought, shed their blood and immortalized the bloody beaches, trenches and battle fields of the world so that we might have what we now have—this opportunity of debate and personal incentive and independence. All this so that the ensign might continue to fly with pride over this land.
>
> Certainly after having paid the greatest price—death—is this in itself not enough to make the ensign official. Or was this, the greatest of human sacrifices, meaningless and wasted. The least we can do now is show our humble gratitude, reverence and respect. Let us leave the ensign alone and make it official.

If we as members must decide, let us have a choice by getting together on three or four preferred designs with the understanding that we must come up with a flag of which we can all be proud, and settle this issue like grown up men and women in a free country.

I have here an article—

Mr. Byrne: Have you anything else?

Mr. Watson (Assiniboia): This article is from the *Globe and Mail* for August 12, 1964. I think this article is a comedy on the flag issue in Cyprus and it relates to the current issue in Canada. If I may I should like to quote part of this article. It is headed: "Canadians can't flee flag fuss", and is by Peter Buckley.

> Any Canadian who hopes to escape the great flag controversy at home would be well advised to avoid Cyprus.
>
> Flags in Cyprus approach the level of a national mania, second perhaps only to a day or two of shooting in the mountains.
>
> In the Turkish sectors of the divided island, the question is straightforward. The only flag to be flown is the flag of Turkey—white crescent and star on a red background.
>
> Well, almost straightforward. Since the flags sometimes fly for extended periods, the decisive red field tends to bleach in the sun to a pale pink.
>
> Then it becomes difficult to tell the Turkish national flag from the flag of the red crescent society, the Moslem equivalent of the red cross, which flies a white flag with a red crescent over

its food dispensaries and other buildings in the Turkish sector. The weather tends to make that flag, too, look pinkish in time.

Then it goes on to speak about the Greek flag.

It is in the Greek Cypriot areas, however, that the confusion hits a fine peak.

There is the Greek-Greek flag, the Greek-Cypriot flag, and the flag of Cyprus.

The flag flown outside the Greek embassy here, for example, is a white cross on a blue field. In the centre of the cross is a gold crown. That, says the embassy, is the official flag of Greece.

If common sense were the sole guiding force, the official flag of Greece would be the most logical banner for Greek-Cypriots to wave in demonstration of their affection for mother Greece—the way the Turkish-Cypriots wave the flag of Turkey.

Instead, the Greek-Cypriots prefer the flag of the royal Greek navy. That flag is a series of blue and white stripes, with a blue and white cross in the corner—a design vaguely reminiscent of the stars and stripes.

For buildings of a public nature in Greek-controlled areas—historic monuments, police stations, government office buildings, and the occasional Greek Orthodox church—there is the genuine and official flag of Cyprus.

The situation being what it is, the official flag is among the rarest to be seen. Some Cypriots have been known to regard this as a blessing because the flag of Cyprus is the result of compromise.

The article continues but I should like to read only the last part.

Since the peaks so often look alike—and since the Greek and Turkish Cypriots themselves are scarcely distinguishable one from the other—a partisan climbing the hills for a day of rifle practice could become one of the rare battle casualties if there weren't a flag to guide him to the right camp.

The entire situation has been even further confused, of course, by the arrival of the United Nations.

Since the six national contingents in the UN force—Canada, Britain, Denmark, Finland, Ireland and Sweden—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Drouin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. An hon. member is rising on a point of order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Drouin: Mr. Speaker, I am very interested by what the hon. member tells us about the flags of Cyprus, Turkey and Greece, but I wonder whether he intends to add other questions to the referendum proposal now under study.

In my opinion, he should keep to the resolution, as he is supposed to do under standing orders.

[*Text*]

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Oh, you are so funny.

Mr. Watson (Assiniboia): In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, this article says:

The UN banner—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Drouin: Mr. Speaker, I ask for a ruling on the point of order.

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member is asking for a ruling on the point he has raised. The only thing I can say is that I really do not think it is a point of order. I have been listening to the hon. member very closely and with interest, and it seems to me that this is part of his argument.

Mr. Watson (Assiniboia): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In conclusion, this article says:

The arrival of a new flag to replace the red ensign over the Canadian camps, if it ever occurs, will only add a small ripple to the sea of confusion here.

I went home over the week end and one of my constituents asked me how we expect the people in Cyprus to be able to settle their issues when we as members of the House of Commons cannot settle the flag issue. She felt we were asking for a pretty big job to be done by our troops and the rest of the members of the United Nations force in Cyprus.

I feel in respect of this issue that members on all sides should have respect for the feelings of others, and that it will be necessary for all races and parties to realize that this may mean a compromise. I am sure that all hon. members of parliament can and will rise to the situation. I say that this is not a time to find fault without good reason. This is a time when serious men should reason together.

When I was travelling through Winnipeg recently I was discussing the flag issue with several people. One gentleman said to me that the only flags of the new type he had seen flying in Winnipeg were being flown on United States tourist cars travelling in Canada. Apparently the people of the United States have purchased a great many of these flags—made in Japan, I am informed. They think the proper thing to do when visiting Canada is to buy a new maple leaf flag and fly it during their visit to Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Watson (Assiniboia): I suggest to the hon. members down in the corner who are doing the clapping, that as a loyal Canadian, after we hold a plebiscite and find that the people of Canada favour the adoption of this new flag, I will honour it. I feel however that the people of Canada should make this decision.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Plourde: Would the hon. member allow a question?

[*Text*]

Mr. Watson (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I feel that I have only a few minutes of my time left and, as I said before, I should like to hear all hon. members speak on this flag issue and invite the hon. member to make his speech later on.

An editorial appearing in the Toronto *Telegram* on Saturday August 22, states:

> The Canadian ensign must not be lowered without the consent of the people.

I believe that is good reasoning and the proper way to settle this issue.

I am not going to read the whole editorial, Mr. Speaker, but I should like to read two or three excerpts under the heading "Too Big For Compromise". The first excerpt reads:

> It is far too important to be settled by parliamentary compromise...
>
> It has been said that a plebiscite would be divisive. This is nonsense. Nothing could have been more divisive than the Prime Minister's introduction of the issue as a matter of high priority.

The article then continues:

> Perhaps Mr. Pearson fears the outcome of such a testing of public opinion. Letters and petitions expressing determination to retain the ensign have been impressive.
>
> There is no reason why this obstructive and divisive bill should not be shelved pending a reference to the people. There is no urgency. Most Canadians outside Quebec appear to be quite satisfied with the flag we have now. In Quebec the matter is of little importance as there they fly the Laurentian flag with its white cross and fleur-de-lis.
>
> Until Mr. Pearson softens his stand, the opposition is justified in continuing a modified filibuster.

Again they have used the word "filibuster", with which I disagree. The article then continues:

> As distasteful as such devices are in parliament, no other method seems practical in the face of Mr. Pearson's stubbornness.
>
> The way out of the parliamentary impasse is clear: a plebiscite to end the long debate and to allow parliament to get on with more important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, an editorial appeared in the Toronto *Globe and Mail* of June 2, 1964 under the heading "Collision Course". I do not intend to read the whole editorial, but it does point out four errors the Prime Minister made. No. 1 was made when he promised a Winnipeg audience of foreign-language newspaper editors that a Liberal government would produce a distinctive Canadian flag within two years.

The second error was committed when the Prime Minister announced even before he had made a final decision on a design that he would take the House of Commons vote on his proposed flag as one of confidence.

His third error was committed when he told the Commons that it would have a full-scale debate on the flag, with this issue taking absolute precedence over everything else on the agenda.

Error number four occurred when the Prime Minister presented the Commons with a resolution endorsing not one Canadian flag but two. Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on but I feel there is little point in putting a good deal more on the record that has already been printed in *Hansard*.

Mr. Speaker, I have another article which appeared in the Ottawa *Citizen* on Thursday, June 18, 1964 under the by-line of John Walker, of the Southam news service. This article refers to the survival of the maple leaf. Mention is made in the article of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson), and it states:

> John Matheson...who advised Prime Minister Pearson on the adoption of the central three maple leaf symbol in the new flag, told the house Wednesday:
>
> "Some people say this flag is a concession to the French Canadians. But they are part of us, part of Canada...
>
> Every member of a family should be respected. The distress of one is the distress of all.
>
> It is not a concession to do what is just and kind—"

Mr. Speaker, as we all know, and as has been pointed out many times, the maple tree actually grows in only about 5 or 6 per cent of the area of Canada. I would have no personal objection to the adoption of a flag embodying a maple leaf design as a compromise to the red ensign, if a parliamentary committee could come to a majority decision, or if it were clearly shown by a plebiscite that this was the choice of the people. I do feel with all sincerity and respect for hon. members from the province of Quebec, and others who feel we should get rid of the union jack on the red ensign, that that is not a majority view. I do not agree with that idea but feel that the union jack should be retained. I

know other hon. members feel the coat of arms, or the entire red ensign, should be replaced by a flag with a maple leaf design. We are grown-up men and women and should be able to sit down and settle this issue in a businesslike manner so that we can then carry on with important business of parliament. I am sure if we follow this course everyone will be satisfied, provided this is done in a democratic way.

Mr. Stuart A. Fleming (Okanagan-Revelstoke): Mr. Speaker, when it became apparent early in this session that the government intended to proceed with the introduction of a resolution that would lead to the identification of a flag as the distinctive flag of Canada, whether it was the Pearson flag or whether it was some other choice it was not unreasonable then for members of the house in every party to expect that the government, before introducing the resolution, would have first shown some indication that it was prepared to assess the feelings of members of the house and the people at large. But the government did not do this.

It has become apparent from what was said earlier today by a supporter of the government that the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) consulted only a very few of his own colleagues and supporters. This of course is the very reason why we have been for some time, are now and probably will be for some time to come engaged in a debate on the resolution and the amendments thereto. For if it is our function here, as apparently the government expects it shall be, to designate a national symbol to represent Canada in the eyes of its own people and in the eyes of people throughout the world, and that we shall either confirm the symbol we have or find a new one, then it is only fair and equitable to every shade of opinion and to each member of the house that there should have first been a consultation and ascertainment of what would be both desirable and acceptable. But that has not been done and there is no sign it is going to be done.

What we in the Conservative party have been endeavouring to do and are endeavouring to do now is to provide the government and its supporters with an opportunity to reconsider their position, to consider whether they are following the best and wisest course, the unifying course for Canada in this issue. I do not think there is any doubt that the course the government has embarked upon has been entirely unwise and that it has failed in its purpose if that purpose was to provide a symbol with some element of national identity around which we could unite and which would draw us together.

I think the government has made a very great error in assuming that there was a tremendous desire for such an extraordinary and total change in the flag of Canada. Perhaps it is true. Certainly there has been discussion for many years in many parts of Canada to the effect that we should in some way make the flag of Canada more distinctive from the point of view of our Canadianism, our history and traditions. I did not feel this was a necessary thing to do but I know there are Canadians who did, and who do.

If the government had decided that this feeling was really strong and if it had been prepared to respond to this feeling with some form of action that would have determined how deep rooted the feeling was, how great the desire was and what symbol of unity in the form of a flag would have proved most acceptable to the majority of people, then we should not have been able to fault the government for having moved in this direction. But we can and we do for the simple reason that if there was validity in what the government felt, it destroyed the validity of its position by the manner in which it acted because it did not ask the people of Canada to express their opinion before it brought a design for a flag into the house. It imposed a design, and not even a design of the whole of the party in power. It sought to impose on the house and on its own supporters a design of a small group. We do not know how many, but from what we heard from a government supporter today we are led to suspect that they must have represented a very small proportion of the total of government supporters. Instead of bringing before the house as a symbol of national unity a flag embodying the elements of unity, we have had thrust upon the house a symbol of division and we are still trying to live with it.

This criticism can fairly be made, and I only make it because I believe it is a justifiable and justified criticism. But there is a way out for the government. I think the Prime Minister recognized last Friday that his position was no longer acceptable and no longer in the interests of Canadian unity when he took the step of indicating that when the vote comes it will be a free vote. But what is the purpose of a free vote on a symbol that the people do not want? There is no purpose in it whatever.

I am not suggesting I can say to the house that the majority of the people do not want this symbol, but I suspect that is true. A great

many of my friends in the house also suspect it is true and I believe there are members on the government side who suspect it is true. Consequently, if there is this suspicion in the house now to any substantial extent, then steps must be taken to eliminate the possibility of a dreadful mistake if we impose this flag on Canada; because if we do, the emotions of the people of Canada and their relationships with one another will be torn asunder, particularly so far as the racial groupings in the nation are concerned. If it leads to a division, then any move to accept this flag is a fatal move in the life of Canada. If not fatal, the wound will run deep and blood will flow long and the nation will take a long time to recover its strength afterward. This must not happen.

There is no necessity for a flag to be imposed. If there is any danger that one is about to be imposed, we have a way out. We can simply provide the people with an opportunity to express their opinions about the ensign, the flag which has represented Canada and by which Canada has been known throughout most of its history, if not always in its present form then in evolution to the present form. As a native born Canadian whose ancestors have been here for several generations, although not for as many generations as the ancestors of others in the house, this flag is to me the flag of Canada, because of the place of my birth, the environment in which I grew up and the traditions to which I am unquestionably attached. There is no doubt in my mind about this. But I realize there are others who do not have this feeling as strongly as I do and if they are in the majority they should be provided with the opportunity to demonstrate that fact. If they are not in the majority, if the majority of Canadians still wish to retain the national flag under which they have lived their lives and served the nation in peace and in war, then they should be provided an opportunity to indicate that fact.

After all, there has been a great deal of talk, Mr. Speaker, about service on foreign battlefields under the red ensign. It is not just those who served Canada in the armed forces in world war I, world war II or any other international engagement in which this country has taken part, who have served Canada under that flag. Every soul who has lived his life in Canada, raised his family in Canada, served his country in any capacity, however great or small, has served it under that flag. His attachment to that symbol, to that flag, is equally strong. Therefore, sir, it should be discovered, first, how strongly this desire runs in the nation for a change and whether, in fact, a change at this time would be or could be a unifying factor or whether it would be more likely a dividing factor. There is the justification for a plebiscite.

If the plebiscite is rejected—and there are those who feel it is a cumbersome method, would take too long or cost too much—then there is the parliamentary committee. A plebiscite could preserve the unity of the nation on this question. However, if a parliamentary committee were decided upon, the members of this house from all parties could gather in the less fervid atmosphere of a committee, away from the pressures of debate on this floor, away from the attentions of the press and public, to examine the possibilities of the various courses that could be followed. They could endeavour to discover what the people of Canada are thinking. If necessary, that committee could travel from coast to coast holding hearings and calling the people before them to give evidence. If this is necessary, then let us do that. Somehow or other, there must be consultation. There must be some more effective means found of ascertaining what this action we are expected to take will mean in terms of our national harmony, of our national existence.

It need not prove that I am right when I indicate my attachment to the ensign. It may not prove that the government is right. However, there may be some common ground between the two positions that would be acceptable to all Canadians. If the government persists in going ahead on the course it is following, it will never know until it is too late. After this house endorses this resolution establishing the proposed flag as the flag of Canada, then that is the end of the matter. This becomes the flag of Canada whether or not the people want it, whether they are prepared to live with it or not, whether it divides the nation or not. I do not believe it is up to us to take that gamble. This is no ordinary piece of legislation that we have been asked to pass. If there is a change of government there will be no opportunity to pass amending legislation in connection with the flag, as we would if this were an ordinary piece of legislation which a succeeding government might find unsatisfactory to it—unless, of course, we are going to adopt party flags, and have rotational flags that change every time the government changes. This would be about as ridiculous as the situation we are facing now, when we are presented with a flag design that does not meet with the wishes of the majority of

the people in their desire for a national symbol.

This debate has been going on for some time, and as I say it will likely go on a good deal longer unless the government recognizes that there is no necessity to thrust this proposed design down the throats of the members of this parliament. There is no necessity to take that gamble. There is not necessity to risk a mistake. The government can take action that will either confirm or deny the validity of its position. Equally, it could prove to the opposition whether or not it has been following a valid course in the eyes of the people. In my judgment, the course upon which we are now set leaves no alternative to us but to put forward every argument that we can, those of us who feel as I do, that this motion should not come to a vote; that this motion is a mistake and the ensign still represents the flag desired by the majority; that if a change were desirable, the majority would still prefer a flag which evolved from the ensign and which retained some of the elements of it. Since we feel this way, we cannot allow the government to secure the adoption of the resolution which may have far reaching and damaging effects on the structure and the harmony of the nation.

I come back to my original suggestion, sir. The thing that is so difficult to understand is that this issue, of all issues, should have given rise to so much antagonism and bitterness in this house, that there should be suggestions that those of us who have a certain affinity for the ensign are colonially minded or that the proponents of the three maple leaf design should eliminate all our Canadian heritage and tradition, and that this sort of thing should become the daily currency of discussion in this house and in the exchange of ideas between Canadians. It is a tragedy that this should have happened, because I am sure no member in this house who discussed this matter two years ago would have assumed that when this question came to the floor of this house for debate there would be anything but a substantial degree of unanimity amongst members, regardless of party. They would have assumed there would be no partisan division, no major fragmentation of the nation. There would be some basis worked out carefully, after consultation, and there would be common ground both in the house and in the nation.

This has not been done. This debate is evidence of that, and it would never have taken place if that had been done. This is the charge we are making against the government. No effort was made to create an atmosphere, either in the house or in the country, conducive to the acceptance of this distinctive national flag which would, in fact, represent the Canadian nation to all its people and to all the people in the world wherever that flag was flown.

So, sir, I would ask the government and its supporters to realize that there is an opportunity to change the course of this divisive debate. There is a means by which unity can be found on this question, but it is now in the hands of the government members to decide, in consultation with their leaders and in particular with the Prime Minister, whether that course is to be followed or not.

Mr. J. H. Horner (Acadia): Mr. Speaker, we are stalled on a flag debate of the government's choosing and, as the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Watson) pointed out, we are taking up our recess to defend the right of each Canadian to have some say in what flag he shall adopt as the symbol for his country.

From time to time we have asked the government to introduce legislation which its members cried for in 1963. They said at that time legislation was necessary arising out of the royal commissions on transportations and on magazines, and they forced an election because they thought this legislation was not coming forth. For the past two months we on this side have been asking them to bring on this legislation. We will deal with it and in due course pass it, as we have done already in some instances. But today we are bogged down on a resolution introduced by a very stubborn government which is bent on ramming the three maple leaf design down the throats of members of this house and of all Canadians.

The three maple leaf design is the design of the Prime Minister, and perhaps of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson). I do not know just what part the latter played in it, although on this particular issue the newspapers give him credit for being the man behind the man. Now we hear some talk that there is to be a free vote and that the trained seals over there—

Mr. Fisher: Oh, oh.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): A noted writer who is also a member of this house does not like those words "trained seals". He is entitled to his opinion, but hon. members opposite have been very active in this debate by simply sitting in their seats and making a lot of noise when they thought it was appropriate. However, very few of them have

risen to defend their Prime Minister and to say why Canadians should accept his design.

The Prime Minister has said he will give them a free vote, but I do not quite see a bunch of swallows flying forth flapping their wings freely. As recorded in *Hansard* of May 12 the Prime Minister said that when the time came to submit the government's decision on this matter to the House of Commons he hoped every member of the house would vote as his conscience dictated, and that there would be no question of confidence or non-confidence in a party sense.

Later, on about May 20, he stated he was prepared to have his government stand or fall on the flag issue. He considered the problem in the interval and realized that he had better whip the boys into line. Maybe a few of them told him about their problems with their constituents, and from May 20, almost for three months, he has had them toeing the mark. Now he has turned them loose, hoping we would think they could go back to their original thoughts on the flag. They were sold a bill of goods on May 20. They accepted a bill of goods on May 20, and therefore the announcement of a free vote at this time means very little because they cannot go back on the words they have spoken to their constituents during the last few months.

We in the opposition have a duty to perform. At the very outset we realized a flag debate would be one in which very many people would have numerous ideas to put forward with regard to Canada's flag. Now we have heard from people all across Canada on the proposed design of the Prime Minister, and it was our duty to show the opposition that was evident in the country with regard to this design. We have done just that and we may continue to do just that.

We also hear some talk that the government is prepared to accept the one maple leaf design put forward by the New Democratic party, but we do not know whether this is a fact or not.

An hon. Member: Would you accept it?

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Many things enter into making a choice. It depends on what colour it is. There would be great similarity between one red maple leaf on a white background, and the red cross. I think it is our duty to know what the issues are. This business of picking up by way of the grapevine that the government is prepared to accept one maple leaf is not good enough. We are all grown men and women and should be able to realize that the opposition in the country to the three maple leaves makes a compromise necessary.

There are many divided countries in the world. This afternoon one member mentioned Cyprus. British Guiana is another country in which there is strife. There is also strife in the Middle East, and considerable strife in our neighbouring country to the south, but if the cards are on the table surely we as grown men and women should be able to compromise, to sit down in a committee of 10 or 11—it does not matter how many—to go into it with the sole purpose of coming out with a solution, and be prepared to compromise. Surely in such a committee we could arrive at a suitable flag, whether it has one maple leaf or three, whether it has the union jack or not. Surely we have reached the stage in this debate where we know a compromise is necessary.

I always thought the Prime Minister was a great diplomat, and I have been told that diplomacy is the art of compromise. I only hope some of that diplomacy could rub off in this house so that we could take action toward a compromise. The committee in 1945 which studied this flag question had something like 2,400 designs presented to it and I believe the members of that committee really considered this problem and worked on it. They tried to reach a decision which all Canada would accept and honour. Some 25 members approved the recommendations of the committee and one was opposed. I think this represented a tremendous effort on the part of that committee to reach a solution. Perhaps the same could be accomplished at the present time.

This should have been taken into account by the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) before he put forward his three maple leaf design and said: Accept this, or else. This issue has been talked about for so many years in Canada that it should have been realized, particularly by those on the government side, that if the committee to which I have referred could not reach a conclusion, the matter ought now to be placed in the form of a referendum and sent to the people for decision. I am not saying this should be done immediately. But it might be done whenever the next election is held. There would be no significant extra cost about asking Canadian citizens to make two X's on ballot forms, one in relation to the election and the other with regard to their flag preference. This would constitute a relatively simple solution to this problem and I think it is the solution which all Canadians would accept. In addition, it

would not take nearly so much of the time of this house to ratify the result of such a plebiscite. An amendment and a subamendment have been moved. In the subamendment, four suggestions have been put forward. I think a flag is something which should embody our tradition and history, a symbol which all Canadians are prepared to accept. If it is evident that any major portion of our country is not prepared to accept the symbol put forward by the government, or by parliament, we should have enough common sense not to press the suggestion.

An hon. Member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): I am glad an hon. member on the other side agrees with me. We should be prepared to bring forward a design which will be generally accepted and which will unite the country—a flag which every Canadian will be proud to honour.

Not long ago I met an old schoolteacher of mine, and while renewing acquaintance he told me he had been teaching for three years in Europe. While I was not his favourite pupil in school—we had our disagreements in those days—I found we got along fairly well, meeting outside in the hurly-burly of life. I told him what we were engaged in at the moment —the flag debate in parliament and he told me he had travelled all across Europe during the summer recess. He had visited all the points of interest to Canadians; he had seen the crosses on many of the war graves over there. And he said to me: The red ensign is accepted as the Canadian symbol in Europe. I might add that this teacher is neither French nor English in origin. He told me he shuddered to think that any government was prepared, so callously, to wipe out the past and do away with the symbol of freedom for which these men fought and died. His parting words were: Do not let that government bring in this three maple leaf flag without first submitting it to the people—without first getting unanimous support from the people, because the symbol of a country without the people behind it means very little. These are the words he spoke to me recently and I cannot help but remember them and put them before the house.

Surely we must be prepared as legislators to bring in a flag which means something to everybody—a flag which can be recognized and honoured by everybody. We are grown men and women and are able to sit down in a committee and discuss this matter. And if a solution cannot be found in a committee, then surely it could be reached along the lines suggested by the hon. member for Regina City (Mr. More). In any event, the committee could decide on a list of questions to be inserted in a plebiscite and the people could then choose which flag they wish to honour in the years ahead.

I am sure Canadians do not want a flag which was picked by one man, rammed down the throat of parliament by a government which in this connection has little regard for freedom of thought and freedom of speech. Fear of being deprived of a recess was held over our heads; we were told that if we did not pass this motion we would have no recess. I am proud of being a member of the party which puts duty first and a recess last.

May I call it 10.30?

At 10.30 p.m. the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to special order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, August 25, 1964

The house met at 2 p.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. KNOWLES—SUGGESTED MEETING OF PARTY LEADERS WITH PROCEDURE SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. Although I have not indicated to you, sir, or to anyone else the point of privilege which I wish to raise, I am sure it will be clear in a moment that it is a matter of concern to the entire house.

On August 12, entirely on my own, I addressed an open letter to the leaders of the parties in the House of Commons in which I suggested that consideration might be given to ways and means of arranging in the future to avoid unnecessarily protracted debate. My letter had nothing to do with the current debate on the flag. It looked only to the future, and it was based on the proposition of acting only by agreement amongst all parties.

I am happy to report, Mr. Speaker, that I have now had a reply by letter from each of the party leaders. One of the letters is marked "Personal" and I shall therefore not disclose its contents. Indeed, I shall not make public any of the letters unless I am authorized to do so. I feel I can say to the house, however, and I am sure the house will be happy to hear this, that there is a wide measure of agreement amongst the five party leaders in their replies. Some of the letters seemed to agree with what I set out in my letter, although all of them did not go that far. However, all the leaders are united in their desire to do everything they can to improve the procedures of this House of Commons.

In view of this, Mr. Speaker—and this is my point of privilege—I should like to suggest that there should be a meeting of the five party leaders with the members of the subcommittee on procedure, which is a subcommittee of Your Honour's committee on procedure and organization. I suggest that there be such a meeting, not for the purpose of discussing the current flag debate but rather for the purpose of looking to the future to achieve what all the leaders have expressed, the desire to improve the procedures of this House of Commons.

I therefore wish to suggest that if within the next day or two the five leaders would indicate to me, as chairman of the subcommittee, their willingness to attend such a meeting I would call a meeting of that subcommittee for the purpose of extending an invitation to them. I realize, Mr. Speaker, that one should consider that this suggestion is being addressed to the party leaders, and a case could be made for their holding a meeting on their own, but I am sure members realize that this is a matter of concern to the House of Commons as a whole, and that it would be proper for such a meeting to be held by the subcommittee on procedure, to be attended by the five party leaders for the purpose of having this discussion. I should like to go one step further and suggest that at such a meeting, Your Honour might also be present. If you are willing to do so, you might also make your chambers or some other room available for the holding of such a meeting.

I hope consideration will be given to such a proposition, and I express to the house my pleasure at the replies I have received from the five party leaders.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): I begin by asking Your Honour whether this is a question of privilege. It seems to me like a specious endeavour to raise a question of privilege and designate it as such when, in fact, it is not.

Then there was a reference to a personal letter. I was rather surprised that the hon. gentleman should have found that the best means of communicating his views was through the instrumentality of an open letter to the press. Be that as it may, it was most unusual. I thought it could have been raised in the house or through the ordinary means of communication by post. This procedure was not followed by the hon. gentleman.

He mentioned a personal letter. I think the one I wrote to him was personal, but I will be only too pleased to have it published. In so far as the suggested meeting is concerned, however, the committee has its

representatives from the various parties. Let the committee on procedure continue its work. It has done very good work. Certainly to bring up such a matter in the manner in which the hon. gentleman has just brought this before the house does not indicate that degree of care that should characterize the handling of questions like this. If he had brought it to one's attention outside the house or through any other means of communication, it could be understood. I simply say that our desire has always been to expedite the business of the house within the limitation that we discharge our constitutional responsibility.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I immediately say to the hon. gentleman that having secured the publicity he apparently desired, I will be only too happy to have publication of my letter, which he can release immediately if he chooses.

Mr. Churchill: For our guidance in the future will Your Honour declare whether this was a valid point of privilege?

Mr. Speaker: I think it is clear that one cannot determine whether a question is one of privilege until you hear what it is. Usually, to be effective, it seems to me a question of privilege should conclude with some sort of motion asking the house to do something, or asking that a decision be reached. There was no conclusion to this projected question of privilege, and in the circumstances I can only say it is quite unusual. I want to assure the house that the Chair, of course, knew nothing about this, but that is beside the point. Perhaps some useful service was rendered by the hon. member rising at this time, but may I suggest that we get on with our business.

Mr. Churchill: A flagrant abuse of the rules; that is what it was.

IMMIGRATION

TORONTO—STATUS OF PERSONS CONCERNED WITH NEWSPAPER STRIKE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. N. Ormiston (Melville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, and in fact in view of the situation there will be more than one question. It pertains to the purported arrival in Toronto last evening of George Hogan and Robert Ameln of San Francisco, who are reported to have a record of strike violence in both San Francisco and St. Louis.

My first question is, have these men been appointed by Mr. Brown, head of the international typographical union, whose head office is in Colorado Springs, Colorado, to act as strike directors? My second question is, under what terms did they come into Canada? My third question is, does the minister intend to apply to them the same treatment accorded to some pressmen who were to assist in getting the newspapers on the streets and whom the newspapers were ordered to get rid of unless the men were prepared to become landed immigrants at once?

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): I will make an inquiry on that matter, Mr. Speaker.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): While an inquiry is being made respecting this question would the minister advise—and this is within his personal knowledge—what directions were given recently to the three Toronto newspapers respecting certain employees who came from the United States? Did the minister direct the three metropolitan Toronto newspapers that they must either get rid of these men, or that the men would have to acquire landed immigrant status if they were to remain in Canada?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Speaker, no work permit is delivered to a person entering Canada on a temporary visa and a person who visits our country without a visa must first seek authorization before starting to work; in other words he must obtain immigrant status or secure a work permit.

To my knowledge, at the time of the strike in Toronto about ten people entered Canada without having a work permit and immigration officials informed them that they could not work in this country without such a permit.

[*Text*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: If, as the hon. member for Melville has said, two gentlemen have arrived under the description of strike directors, would they come within the ambit of the principles which the minister has just enunciated?

Mr. Tremblay: As I said, anyone who comes to Canada has to get a permit to accept any contract or undertake any work here. I will make inquiries today to find out exactly what happened.

PUBLIC SERVICE

PROTESTS RESPECTING RECENT SALARY INCREASES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): May I direct a question to the Minister of Labour and ask whether he has received any representations from the national unemployment insurance commission association protesting the recent pay increases as being inadequate in the opinion of its members?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): No, but I will check to see whether any representations have come to my office which have not been drawn to my attention.

Mr. Starr: Will the minister bring this matter before the government so that a review may be made which will give a more adequate increase in salary to these employees, who between 1963 and 1965 received an increase amounting to only 3.5 per cent as announced over the week end?

An hon. Member: What did you do?

Mr. Starr: I readjusted it.

An hon. Member: Not in 1961.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): I wish to ask the Prime Minister whether the government intends to make any statement with regard to salary increases for federal civil servants in group B? Can we be told whether these increases were granted on the basis of recommendations by the salaries review committee or by the civil service commission, and whether they will be reviewed by treasury board?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): The President of the Privy Council has a statement to make on this.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (President of the Privy Council): On Friday last, as appears on page 7114 of *Hansard,* in response to a question from the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam, and again yesterday, as reported on page 7168, in reply to the Leader of the Opposition, the Prime Minister promised to review with me the representations that have been received from the civil service organizations with respect to the recently announced group B salary revisions.

This is to report that we have reviewed this matter and, in doing so, have paid particular attention to the rates for grades 1 and 2 typists, clerks and stenographers in whose positions both hon. members expressed a special interest.

We are satisfied, after further examination of the problem and from the careful study which has been given to the whole range of group B salary rates by the ministers on the treasury board, that the rates which have been announced are fair and equitable, and place the government's salary levels on a basis which compares favourably with other employers in Canada. There are numerous comparisons which could be made, including comparisons based upon data derived from the pay research bureau surveys, to confirm what I have said. However, pay research bureau reports are confidential, and I am therefore obliged to make the following comparison on the basis of data available from public sources.

To illustrate my point, we have compared the rates now announced for typists, clerks and stenographers 1 and 2 with the rates in force under collective bargaining agreements between the Saskatchewan government employees association and the government of that province. In five of the six classes referred to the maximum rate now effective in the federal service is equal to or greater than the maximum provided under collective agreements in the Saskatchewan service.

I should also say a word, I think, with reference to the claim that large numbers of the employees in group B have not received a salary increase in four years. This is not in fact correct. The ranges of pay for typists, clerks and stenographers grade 1 all contain at least seven steps, and while rates of pay may remain unchanged for a period of time, employees entering these classes are entitled to semi-annual statutory increases of $90 a year until they reach the maximum. For group B as a whole the increase in the actual levels of pay over the two year period since the last review amounts to approximately 6.4 per cent and this latest increase in the rates of pay will add another 3.4 per cent to this increase, making an increase in the actual salary level of the order of about 10 per cent over the two year period.

As for the question asked by the hon. member for Pontiac-Témiscamingue on Friday last as reported in *Hansard* on page 7114 regarding the position of the corresponding classes on the House of Commons staff, while I may point out that this matter is under the jurisdiction and responsibility of Your Honour perhaps I could have the indulgence of the house to say that prior to the question being asked last Friday, action had already been initiated to deal with the revision of the salary rates for this group. This is in

accordance with the usual procedures for reviewing the salary rates of the clerical, stenographic and other office classes of the House of Commons staff concurrently with the group B.

As I have indicated, since this matter is in your hands, Mr. Speaker, and while it is not perhaps entirely appropriate for me to say when the announcement of the revision will be made, may I be permitted to indicate that I expect it will be made very soon.

Mr. Douglas: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could I ask the minister whether the increases which have been granted and are now approved are in accordance with the recommendations of the salaries review committee or the recommendations of the civil service commission?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, they are not in accordance with the recommendations of the civil service commission, but are based on the data provided by the pay research bureau.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, could I ask the hon. gentleman a question. With regard to the announcement the minister has made, which will be received with disappointment, I am sure, by civil servants in all parts of the country, does that represent a decision of treasury board, to whom this matter was submitted recently for consideration?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I want to pick up part of the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition when he used the word "paltry" the other day in relation to the increases and speaks about "disappointment" today I would point out that when his government dealt with this matter they did not grant any increases. However, Mr. Speaker, this represents a decision of treasury board which has now been confirmed by the full cabinet after consideration of the whole matter. I might add that this decision was taken after a good deal of time had been spent on the question.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR INCREASE IN BURNT OUT PENSION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I put a question to the Minister of Veterans Affairs. In his absence it was replied to by the Acting Minister of Veterans Affairs, who said that today he would give us an answer as to what action is contemplated with regard to increasing the allowances of those who qualify under the Veterans Allowance Act. Is it now possible to have the answer that was promised yesterday?

Hon. Roger Teillet (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the question was brought to my attention just a few moments ago. I can say to the hon. gentleman that it is my hope to have a recommendation some time in the month of October. This is a hope; I trust I may realize it.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

VIET NAM—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON PRESENT SITUATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Could the minister bring the house up to date on the situation in Viet Nam today, particularly as it relates to the state of the government, and also the situation centring around the truce supervisory commission and the part Canada has in it?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for New Westminster gave me notice this morning of his intention to ask a question along similar lines. My response will take into account events that have occurred since his notice of question was received, which was of course prior to the question just put by my hon. friend.

A statement was issued in Saigon not very many minutes ago by the military revolutionary committee revoking the recent measures and announcing the proposed election of a new head of state and the convening of a national congress in Viet Nam. These events are of course too recent to warrant any comment. Canada does not have any diplomatic mission in South Viet Nam. Our contacts there are, of course, made as a member of the international control mission, of which we are a member, serving in both North and South Viet Nam.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): I should like to ask a supplementary question. I ask the minister whether he has had drawn to his attention the comments made on C.B.C. by Mr. Tom Gould, I think, reporting from Saigon, speaking of the dilapidated condition of the quarters of the Canadian representatives on the truce commission, the antiquated vehicle that is used, and the faded red ensign. I ask the minister whether any investigation has been made as to the accuracy of these

remarks and, if they are true, what steps he intends to take to rectify them.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I have not heard the report of Mr. Tom Gould but I have seen the conditions myself under which the commission in Laos operates and can very well understand the situation. This only goes to show that Canadian diplomats abroad are prepared to do their duty under difficult circumstances.

Mr. Douglas: I have another supplementary question. Do the difficult circumstances necessitate unpainted buildings, 1929 vintage cars and filthy premises that are supposed to represent Canada in another country?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, this gives me an opportunity of reminding some of my colleagues of the difficulties under which we must operate in this department.

INDONESIA—SUGGESTED TERMINATION OF CANADIAN AID

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. In view of a report which appeared in last Saturday's issue of the Vancouver *Sun*, the heading of which reads as follows: "Go to hell, Canada," says Indonesian paper, with certain other observations in a similar vein, I am wondering whether the Secretary of State for External Affairs can accelerate his decision as to whether or not Canada should continue to hand out aid to Indonesia so she can thus save on foreign exchange and buy arms to attack Malaysia. In view of this particular observation in an Indonesian official paper I suggest to the secretary of state that they be told to go to the same location.

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I may say to my hon. friend that if the direction reported in the paper was a correct representation of what was said, the hon. member need not think that the Canadian government has any intention of observing the direction. I want to add, however, that in the formulation of foreign policy both my hon. friend and I would be wise not to use stories that emanate from outside as a necessary base for the foundation of foreign policy.

CANADIAN MEMBERSHIP IN ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

In view of the speech he made in Banff a few days ago, could he tell the house whether there has been any change in the policy of the government as to its admission to the organization of American states, and whether Canada still intends to join this organization?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I shall table a copy of my speech. There is no change in our policy, but I took the opportunity to explain our views in detail and to state our reasons.

[*Text*]

Mr. Martineau: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the minister's answer, and in view of the fact that he said it was Canada's ultimate destiny to join that organization, I was just wondering whether his speech meant just nothing.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend would know more about that kind of thing than I, but I can assure my hon. friend that if he reads the text he will find that it was a contribution from which even he might derive some benefit.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Having read the text of the minister's speech I should like to ask him, in view of the fact that two South American countries have been compelled reluctantly to impose economic sanctions on Cuba as the result of an O.A.S. resolution, does the minister propose that Canada shall now be reduced to the same status?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that any countries have been compelled to take the course which my hon. friend mentions. However, while he has read my speech, perhaps if he were to reread it he might find that the question was not really necessary.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman suggests reading the speech twice, and I have been privileged to endeavour to interpret it too. Does that mean it was couched

in such uncertainty it was meant not to be understood by anyone, including the hon. gentleman?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, my right hon. friend is in such a frame of mind that I hope he will not mind my saying, if I told the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam to read my speech twice, it is apparent that the right hon. gentleman should read it three times.

VISIT TO RUSSIA BY CANADIAN PARLIAMENTARIANS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Barry Mather (New Westminster): Having in mind the announcement today of the forthcoming visit of a group of distinguished parliamentarians to the Soviet union, I was wondering whether the Canadian government would consider extending a similar invitation to Russian politicians at the appropriate time to visit this country?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): The invitation in question was issued to the Speaker of parliament. I think the question of a return visit should be considered by them on behalf of parliament.

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): May I ask a supplementary question. Will the Prime Minister state if he will recommend a recess of this house in order to permit the Speaker and other members of the delegation to attend?

Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker; but I think consideration should be given to the possibility of postponing the visit, in view of the fact that the house will be in session next week.

Mr. Starr: And the week after.

CYPRUS—EXTENSION OF POWERS OF UN FORCE

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether any extension has been now provided in respect of additional powers for the United Nations force on Cyprus, and in particular whether the Canadian members of that force have received instructions that arms may be used when considered necessary by the officer commanding.

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, under the directives, which of course are those between the United Nations and the United Nations commander of the Cyprus force, there will be no difficulty in the kind of situation to which my right hon. friend has just referred. With regard to the other aspect of the question, as I pointed out last week, as a result of the negotiations between General Thimayya and the government of Cyprus there have been some improvements in the position of the force and its authority.

Mr. Diefenbaker: But the question is, have directions been given by the United Nations organization to the United Nations force in Cyprus that arms may now be used when, in the opinion of the commander, it is deemed necessary and appropriate?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Yes. This is not a new situation.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

ATLANTIC PROVINCES—DIRECT INCENTIVES TO INDUSTRY

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. Is the minister in a position to reply further to a question I posed to him some days ago in reference to the report and recommendations of Professor T. Wilson of the University of Glasgow, and a subsequent press release by Premier Stanfield concerning industrial incentives in the Atlantic provinces?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I can embark upon a debate in respect of that very interesting report, but I can suggest that when the estimates of the Atlantic development board are before the committee we should have some discussion on it. As I understand it, Mr. Stanfield merely produced a submission he had made months before to the Atlantic development board coincident with this document, and there was nothing novel, therefore, in what he said at that time. The board, of course, for a long time has been giving consideration to the representations of the government of Nova Scotia, and there have been discussions going on with the officials of the board, Industrial Estates and ministers in the Nova Scotia government.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): I have a supplementary question. I realize the board is giving consideration, but what we want, of course, is action. May I ask the minister whether he is suggesting that the premier of that province is absolutely incorrect in what he said in his press release?

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the quickest way for the government of Nova Scotia to get action would be to put some concrete proposals before the Atlantic development board.

CANADIAN COASTGUARD

REPORTED DENIAL OF AID TO FISHING SHIP 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 fact that the captain and crew of the long liner *Cheryl Anne* recently found it necessary to ask for aid from the ocean going tug *Slavnij* of the Russian fishing fleet, when assistance was denied their disabled craft in a 60 mile gale on Georges bank by the transport ship *Thomas Carleton,* will the Minister of Transport inform the house the reason for this disgraceful action by a government ship on the high seas, and will he also tell the house the exact nature of the duties presently assigned to the Canadian coastguard?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I think that would also necessitate a rather prolonged debate. However, as a result of the particular incident to which the hon. gentleman referred, which I do not really think should be properly called disgraceful although perhaps there may have been an error in judgment in this matter, I have suggested that there should be a very careful review of the work of the coastguard, particularly in respect of fishing vessels.

Mr. Crouse: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister give consideration to providing aid to all small ships owned by fishermen when they are in distress, and I refer to aid that may be provided by the present coastguard? Will the minister give this some consideration?

Mr. Pickersgill: I will give a good deal of consideration to enlarging the duties beyond those prescribed by the government the hon. gentleman was supporting.

RECRUITMENT OF STAFF FOR TRAINING COLLEGE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Transport. Can the minister report any progress in the recruiting of qualified staff for the coastguard training college in Sydney?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): I am afraid I did not catch what kind of staff the hon. gentleman mentioned.

Mr. MacInnis: Qualified teaching or training staff, which the minister indicated was holding up the progress in starting the school.

Mr. Pickersgill: Progress in starting the school is not being delayed at all. We are making very good progress, and some staff is already being recruited. I have no doubt that by the time we hope to be taking pupils in this school, which would be in the autumn of next year, it will be quite ready for them.

AGRICULTURE

JOINT LOANS TO FARM GROUPS FOR EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Chapleau): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

It is based on a report published in *La Terre de Chez Nous* to the effect that the federal government is preparing a bill to grant loans to some farmers who would like to get together to buy particularly costly equipment.

Could the Minister of Agriculture tell us if he intends to introduce such a bill this session?

[*Text*]

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I should hope we could get at this legislation as soon as possible.

PURCHASE BY RUSSIA OF CANADIAN LIVESTOCK

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reynold Rapp (Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. Can the minister inform the house whether the Russian agricultural delegation now touring Canada are very much impressed with what they have seen so far, and whether they have shown any interest in the purchase of livestock, particularly bulls?

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak for the Russian minister with regard to what he thought of Saskatchewan, but I can assure the hon. member that he is interested in bulls. The Russians are interested enough in our livestock that on the 26th of this month there will be a shipment from Montreal of 600

Hereford bulls along with 65 Lacombe hogs, which were developed in Canada, and three Holstein cows.

ALBERTA—CANCELLATION OF CONTRACTS WITH MILK PROCESSING PLANT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. C. S. Smallwood (Battle River-Camrose): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture and I am asking it also on behalf of the hon. member for Wetaskiwin and the hon. member for Acadia whose constituencies are affected as well. Has the minister received a petition from 124 farmers in the Bashaw area concerning the cutting off of their contract with the Carnation milk plant in Wetaskiwin, and what action has he taken?

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I have not received a petition from 124 farmers, although I have received communications from some of the people affected by the closing of this plant. In this regard the federal government does not have any authority over milk plants with regard to their sources of supply or the arrangements they make with those shipping milk to their plants. The federal government does, however, stand ready under the Agricultural Stabilization Act to support all butter produced through a purchase program at 53 cents per pound plus a supplementary payment of 13.3 cents per pound of butterfat to eligible shippers. Thus, while certain farmers have lost access to the concentrated milk plant, an alternative method of merchandising their product is available to them. We would hope that these plants would diversify their operations so they could take care of problems when they arise as they have in this particular area.

Mr. H. A. Moore (Wetaskiwin): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister look into the possibility of finding a further market for the condensed milk that this plant produces? I think that is where the trouble lies.

Mr. Hays: Yes. We are familiar with the situation and, as I have just mentioned, we feel that some of the plants in these areas should be more diversified along the lines of the production of powdered milk, butter and so on, so they could be supported under the stabilization program.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): What about buying the milk for school children?

[Mr. Hays.]

QUEBEC—PROTESTS RESPECTING FEED GRAIN SUBSIDY

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Forestry. Since he announced a subsidy for the transport of feed grain in eastern Canada, can he tell the house whether he has received protests from officials of the Quebec Catholic farmers' union? Can he tell us also about his recent interview with the representatives of that association, more especially on Friday last according to press reports?

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I fail to see the immediate urgency of this question. Surely it is a question for the order paper.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Speaker, since this is a very urgent question which interests farmers in eastern Canada, I ask that it be taken up at 10.30 tonight.

[*Text*]

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Royal): I have a supplementary question to the one which you ruled out of order, Mr. Speaker, and I have a submission to make about its urgency. The policy is to take effect on the 31st of this month and I want to ask the minister if before August 31 he can announce any change in the interim policy on feed grain subsidies.

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): Last Friday I received a delegation from the Canadian Federation of Agriculture. Representations have been received, and we are now studying these. We will advise the house in due course.

TURKEYS—POSSIBLE OUTBREAK OF COMMUNICABLE DISEASE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): I should like to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he has a reply to the question I directed to him a week ago Monday in connection with the death of turkeys.

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, with regard to the question raised by the hon. member for Mackenzie concerning the cause of death of some 10,000 turkey poults in a flock in Saskatchewan, I am advised that laboratory and

field investigations conducted by veterinarians of the college of veterinary medicine of the University of Saskatchewan indicate no evidence of an infectious or contagious disease. The field investigations indicated that improper feeding was likely the cause of the mortality, and this diagnosis was supported by the fact that birds removed to the university made a complete recovery when fed a balanced ration.

TRANSPORT

CONSTRUCTION OF CAUSEWAY BETWEEN LABRADOR AND NEWFOUNDLAND

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Maurice Côté (Chicoutimi): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Works.

Could the minister tell the house whether the government intends to study and carry out the project of building a causeway between Labrador and Newfoundland whereby that province could be connected by means of the trans-Canada highway? Railroads and power lines could be built and the climate could also be improved in the gulf of St. Lawrence, St. Lawrence river and Saguenay areas, and all that for less than what the St. Lawrence seaway cost.

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order. This is a question for the order paper.

P.E.I. CAUSEWAY—SUGGESTED CONSTRUCTION UNDER PRIVATE SPONSORSHIP

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transport. In view of the recent proposal by the consulting engineering firm of A. D. Marginson and Associates for the construction of the Northumberland strait causeway to connect Prince Edward Island to the mainland, to be financed by Canadian funds under private sponsorship, can the minister inform the house of the government's reply or attitude to this vital proposal?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I may say that beyond an acknowledgement of receipt of the proposal there has been no reply.

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Queens): As a supplementary question, will the Minister of Transport be prepared to make a statement in the house outlining the government's position when he does give a more extended reply to this proposal?

Mr. Pickersgill: I would think this is a proper matter to be referred to in the house at that time.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

SUGGESTED RESTRICTION OF FLAG DEBATE TO TWO DAYS A WEEK

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister will remember that on May 25 in response to a question he invited all members who wished to do so to participate in the flag debate, and my question is related to this invitation.

In view of the fact that most members appear to have accepted this invitation, resulting in no foreseeable end to the debate, and in view of the fact that the Liberals and Conservatives have adopted positions that at the moment are totally irreconcilable, which will result in an even longer debate, would the Prime Minister consider having the flag debate for only two days a week for the balance of the session and letting the house deal with such other items as the Canada pension plan, so there could still be full discussion on the flag without neglecting all the other vital matters that should be receiving our immediate attention?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I still think we should proceed along the course already indicated, and I do not like to think that there is total irreconcilability between positions.

HOUSING

VANCOUVER—REPORTED RENT INCREASES IN VETERANS PROJECT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Postmaster General as the minister who reports to the house for Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. Yesterday afternoon in his absence I directed a question to the Prime Minister relative to the position of the veterans in the Fraserview project at Vancouver. Is the minister now in a position to give the house any information with regard to a review of the situation which these hundreds of veterans and widows face, having in mind the fact that within a few days they will be con-

fronted with having to pay increased rents, or buying their homes, or being evicted?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, with regard to the suggestion that something is to happen within a few days, I would point out that the actual date involved is October 1. I might also say I am informed by officials of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation that the tenants of the corporations's Fraserview veterans project were notified on July 3 of this year that rents would be increased effective October 1. The increases range from $3.50 to $11 per month.

The increases in rental charges were implemented after very careful study and consideration by the corporation which extended over a period of several months. In this study the corporation had the assistance of consultants who were retained on instructions of my predecessor, Hon. Jack Garland. The increases which have been approved by the corporation's board of directors are sufficient only to eliminate the deficit in the operation of the Fraserview project. I might add that over the past two or three years there has been a serious question whether, and the extent to which, these rates should be raised. The increased rates are considered to be fair and reasonable to both the tenants and to the corporation, and they are considerably below the rental market in Vancouver as established by the study by the independent consultants.

Early in July I answered a similar question asked by the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway. At that time I thought it would be wrong to raise the hopes of the tenants, and after most careful consideration and discussion with the officials I do not think it is advisable to reconsider this matter at this time. I think it should be terminated now. It would only raise false hopes if we did anything else.

Mr. Winch: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it not correct that although the date is October 1 the tenants have been told they must make a decision either to buy or pay increased rent by the 14th of September? I have one of the notices in my possession, and they must answer by the middle of September. This matter concerns a housing project built for veterans and not for profit. Will the minister recommend the postponement for another month or two of the date by which these veterans must make a decision, so the matter can be reconsidered not only by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation but by the veterans themselves? Will the minister recommend postponing the deadline for another month?

Mr. Nicholson: Mr. Speaker, briefly the answer to that question is no. I might say that I personally saw the officials of this organization as far back as May and discussed the matter with them at some length. I then referred it to a special meeting of the board with my own comments on the subject. This matter has come up several times over the past two years, and I think it is time we put an end to it rather than raise false hopes.

Mr. G. L. Chatterton (Esquimalt-Saanich): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. When the minister reviewed the situation did he take into account the written promises made to these people by the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources before the last election?

Mr. Nicholson: We have made the decision that we think is right and proper under the circumstances. While I am on my feet—is there a further supplementary?

Mr. Winch: May I ask a supplementary question. I believe it is a correct question for the House of Commons, when we are now told that a certain decision has been reached by the minister which is completely at variance with a written promise made by the minister of northern affairs. If we are now told that there is a differentiation between what the government has decided and the written commitment of the minister of northern affairs, then surely that is something about which we should ask in this House of Commons.

Mr. Nicholson: With due respect, Mr. Speaker, I say there was no promise made by the minister of northern affairs. This was a statement, I believe, that was made by a political candidate in the course of an election campaign some years ago. It was not made by a responsible minister of the crown.

Mr. Chatterton: Can the minister say whether this candidate to whom he referred was the minister of northern affairs? Does the fact that he has become a minister relieve him of responsibility?

Mr. Nicholson: All I said was that at the time the statement was made, in 1962, unless it was made by a member of the government of the hon. gentleman sitting opposite, it was not made by a member of the government.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): This is the most outrageous proposition that I have ever heard advanced. Does

the minister say a statement made by the man who today occupies the position of minister of northern affairs is irresponsible because he was not the minister then?

Mr. Nicholson: I never made or suggested any such statement.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I just ask the minister, then, to whom he was referring when he spoke of this irresponsible statement.

Mr. Nicholson: With all due respect, I did not say that. I said it was not made by a responsible member of the government, because it was made at a time when the right hon. gentleman headed the government of this country. It was not made by a member of the government.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I will simply ask this question. Is the statement to which the minister refers a statement made by the person who today is minister of northern affairs?

Mr. Nicholson: I have not got the statement before me, but if it is the statement that I think it is, it was made before he was a minister.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nicholson: Actually, Mr. Speaker, in fairness to the minister to whom reference was made, the statement was made before he was even a member of the House of Commons.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Does the minister say that statements made by candidates are not to be regarded as responsible unless they are ministers when they make them?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Nicholson: The answer is emphatically no, but I say there is a difference between a private person campaigning as a member of the opposition party trying to get elected, and a member of the government.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lake St. John.

Mr. Douglas: May I ask—

Mr. Speaker: Order; it does seem to me we have had a long discussion on this matter.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): I just wanted to ask the minister a simple question. I have not participated in the discussion. I should like to ask whether being sworn in as a member of the cabinet relieves a member of all the previous commitments he has made.

Mr. Nicholson: In answer to the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam, what I said was that when a man speaks as a member of the government he speaks on behalf of the government. When a man speaks during the course of an election campaign about what he will try to do, that is another matter and different from speaking as a member of the government.

[*Later:*]

Mr. R. A. Webb (Hastings-Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Postmaster General as minister answerable for Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. What is the real reason for the approximately 18 per cent increase in the rents for Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation houses in the Fraserview veterans housing area? Is the real reason that stated by Arthur Laing in public—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Webb: —to force sales of the houses?

Mr. Diefenbaker: When did he say that?

Mr. Nicholson: Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge of this particular statement. If the hon. gentleman would put his question on the order paper I would be glad to answer it.

Mr. Webb: I will send you a copy.

Mr. Chatterton: As a supplementary question, may I ask the minister whether the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources has made representations on behalf of the Fraserview tenants, since he became a member of the ministry?

Mr. Nicholson: Having regard to the oath I took as a privy councillor I cannot very well answer that question, Mr. Speaker.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

ISSUE OF NEW STAMP WITH INSCRIPTION "QUEBEC LIBRE"

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): May I deal now with a question that was asked yesterday by the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Bagot. He asked whether a new stamp bearing the inscription "Free Quebec" had been issued by the Post Office Department. The question was put to my parliamentary secretary. There is absolutely no truth in any such suggestion. I might say I wish to thank the hon. gentleman for having brought this to my attention, since it may

have been overlooked by the department; because I believe an investigation is warranted to ascertain whether there has been a recent infraction of the Post Office Act.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

POLICY RESPECTING NUCLEAR ARMS STORAGE IN CANADA

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence. Can he tell us whether storage of nuclear arms in Canada was discussed at the Canada-United States conference held recently in Harrison Hot Springs, British Columbia? Can he tell us also whether there has been any change in the policy of the department on national defence in connection with the storage of nuclear arms in this country?

[*Text*]

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): No, there has been no change, Mr. Speaker. The policy was very clearly set out in the white paper on defence that was tabled in March.

BROADCASTING

HEARING IN HALIFAX OF APPLICATIONS FROM WESTERN CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. S. J. Enns (Portage-Neepawa): I have a question for the Minister of Transport. I have in my hand a notice for a public hearing of the board of broadcast governors to be held in Halifax on September 4. At this hearing applications from radio stations in Winnipeg, Edmonton and Prince Rupert, B.C., are to be heard. I am wondering what possible justification there could be for having the representatives of these stations travel to the Atlantic seaboard for the hearing of these applications.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): If the hon. member would just glance again at that notice he would find it is supplementary to a much longer notice. One application to be considered at the hearing is a very important application from a T.V. station in Halifax.

Mr. Enns: I was wondering if this was a clever device by an alert minister to have the Canadian National deficit decreased by forcing these people to travel this distance on the Canadian National?

[Mr. Nicholson.]

Mr. Pickersgill: I am not responsible for the board of broadcast governors, sir.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

INQUIRY AS TO HOLDING OF BY-ELECTIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. It arises out of a report in today's edition of Toronto's leading morning newspaper to the effect that by-elections in Westmorland and Waterloo South will be held on November 16. Has the government reached a decision that these by-elections will be held on November 16, or on some other date, and if so will the Prime Minister inform the house?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker, we have not reached our decision, although apparently the newspaper has.

Mr. Bell: Is the newspaper report incorrect?

Mr. Pearson: I could not comment on a speculative report.

FINANCE

REPRESENTATIONS RESPECTING REMOVAL OF SALES TAX ON DRUGS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Pictou): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance but I believe it can also be directed to the Prime Minister. Has the Prime Minister received a resolution from the Canadian pharmaceutical association, as a result of its recent meeting in Halifax, asking for the removal of the 11 per cent sales tax on drugs? If so, would he give consideration to this request?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I shall have to look into that, Mr. Speaker. It is my impression that I have received a telegram from that organization on this subject, but I will check.

WORLD BANK PROFITS FOR LOANS TO UNDERDEVELOPED COUNTRIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. B. Patterson (Fraser Valley): Mr Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Would the minister inform the house what is the attitude of the government in regard to a plan for the world bank to use its profits to provide interest free loans

for educational and agricultural projects in underdeveloped countries?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): In the absence of the Minister of Finance I shall bring this question to his attention.

POWER

BAY OF FUNDY—REQUEST FOR ECONOMIC SURVEY

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could answer very briefly three questions asked when I happened to be out of the house yesterday. The hon. member for Cumberland asked the Prime Minister a question about the Atlantic development board immediately initiating an economic investigation of the harnessing of the bay of Fundy tides for electric power.

The board is giving consideration to this and other related proposed power developments in the Atlantic provinces, and as the Prime Minister, I thought very properly, pointed out in reply to the hon. member for Saint John-Albert, it is very desirable that these matters should not be considered in isolation from one another.

HARBOURS

VANCOUVER—INQUIRY AS TO LEASES OF WATERFRONT PROPERTIES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon. member for Okanagan-Revelstoke asked a question about a possible lease to Coal Harbour Investments Limited by the national harbours board. There is no lease, and there will be no lease unless the project is approved by the city of Vancouver.

AIRPORTS

WINNIPEG—INQUIRY AS TO INSTALLATION OF ESCALATORS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, notwithstanding a request I made to him as I went out of the building that he should not ask me any questions, chose to ask me an urgent question about escalators at the airport at Winnipeg. This matter is under consideration in relation to the possibility of a different method of conveying passengers to the planes, and until that matter has been resolved it would be perhaps unwise to go on with the installation of escalators.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): May I thank the minister for answering the question. I am sure he realizes that in effect I was giving him notice so he could answer the question when he got back.

Mr. Pickersgill: With regard to the hon. gentleman giving me notice I am surprised, Mr. Speaker, that that great exponent of the rules did not put the question on the order paper, as other hon. members do.

Mr. Bell: Slapped down twice in one day.

Mr. Knowles: That proves something but I don't know what.

PUBLIC WORKS

OTTAWA—ABSENCE OF QUEBEC FLAG IN GARDEN OF THE PROVINCES

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, last Friday the hon. member for Labelle asked me why the province of Quebec was not represented by its official flag at the garden of the provinces.

I must tell him that at this time the national capital commission is flying at the garden of the provinces the banners bearing the provinces' coat of arms rather than their flags because most of them have not yet adopted an official provincial flag. I think that only four of them have done so.

[*Text*]

GRAIN

ESTABLISHMENT OF PRICES FOR WHEAT AND COARSE GRAINS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. N. Ormiston (Melville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Trade and Commerce but in his absence possibly the Minister of Agriculture could answer it. How soon can the Canadian wheat board release the purchase prices for wheat and coarse grains to the elevator agents, so that farmers with grain in storage since the beginning of the crop year might be paid?

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): I shall be glad to bring this question to the attention of the minister.

Canadian Flag

LABOUR CONDITIONS

QUEBEC—REPORTED INTENTION TO REDUCE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PAYMENTS

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Perron (Beauce): Mr. Speaker, my question arises from a statement made to the press by Mr. Claude Jourdain, president of the economic development regional council of the Gaspe peninsula and Magdalen islands.

In his statement, published in the newspaper *Montréal Matin* of August 25, Mr. Jourdain suggested the abolishment of unemployment insurance benefits:

Instead of paying benefits to the unemployed, they should be forced to work.

My question is directed to the Minister of Forestry since he is responsible for the administration of ARDA.

Does he agree with Mr. Jourdain's statement when he says that unemployment insurance benefits should be abolished in order to put the people of the Gaspe peninsula to work under ARDA?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): Mr. Speaker, I did not read that press report, and I would like to do so before making a statement on this matter.

[*Text*]

CANADIAN FLAG

OFFICIAL ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW DESIGN

The house resumed, from Monday, August 24, consideration of the motion of Mr. Pearson:

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 the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Diefenbaker, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. More.

Mr. J. H. Horner (Acadia): Mr. Speaker, to continue my talk on a Canadian flag, and trying to put forward the views of my constituents and what the Canadian people feel about this debate, I said last evening that I am sure most people in Canada think we should get on to something other than the flag.

As grown people we should realize the extent to which this issue is controversial. Perhaps it should be taken out of the realm

[Mr. Hays.]

of politics and placed in the hands of a committee comprising representatives of all parties, where a solution might be found. If no agreement on a flag design can be reached there, perhaps the committee could agree on four questions to be asked in the course of a referendum, questions similar to those set out in the subamendment with, possibly, a few more added. The Prime Minister has indicated that he is prepared to submit this matter to a committee as long as a time limit is placed on its deliberations as well as on the debates in this house when the question is brought back to the Commons. This seems to be a further indication of his intention to use his authority to force Canadians to accept his three maple leaf design.

I think there is no necessity for a time limit to be placed on the work of the committee. Surely such a committee should be given all the time it needs in order to reach a conclusion. My own belief is that such a committee could reach agreement. After all, the committee set up in 1945 was virtually unanimous in the conclusion it reached. I think another committee could reach a similar measure of agreement provided no time limit were placed on its work, and if its members began their task with a real intention to do something about this controversial question which has upset the nation so much, even if compromises were necessary in order to achieve this purpose.

Perhaps the first question which should be placed on any plebiscite is, do Canadians really want a new flag? This is a question I have encountered from time to time, and it is a question I have often asked myself. If it were put to a plebiscite, this house would know the feeling of Canadians generally in this regard. If the answers showed that Canadians do want a new flag, then we could set ourselves to work in an effort to evolve, or find, that new flag, one which would be satisfactory to the majority of the people and which would unite our country rather than divide it.

Everything has its good points, even this flag debate. The debate has made Canadians more aware of the Canadian flag, more aware of the red ensign than ever before. A few months ago I was shocked at the number of Canadians who were asking what is on the red ensign, and what does it mean, anyway?

I think this unawareness stems from the lack of teaching in schools across Canada, particularly on the subject of Canadian history. Canadians are more ignorant about Canadian history than they are about the

history of the United States or Britain. One could ask any number of school children about the war of 1812, and I imagine that not more than one out of 100 could say very much about it. I think ignorance of the red ensign, the Canadian flag, stems from the fact that very little Canadian history is taught in our schools across Canada. If better instruction were given we should all be very much more aware of the history of the red ensign, because this flag certainly has close links with Canada's past.

In 1945, under the order in council passed on September 5, the government of that day set out clearly that the red ensign, as modified, was Canada's distinctive flag to be used wherever a distinctive flag for Canada might be needed. This was generally accepted at the time. The question which arises in my mind is, why this sudden need for a reappraisal of the whole flag question in 1964? The Prime Minister suggested, in a television talk I believe, that it came about because he had promised a new flag. Well, the Minister of Transport at one time promised two flags and, indeed, three flags for Canada.

We all want to see a united Canada. We want to see one flag for all Canada; this is the only way in which Canada will remain united. To return to this question of the need for a reappraisal of the flag situation in 1964, the Prime Minister, it is said, promised a new flag for 1965.

An hon. Member: He promised other things, too.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): He promised a lot of other things, too. A promise was made about milk, and we discussed that promise this afternoon. The Minister of Agriculture told all Canadians we would have a school milk program. Now we have a surplus of milk in Alberta and he says he cannot touch the problem. Another promise which we in western Canada remember very well is the promise with regard to $2 wheat. We have not seen it and we are unlikely to see it fulfilled by 1965 or even by 1968. We could talk about the time the minister of northern affairs made a number of promises. That was before he became a member of the cabinet. This promise about the flag could be regarded in the same light. It was made before the hon. member for Algoma East (Mr. Pearson) became Prime Minister.

People can only form their opinions in the light of their own knowledge, I suppose, but I do know that the new flag was never waved about in western Canada in 1963. It was never proclaimed that this promise was one the Liberals intended to keep. It was certainly not proclaimed as loudly or as often as the promise about $2 wheat. As a matter of fact, in my constituency I heard no talk whatsoever about the introduction of a new flag; neither did anything on this subject appear in the weekly newspapers. The hon. member for York-Humber made this position very clear when he spoke yesterday. He told us the flag was not promised in Toronto.

So where was it promised, and for what purpose? I do not wish to contribute to any division which already exists in this country, but we know that the promise of a new flag served the Prime Minister well. Why did he bring it before this parliament? It was not mentioned in the speech from the throne. I suggest the Prime Minister brought it forward because he had very little other legislation ready. He is using this flag debate as a filler. He tells us "Pass the flag resolution and we will give you a recess". This will give them more time to prepare their pension legislation, more time to discuss things of that nature with the provinces. The Prime Minister has promised the house many things; in particular, a recess if we accept this flag. I said yesterday that I am proud to be a member of a party that puts duty before holidays.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): The Prime Minister has clearly brought Canada's flag into the political arena. For what purpose, he knows best; but I think it should certainly be taken out of the political arena, because we want Canadians all across this country to accept the flag once it is chosen. We are well able to gather that the flag at present proposed by the Prime Minister is not acceptable to many Canadians. Therefore it must be referred to a standing committee which can study the whole subject at great length.

I noticed an editorial in the Quebec *Chronicle* of August 8 which I think is very significant to this particular debate. It says in part:

> For reasons he knows best, Mr. Pearson has made a political issue of the flag: and he could not have picked on a worse time. Introduced in rather authoritarian fashion in the house, with no popular consultation and in the teeth of fierce opposition from a large section of the public, the flag question, far from settling anything, has only stirred unnecessary controversy and a great deal of recrimination.
>
> Mr. Pearson surely knew (there were plenty of public statements which pointed to it) that any flag, as long as it did not contain references to the histories of either of the two founding nations, would be acceptable to the French Canadians. Why then did he not consult the people

on a design which would have been universally acceptable? One Liberal answer to this is that it would not have been practical.

I think that is a very weak answer indeed. This editorial goes on to say:

> But this is utter nonsense. All legislation is, in fact, based on the principle of popular consultation. Why else do we go through the enormously costly motions of electing a new government every four years? Why else do we give our M.P.'s the right to speak for us?

It goes on to deal at great length with some of the problems this flag has run into because of the time at which the Prime Minister chose to present it to parliament. I will not read the rest of this editorial, Mr. Speaker, but I believe it deals with the question very well. It states that the Prime Minister has brought this flag into the political arena at the worst possible time, when the country is divided enough, without adding to the problem. Certainly it has already been proven that this flag issue is adding to that division.

In looking at the four questions contained in the subamendment one notices that the first question suggested by the hon. member for Regina City is "Are you in favour of the Canadian red ensign?" I think I should point out that in going back over the history of the red ensign we find it was flown by the Hudson's Bay Company. This trading company was more or less the founder of western Canada, particularly, and most of eastern Canada. They used the red ensign as their flag and the flag of Canada. I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that this company were perhaps more than just a trading company. They were the government of the day; they had powers far more sweeping than many governments; they could arm ships, punish offenders, enforce laws, and so on. In fact they controlled the whole area that is now western Canada; and at that time, away back in the early 1800's, the Hudson's Bay Company used the red ensign as their flag.

Coming to a later period, in 1841 northern Manitoba used this flag. It flew over Fort Garry at the junction of the Red and Assiniboine rivers. Hon. members have referred to the fact that in 1904 and 1905 the red ensign was flown as the flag of Canada. In 1922 an order in council was passed authorizing the use of the new Canadian coat of arms on the fly of the red ensign.

Mr. Francis: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Certainly.

Mr. Francis: I understand the hon. member said the Hudson's Bay Company had used—I forget the date—the red ensign as its flag. Has the Hudson's Bay Company, however, changed that practice? Do they still not use it as their flag?

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Being a very loyal company, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that perhaps they do. In 1924 a government order in council authorized the use of the red ensign on all Canadian government buildings in foreign countries. In 1934 the Bennett government declared the red ensign to be our national colours. During the second world war the King government chose the red ensign as the flag for the commander of the Canadian army overseas. Mackenzie King has often been quoted in this house, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps I may be allowed to quote him once more with regard to the Canadian flag. Mr. King said this:

> The red ensign, with the Canadian coat of arms in the fly has, for over 70 years been very generally used in situations where a flag specially distinctive of Canada was essential. It was first authorized by the government of Sir John A. Macdonald shortly after confederation for use on Canadian merchant vessels. It has been popularly accepted as a flag distinctive of Canada.

Certainly the red ensign flew over the houses of commons of Upper and Lower Canada at the time of confederation. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, if one looks back over Canadian history one can see that as history unfolded the red ensign was there. This parliament has defended the flag many times. During one attack back in 1949 Mr. King said this:

> Canadians have fought and died under this flag. The red ensign should be good enough for anyone.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Every prospective immigrant is informed what our flag is by the Department of Citizenship and Immigration. They are advised that the flag used as distinctive of Canada is properly described as the Canadian red ensign, with the shield of the coat of arms in the fly. This should point out to most members that the red ensign has very strong claims indeed to being called Canada's distinctive flag, and certainly the first question submitted by the hon. member for Regina City has a right to that place.

In view of the great deal of controversy over the flag question the hon. member has referred to a modified form of the red ensign in question No. 2, perhaps one which would set out more clearly the two founding races of this great country of ours. Certainly this has merit, because if it can bring greater unity to this divided country in which we now

find ourselves, it will be very worth while. Anything that can bring greater unity to this country should be seriously considered. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would wholeheartedly support the second question, if such a flag were favoured by most Canadians as the result of a plebiscite being held.

The third question contained in the hon. member's subamendment is, "Are you in favour of a three maple leaf design?" One wonders why one should be in favour of such a design. Naturally, being an agriculturist, when the suggested Pearson pennant was brought forward I looked at the maple trees in Ontario and even those in Quebec to see if three maple leaves grew naturally, as suggested by the Pearson pennant or the Pearson flag, as it is now called. I failed to find any resemblance whatsoever. I immediately wondered, why three; why not five? It seemed to me maple leaves grew in clusters of five more frequently than in any other number; I never found them growing in threes. Why not one maple leaf, as has been suggested by the New Democratic party? Certainly the timing of this flag resolution has been poor; the advance notice on behalf of the government has been poor, and the authoritative manner in which the government has presented its three maple leaf design has been poor.

I could not help noticing an article which appeared in the Ottawa *Citizen* of August 22 from Southam news services, written by that noted reporter Charles Lynch. Mr. Lynch states in this article:

> To me, Mr. Pearson's decisiveness introducing the three leaf flag, as a focal point around which new flag sentiment could rally, was admirable. In decisive fashion, he made it clear that this was the new flag and that the government would stand or fall on it. Now was the time for all good Canadians to rally 'round.
>
> But in the next breath he trotted out the union jack, to be endorsed for Canadians as our symbol of Queen and commonwealth. This preposterous proposal started the erosion of his position, arrested only momentarily by the action of Mr. Speaker Macnaughton who broke the leaves and the jack into two separate resolutions.
>
> In the subsequent confusion, the Prime Minister seemed to be saying that he would stake the life of his government on adoption of the union jack, in its Queen and commonwealth context.
>
> Now he has made it clear that he isn't staking the life of his government on any flag—leaves, jacks, or what have you.
>
> And instead of fighting valiantly for the three leaf flag that he unveiled so dramatically last spring, he's saying that he'll agree to referral of the flag matter to a parliamentary committee, provided a time limit is set both on the committee's work and on the subsequent debate in parliament on whatever the committee recommends.
>
> This seems to me to be a considerable retreat from his previous position of solid support for the three leaf flag.
>
> And if the Prime Minister is retreating from the three leaf flag, the three leaf flag would appear to have little chance of ever being run up the parliamentary flagpole.

Mr. Lynch then says:

> What weakened Mr. Pearson's position?

Mr. Lynch then suggests reasons for this weakened position. Mr. Speaker, perhaps you will bear with me while I read another portion of this article. Mr. Lynch states:

> One factor has been his own unwillingness, and that of his Liberal colleagues, to stump the country in support of the three leaf flag.

In other words he is suggesting there is some dissension among Liberal backbenchers, and Mr. Pearson is just a little bit confused as to whether he would have the support of his party after the members got out on the election hustings, away from parliament and out from under his thumb. He is suggesting that perhaps these backbenchers when fighting in their own ridings would not be proud to fly the three maple leaf flag, and it would not receive the unanimous endorsation that Mr. Pearson thought it might.

Mr. Lynch then states in the last paragraph of this article under the heading "The Red Ensign is Now Stronger Than Ever":

> If not above the battle, it at least flew over the battlefield—

He was referring to the House of Commons.

> —and its position seems considerably stronger at summer's end than it was at the beginning.
>
> Mr. Pearson is ready to throw the design of a a new flag back into committee—a far cry from hopes that it would be flying by July 1, or for the royal visit in October.

Mr. Lynch is suggesting that the government is going to withdraw its flag and refer it to a committee in the hope that the committee can bring the government out of its state of confusion, and out of this hopeless situation it has brought parliament to, without losing too much face. Mr. Lynch then commends to opposition party for standing up for what it thought was right, in an effective debate in respect of this flag issue.

Certainly I should like to see this flag issue resolved. I know my constituents would like to see this house get on with the more urgent business of parliament, including the pension legislation, legislation in respect of the railways, which is of great concern to western Canada, legislation in respect of the Hall report, also of vital concern to Canadians, to say nothing of the legislation promised by the Minister of Agriculture six or seven

months ago, which he said will revolutionize agriculture in Canada if only the opposition will allow him to bring it in. I am sure we are all agreeable to allowing him to bring in this legislation. I invite him to do so, and we will deal with it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. I must advise the hon. member that the time allowed him has expired.

Mr. Gene Rhéaume (Northwest Territories): Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to speak on the subamendment now before this house, because I feel that for several reasons I am in almost a unique position.

Those of us who live in the Northwest Territories have real difficulty in masking our incredulity and containing our amusement at the prospect of you sophisticated southerners trying to suffocate each other with an issue which on the surface at least has little real significance to us in the north. It is perhaps this very sort of thing that motivates some Canadians to move into the Northwest Territories, where there is enough work to do each day to keep their minds off these interesting but hardly productive problems.

For my own part, I do not have any mandate from my constituents on this particular issue. I believe I have received altogether four letters in the past year, three of them asking that the red ensign be retained and one asking that the new flag be a single maple leaf design. In fact only one person suggested anything, should there be a necessity to change the flag and after all, 10,000 of my constituents live in the Canadian barren lands.

I should like to ask you this question, Mr. Speaker. Have you ever tried to explain three maple leaves to an Eskimo who has never seen a tree? I ask you, Mr. Speaker, would you like to fight an election about a flag, going to voters who have no access to flagpoles? What in God's name, we in the territories ask, is all this about? Who decided that now was the time to proceed with this issue? The people of the north on my recent visit continually asked me, what is going on? I could only tell them that our Prime Minister has chosen a design for a new flag and has said that until it is accepted the other business of parliament must remain on the shelf. I have told them that, if he chose, the Prime Minister could bring forward other pieces of legislation that are of direct concern to them, such as the pension plan, legislation in respect of the Hall commission report, and even legislation, which is long overdue in the Northwest Territories, giving the people of the north the right to vote in territorial elections. But in the eyes of the Prime Minister the right to vote takes second place to three maple leaves waving proudly over their heads on metal flagpoles.

What else can I say to answer the question of what is happening in this place, when asked by people who need schools, roads, hospitals and jobs to give them even half a chance to raise their families in health and decency? This prime ministerial preoccupation with a new flag is incomprehensible. To me personally, but speaking as a northern Canadian, the whole business is a pathetically stupid piece of fumbling by a Prime Minister devoted to tokenism in the handling of Canadian domestic problems. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the conversion of the flag debate in a barely disguised underground battle between the two founding races is a direct result of the ineptitude of the Prime Minister and more particularly of his advisers. The issue is not a real one, nor is the proposed solution a real solution. The subamendment we have before us is, as I see it, an attempt to modify and change a basically unsound and unfortunate government resolution.

I have spoken about these matters before and I intend to do so again today. When we talk about tokenism surely the parallel is obvious, that parallel being the B and B commission. This, after all, was one of the greatest exercises in tokenism that any Canadian prime minister has ever attempted. This is saying to people who have legitimate complaints, who have legitimate feelings of injustice on certain matters, "We will give you a commission where the extremists among you can run off at the mouth. It will change nothing really but we will say in the next election, see what we have done, we have set up the B and B commission," as though that accomplished anything.

This is what the flag issue is, too, because the Prime Minister and the government will go to the people of the country and say, see here are three maple leaves; you have unity, you have a nation. This is nonsense, and it is the most vicious kind of nonsense that could be perpetrated on the Canadian people at this time. I say it is vicious because I believe this issue is postponing in fact two essential steps that have to be taken to achieve Canadian unity. As I see them, these two steps are in the first place the repatriation of the constitution, which we know is being worked on but which will be postponed in the

artificial atmosphere of a new flag; and second, a hard headed review of the responsibilities and the revenues in each of the federal and provincial spheres of government.

This is the work that needs to be done to give Canada a new sense of national purpose. What frightens me about the flag is that should it be accepted, be it three maple leaves or one, be they red or green, it will be used to say to the people, "Here, you really have something," when in fact the basic problems confronting this nation will have been postponed for an even longer period.

I suggest to the Prime Minister that if he wants to meet the needs of certain areas of Canada he should state firmly now the position his government will take in relation to new kinds of revenue and new kinds of arrangements that will be made with the provinces. Quebec has legitimate demands that must be met. What I want the Prime Minister to do is to outline these views to the house and the country, and say to Quebec and all the other provinces, "Beyond this we do not go".

I say that because what is bothering many people is a vague feeling of unease that there is no end to the demands that will be made by a group of people in a minority position who feel, perhaps quite rightly, that they have been treated unjustly. Such action on the part of the Prime Minister would do much in itself to remove the malaise that is affecting many Canadians and that causes them to interpret every act of the government as some kind of appeasement to Quebec, whether it is or not.

At this point I want to take a few moments to register strong objection to the efforts of numerous members of parliament from the province of Quebec in all parties to appoint themselves as the sole spokesmen for the so-called French Canadian people. I am a French Canadian from the Northwest Territories. I am as French Canadian as anyone in the House of Commons. I can trace my ancestry back to 1665 and an early deserter from the French forces. I am able to read French and can speak it haltingly, sufficiently well to get by. Indeed, I am relearning the language, and within a year I should be able to chatter along with the best of you.

But this is beside the point completely. Indeed, I resent the implicit suggestions that any French Canadian who cannot speak French has forsaken his cultural heritage or is some kind of traitor. I resent the suggestion that the well-being of French Canadians is totally tied up with the well-being of the province of Quebec.

I make these points, Mr. Speaker, because the myth is being circulated that all people of French descent support the expressions of view of a handful of extremists, some of whom are in this house. I have a right to speak for those French Canadians among us who do not live in Quebec, who do not speak French as their first language, who do not particularly feel that they have had an unfair deal, who do not resent the union jack or the red ensign, who do not consider the world wide use of English in commerce and international aviation as some sort of Anglo-Saxon plot against Quebec. Furthermore, I suggest that the widespread unease, anxiety and tension are being heightened by seemingly interminable demands on the part of some Quebec members, and more particularly by the startling inability of the government to manage the business of the house.

I urge the Prime Minister to use restraint in the course he has adopted, because the temper in the rest of Canada and indeed among many French Canadians in other parts of Canada is not good.

Mr. Berger: Who says so?

Mr. Rhéaume: I say so. You listen, because I will have more to say. I urge the Prime Minister and the government to depart from the kind of tactic that we saw too often in the two previous election campaigns, the business of destroying something that is good before you can say you have anything else to offer. It was a matter of real concern to me to see the disrespect that became widespread with regard to the red ensign and the efforts, which I have to believe were conscious and deliberate, to discredit the red ensign among the young people of the country and in certain parts of the country as a preliminary step to introducing the three maple leaves pattern. I say get rid of this kind of tactic, because you will never achieve unity that way and you will only leave many of us in Canada with a bitter taste in our mouths.

The amendment and subamendment set out the terms of a plebiscite. Some speakers have suggested that a plebiscite would divide the country as it has never been divided before, but oddly enough these same speakers feel that a vote in the House of Commons would not divide. I ask this question. Why in the world would anyone believe that feelings and emotions in the House of Commons would be less deep or less painful than in the country at large? Who is afraid to allow the

Canadian people the opportunity to say what they want in terms of a majority vote in a plebiscite?

I ask this question today particularly after the sham and the subterfuge has been stripped away from the public position of the Prime Minister on this whole question of the flag. I have wondered for weeks how there could be complete unanimity in the Liberal caucus over the flag issue. It was not until the confession of the hon. member for York-Humber yesterday that I realized why there was no disagreement. The matter had never been discussed with the membership of the caucus.

I urge the Prime Minister to reconsider this whole question, its timing and its dangers. There is after all, Mr. Speaker, a difference between courage and foolhardiness. I suggest that the course he is now following can only lead to a confrontation of all strong people, can only divide and deepen mistrust. If he does not do this, if he insists as he did earlier today that he shall have his way, then I predict that he will be remembered in history not as a man of many distinguished accomplishments and contributions to Canada, but rather as the great token prime minister who helped the country into bitterness that will be a lasting black mark on his name, on our House of Commons and on our time.

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): I hesitated to rise, Mr. Speaker, because I did not want to prevent some member of the Liberal party from participating in the debate. I continue to wonder why no member of the cabinet has come to the defence of the Prime Minister. The Minister of Trade and Commerce was not doing that the other day. What has happened to the former great Liberal party?

However, as no one did rise, I take this opportunity to participate in what has become a great, historic debate of national importance. There is no question now, since ample evidence has been produced in the course of this debate, that there is a very strong feeling across this country against the action of the present government, and particularly the action of the Prime Minister. There has been ample evidence of the strength of feeling in members who have spoken so far in the course of this debate, and they have indicated that they are expressing the feelings of their constituents.

The miscalculation of the Prime Minister and his advisers has been shown to be very great. There was miscalculation with regard to the approach to a subject such as this which arouses the emotions, which affects our history and traditions; an amazing miscalculation with regard to the attitude that would be taken by the members of races other than the founding races of this country; a miscalculation with regard to the method by which an innovation like this should be brought forward.

This is a catalogue of errors. The result so far has been not to create the unity which the Prime Minister emphasized so much in his opening speech on this subject, but to create great disunity. The Prime Minister will go down in history as the man who, of his own accord, by his own faulty judgment, created greater disunity in this country than at any time in our history. This is a lamentable development indeed. I hope it is not too late for the Prime Minister to retrace his steps and restore to Canada better feeling with regard to the matters that should unite us rather than divide us.

In a matter such as this, as the hon. member for Brandon-Souris pointed out when he was speaking, evolution is the process, a slow and steady development if change is desired in something that touches so deeply at the roots of our country, and not the revolutionary tactics and arbitrary action of the government. This was the initial, vital mistake of the Prime Minister. His greatest error was made in his approach to the biennial conference of the Royal Canadian Legion in May of this year in the city of Winnipeg. Members of the Royal Canadian Legion will take second place to no citizens of this country in their devotion to duty and their love of their country. They have demonstrated this ever since the organization of that great body. Their efforts are primarily concentrated, after they have dealt with the problems of their disabled comrades, on improving the life of communities right across Canada and making stronger our national spirit.

However, it was to this body that the Prime Minister, without prior notice, without advising the officers of that organization that he was going to introduce a political note, brought forward his proposal for a new flag. As a member of the Legion since 1927 I register, as my comrades on this side of the house have, my protest against that action. When I heard that the Prime Minister was going out to Winnipeg to do this—and in this rumour-infested town you hear about these things in advance—I said it would not happen for three reasons. First, the Prime Minister is himself a veteran of the first

world war. He will respect the stand of the veterans on the question of the flag. He knows they have been endeavouring to conduct a campaign to retain the Canadian red ensign. In the second place, he will not do it because, as a veteran, he knows that their opening ceremony held on Sunday is a memorial service, a deeply impressive memorial service, for the hundred thousand comrades who were left overseas around the world. I said that he would know every man and woman in that audience on that occasion would be thinking of friends who had been lost in battle. I said the third reason he would not do it would be that, after years of experience in the field of diplomacy and in political life, he would judge it to be unwise to introduce a political question under such circumstances.

Unfortunately the Prime Minister, either wrongly advised or failing to exercise good judgment, intruded himself upon that memorial service of the Canadian Legion and introduced a political tone that aroused controversy which will not be forgotten. Unfortunately the Prime Minister—and this is really unfortunate because veterans tend to respect veterans—lost the respect of thousands of members of the Canadian Legion. To show how much effect his announcement had on this gathering, in subsequent days when they were still assembled in their business sessions, a petition addressed to the Secretary of State was signed with 1,100 names, indicating the veterans were unimpressed with the Prime Minister's point of view and registering their opinion and belief that the Canadian red ensign should be maintained as Canada's flag. I shall transmit that petition to the Secretary of State as a permanent record of the feelings of the members of the Canadian Legion who were present at that meeting.

I intend to deal with certain inaccuracies which have crept into this debate, concerning the maple leaf emblem and the Canadian red ensign, and then I propose to indicate why in the suggested plebiscite, if and when it is held, people should give their support to the flag we now have rather than to the personal choice of the Prime Minister or to the personal choice of a fragment of the New Democratic party, because you have in those two suggestions political flags, flags sponsored by political parties. With regard to the inaccuracies that have crept into the debate so far, much has been made of the fact that the maple leaf has a long history in our country, and with that I do not disagree. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson), who patiently made quite a study of this matter, pointed that out when he was talking. It has been a recognized symbol and, as I said during the course of his speech, we admire it as a symbol but not as a flag.

I do not quarrel with any of the arguments made about the antiquity of the maple leaf as a Canadian symbol, but I do suggest that the references made by the hon. member for Leeds and the Prime Minister, with regard to its use by the Canadian army overseas and Canadian service people overseas in two world wars, are somewhat inaccurate.

Quite a bit was made of the fact that most of the battalions that served overseas in the first world war wore the maple leaf as a cap badge or shoulder badge. That is true because about 90 per cent of them did; but I happen to be one, like the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Fane), who served in that world war and never wore a maple leaf badge. There were thousands of others also in a similar position. However most of the battalions did have a maple leaf badge, and it arose this way.

When mobilization was called in 1914 General Sir Sam Hughes, minister of national defence, decided he would not use the names of the militia regiments and favoured instead, and so ordered, that regiments would be numbered. So the battalions that were raised were numbered from one up to several hundred. Then, when the battalions were being organized the commanding officers were faced with a considerable problem, one which I have gone through twice in my experience in the army, namely what to do for a cap badge, what should be the design, and what to do with a number, like 7, 44 or 115, pinned to the cap. The obvious solution was to put a backing on the cap badge, and the easiest thing to deal with was a maple leaf. And so the maple leaf was used as a base and the numbers were superimposed on it.

There were a few exceptions. The Little Black Devils of Winnipeg did not put the maple leaf behind their historic figure. The 22nd regiment superimposed their number on the beaver, and the Black Watch maintained their original insignia. The Fort Garry Horse of Winnipeg had the Fort Garry gate, and they put the maple leaf behind that; but they should now remove it because the Fort Garry gate alone is sufficient recognition of that regiment. Neither did the Royal Canadian Dragoons make use of the maple leaf. And so it was by accident, not by design, that the maple leaf was so outstanding and so extensively used in the first world war.

In the second world war about 60 per cent of the battalions in the army used the maple

leaf in connection with their badges, and 40 per cent did not. Once again in my experience in the second world war I served in northwest Europe without wearing anything resembling a maple leaf, and so did thousands of other members of the Canadian army, the Royal Canadian Air Force and the navy. In the second world war the maple leaf was not the all-pervading symbol that it was in the first world war, and in the regular army of today only about 20 per cent of the battalions have a maple leaf incorporated in the design of their badges. Therefore the maple leaf has been going out of existence since the first world war, when it arose by accident, and you cannot make an argument on the basis of war experience that the maple leaf was preferred by Canadian servicemen.

To give the house an example of how misconceptions arise, in the fall of 1945 some parliamentarians visited northwest Europe. They motored up from the Normandy beaches into Holland, and by that time the army was forward in Holland and on the banks of the Meuse. These parliamentarians were impressed by what they saw en route and one of them made the following remarks a few years ago, after indicating where they had been. As a matter of fact they did not drive up from the Normandy beaches. They flew into Brussels, motored down the coastline and then up into Holland; but this is what he says about the Canadian troops:

> As if they were anxious to show that they were Canadians they had painted maple leaves on pieces of cardboard, and nailed them to the telegraph poles and trees along the road. If up to that time I had not believed that Canada should have a distinctive flag, I would have believed it then. And ever since that time, whenever, I have had the opportunity I have told that story, because I think it meets some of the arguments of those who think that we should not consider having a purely distinctive national flag.

It is very easy for misconceptions to arise when you do not know the facts. The fighting troops of the Canadian army were much further forward than these visiting parliamentarians. The parliamentarians travelled along a route which was marked with maple leaf emblems from the Normandy beaches into Holland, and the purpose of those markings was simply to direct the lorry drivers on that long drive, travelling night and day, so that they would not have to stop to read maps. We called it "maple leaf up" and "maple leaf down". Those signs were just road signs set up by ingenious Canadians for that purpose, and they were of great help to a lorry driver I had in my regiment who was unable to read or write, but who could follow the signs.

One of the visiting parliamentarians thought this was evidence of a national desire on the part of the Canadian troops to have the maple leaf as their symbol. But there was nothing to it at all. It was simply a route director and the Canadian soldiers paid no more attention to this than they did to a great many other things during their lives. As a matter of fact, in both world wars the distinguishing sign for Canadians was the word "Canada" on the shoulder, worn on the greatcoat or on the tunic. You don't peer at a man's cap badge to find out what country he comes from; you look at the flash on his shoulder. Every Canadian was proud to have the word "Canada" there, and that is how they were designated. In forward areas, where steel helmets were worn, there were no cap badges in evidence. It was the distinguishing regimental flash, the brigade and divisional insignia on the arm of the tunic, which indicated where a man belonged.

Mr. Matheson: But every divisional badge contained a maple leaf.

Mr. Churchill: No. In the first world war there were 140 badges and these will be found in the official history of that war. They were of different colours, and there is not a maple leaf to be found among them.

Another inaccuracy which has crept into this debate is the statement of the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) as reported on page 4321 of *Hansard*:

> The red ensign, though many of my correspondents do not seem to appreciate this, was not in use during world war one in any way, shape or form for the Canadian forces.

I do not know where the Prime Minister served during the first world war but I think it was not in Flanders. He must have been completely unaware of what was going on. Yesterday my hon. friend from Digby-Annapolis-Kings (Mr. Nowlan), imperturbable as he must have been as an artillery man in the first world war, showed equal imperturbility here under a missile attack in the House of Commons and gave incontrovertible evidence that the Canadian red ensign was used among Canadian troops between 1914 and 1918, and backed his statements up with testimony from General McNaughton. I can corroborate this story, because I was present also, on July 1, Dominion day, at the corps sports event which everyone who was there

will remember all his life. On that occasion, Canadian red ensigns were flying freely at our assembly points.

Was the Canadian red ensign used elsewhere in the first world war? Of course. In 1918 a monument was unveiled to the artillerymen who lost their lives during the battle of Vimy ridge and the Canadian red ensign was flown at the unveiling; a picture of it may be found in some of the books in the library. The Prime Minister did not make the long march from Mons to Germany to join the army of occupation. But I did. When we crossed the Rhine bridges, the first division crossing at Cologne and the second division at Bonn, we passed reviewing stands and on those stands the Canadian red ensign was flying with the union jack. I remember it very well, and as far as the bridge at Bonn is concerned, a reproduction appears in the August 1 edition of the *Globe* magazine—the second Canadian division passing the reviewing stand where the Canadian red ensign was flying. We experienced the same thing when the first Canadian division crossed the bridge at Cologne.

Let me remind the house of another significant factor. Earlier than this, in 1915, in the month of April, the Canadian first division—I was not there at the time—was subjected to a poison gas attack and fought the battle of St. Julien which prevented the Germans breaking through to Ypres and the coast. The name of Canada was spread throughout the world as a result of that action. This was the first occasion in the history of the world upon which poison gas had been used, and our Canadian troops were among the first to be subjected to it. They were without any protection whatsoever—it was before gas masks had been invented. And they held the line, though the Canadian division suffered 6,000 casualties, killed and wounded. But, as I say, the name of Canada was flashed across the world and in the celebrated magazine *Punch,* an artist, sensing the significance of that occasion, drew a picture which has since been reproduced many times in this country—it should be hanging somewhere in the corridors of our parliament buildings. It was a picture of a Canadian soldier standing on a battlefield amid barbed wire and mud; near him is a piece of artillery and all around is a scene of desolation and destruction. The soldier standing there holds a rifle in one hand, and in the other, he grasps—what? A Canadian red ensign—the distinctive flag of Canada at that time.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Churchill: I mention these things to correct some of the inaccuracies which have crept into this debate thus far.

Another inaccuracy which is even more alarming is an inaccuracy with regard to Canada's coat of arms. The Prime Minister and the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson) have based their case on the emblem of the three maple leaves which appears in the coat of arms, and they have drawn our attention to the proclamation of 1921. It is an incidental footnote to history that when this declaration was signed by King George in 1921 it was transmitted to Canada, to the governor general here, by none other than one who was a member of the government at that time, the most famous man of this century, Winston Churchill. His letter will be found in the appropriate books.

Hon. members opposite have spoken about that proclamation and they have based their case upon it. But they have been misled into inaccuracies. I do not think they realize the extent of those inaccuracies. On June 15, the Prime Minister, as recorded on page 4322 of *Hansard,* spoke on the subject of the proclamation and the order in council, and then he used these words:

> If I may paraphrase this royal proclamation of 1921 establishing the arms of Canada, by simplifying the heraldic language, what it said in essence was this: The King, at the request of Canada, assigns to Canada the national colours white and red, and declares that the national emblem of Canada shall be three red maple leaves on one stem, on a white field. These shall be used to represent Canada on all appropriate occasions. Surely Mr. Speaker, that answers the two questions "What are our national colours"? "What is our national emblem"?

I suggest, first, that those words were not the original words of the Prime Minister; they are the words of Colonel Duguid, who delivered exactly that interpretation of the proclamation to the committee which was meeting in 1945 to discuss the Canadian flag. Those words, which I shall soon show to be inaccurate, have continued down for almost 20 years now, have received the blessing of the Prime Minister and are already being quoted as authentic by people who are writing letters to newspapers.

Mr. Matheson: Mr. Speaker, I will but interrupt my hon. friend for a moment, but I wonder whether at this point he would be good enough to explain the answer given by his government on February 5, 1963, to question No. 1,449. This question was:

> Does Canada have a national emblem; and if so, what is the emblem?

Canadian Flag

The answer was:

Yes. Three maple leaves conjoined on one stem.

The other question was:

Does Canada have national colours; and if so, what are these colours?

Yes. White and red.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Churchill: I am very glad the hon. member mentioned that, Mr. Speaker, because he has been studying this problem and his speech in June encouraged me to study it. I would say now that the government of our day was misled, in exactly the same way as was the government of Mr. Mackenzie King, the government of Mr. St. Laurent, and the present government. I shall give the house the evidence to show this is the case. I will put forward two pieces of evidence. One is contained in the committee report of 1945 and is to be found on page 59. Mr. Savage, who is not without distinction in the art of heraldry, made these statements. He said that Colonel Duguid's statement abounds in false premises and inaccuracies; that Colonel Duguid has confounded the colours of mantling and crest wreath with "national colours"; has taken the maple sprig, a small part of Canada's arms, and incorrectly stated that it is the "national emblem of Canada". Then Mr. Savage says in so doing Colonel Duguid has changed from green to red the accepted and heraldically proper colour of the maple leaves; has read into and deduced from the proclamation, and has presented as facts, conclusions and statements which definitely are not included in that document.

As further evidence let me draw to the attention of the house the explanatory notes that were produced by the committee of 1921. The committee, which the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson) has drawn to our attention, and has commended for its ability—with which I do not disagree at all, because very able men sat on that committee—made certain comments in their explanatory notes concerning the coat of arms. You have to refer to a bulletin of the dominion bureau of statistics in order to find what they had to say. I have been able to find only the second edition of a descriptive booklet published by the office of the secretary of state in 1923. There was obviously a first edition. There have been subsequent editions published, I think, in 1937 and 1947. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I had to go back to the d.b.s. annual report of 1921 to find out what they had decided was the meaning of that proclamation and the advice they had given to the government. This is what you will find on page 17 of the Canada Year Book of 1921:

> Three considerations were kept in view in determining the "achievement of arms", i.e., the combination of arms, crest, supporters and motto, which has now been authorized. These were: first, that Canadians stand to their King in as close a relation as do any of his subjects elsewhere; secondly, that Canada, an integral part of the British empire, has emerged from the war a member of the league of nations; and lastly, that Canada was founded by the men of four different races—French, English, Scottish and Irish—and that Canadians inherit the language, laws, literature and arms of all four mother countries.
>
> The arms are those of England, Scotland, Ireland, and France, with a "difference" to mark them as Canadian, namely, on the lower third of the shield, a sprig of maple on a silver shield.
>
> The crest is a lion holding in its paw a red maple leaf, a symbol of sacrifice.
>
> The supporters are, with some slight distinctions, the lion and unicorn of the royal arms. The lion upholds the union jack, and the unicorn the ancient banner of France.
>
> The motto is new—*A mari usque ad mare*—"From Sea to Sea"...

There is not one word there with regard to national colours. Are we to believe that the committee which sat in 1921, and which subsequently drew up the representations for the coat of arms and had the coat of arms produced and submitted to the college of heralds in London, were dealing with national colours when they went through all that work? Why did they not make some mention of "national colours" in the course of their explanatory notes? Why is there no mention of this in the subsequent issues? In this issue there is not one word about "national colours". I ask the hon. member for Leeds, who has made a study of this problem, to indicate to me the authority by which he determined that the mantling on the coat of arms represents national colours. I have not been able to find any authority for that.

Mr. Matheson: Mr. Speaker, if I may—

Mr. Churchill: Subsequently he may be able to give us that information. If so, I shall be very grateful. But I want to move on to this other significant point, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Matheson: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I may answer that point. These colours are in both the wreath of the liveries and in the mantling of the arms. And has this not been completely covered in the announcement of the Hon. Ellen Fairclough of October 8, 1957 and, furthermore, Her Majesty's banner as Queen of Canada, containing three maple leaves on a white field at base, which was created by Sir Anthony Wagner in 1962, when my hon. friend was a member of the privy council?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. Is the hon. member for Leeds rising to ask a question, or is he rising on a point of order?

Some hon. Members: He made a speech.

Mr. Matheson: Mr. Speaker, I rose in reply to what was said by my hon. friend and also to ask a question of him. My question is, has not this matter been dealt with by the clear, unequivocal statement of the Hon. Ellen Fairclough of October 8, 1957; and, furthermore, the subsequent act of Her Majesty in 1962 on the matter of her own banner as Queen of Canada?

Mr. Churchill: I do not mind these interruptions, Mr. Speaker, provided my time is not subsequently reduced, because it is a very interesting question. I think our government was misled, just as other governments were misled, by that original statement of Colonel Duguid's. Let me deal now with the three red maple leaves. I have read the description that on the coat of arms there is a lion standing on the crest, holding in an uplifted paw a red maple leaf. The explanation is, "The crest is a lion holding in its paw a red maple leaf, a symbol of sacrifice". That description or definition was repeated in the subsequent issues concerning the arms of Canada, published by the office of the Secretary of State, until you reach the issue of this year, 1964, when that descriptive sentence is left out.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: Why was it left out? In the terminology of the coat of arms this red leaf is described as "gules", which means red. There were three other leaves in the coat of arms and the description, I think, can be given as "proper", or in the French version, "au naturel", which means in its natural state. The red maple leaf had been pre-empted for one specific purpose, to indicate the sacrifice of life in the first world war which contributed to the building of our nation.

We cannot have then, sir, one red maple leaf representing that sacrifice and then three more red maple leaves. That was never intended, because had the people who devised the coat of arms in 1921 intended that the three leaves at the bottom should be red they would have specifically stated that and used the word "gules". They did not use that word but instead "proper" or "au naturel". The maple leaf in its natural state is green. It is when the leaf is dying that it turns red.

Are we to take away from the coat of arms, as has been taken away in this descriptive booklet, that red maple leaf which represents a blood sacrifice in the first world war? I say that Colonel Duguid was wrong when he said that the three maple leaves at the lower part of the coat of arms should be red. He was obviously aiming at the achievement of something; a white background for a flag with red maple leaves.

We are now faced with this problem. What do we do with the coat of arms? If we are going to accept the idea of three red maple leaves on a white background in the coat of arms, what do we do with the red maple leaf in the right paw of the lion representing that sacrifice? You see, this is an impossible situation. I suggest this change was made for some deliberate purpose.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: I am surprised that members opposite laugh. I think that red maple leaf representing the sacrifice made in the first world war is very proper and should be retained. I think, therefore, we should revert to the colour which was on the crest before, namely three green maple leaves.

Referring again to the original question asked by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson), Mr. Speaker, I think that the secretary of state in 1957 was misled or not given complete information. As a matter of fact, I phoned her to find out what the situation was, but my only recollection of that episode is that we were told the coat of arms would be changed because Queen Elizabeth had selected a different crown; the St. Edward crown to replace the Tudor crown. The only alteration required in the coat of arms was a redrawing of the crown, and that was done.

That opened the way to what has been called a simplification of the coat of arms. I do not object to this and I think it has been done rather nicely. However, in the circular letter—there was no order in council—issued on September 23, 1957 and signed by the under secretary of state, there was nothing to indicate that there would be changes made in the coat of arms. There was reference to the fact that the change was being made because of the change of crown, and I think this is sensible. There was also reference to simplifying representations of the coat of arms but not one word in respect of changing the green maple leaves to red.

Mr. Speaker, when the enlarged coat of arms was hung up in the railway committee room several years ago I looked at it week

after week while sitting there in caucus, and I commenced to wonder why we could not have the colours put on that coat of arms. I went to the Speaker of the house, Hon. Mr. Michener, and asked whether steps could be taken to have that coat of arms coloured so we could see exactly what was on it. Had it been coloured I am sure I would have noticed the change from green to red.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest an error has been committed, and the reason I have dealt with this matter at length is that unless this error is corrected people outside this House of Commons, writing about our coat of arms and our so-called national colours, will follow this mistaken course. I feel this error should be corrected.

Mr. Speaker, I could produce more evidence from people skilled in heraldry to support my point of view. I think it would be a great advantage to a committee to consider this problem and to call for expert advice. We are amateurs in heraldry. I did not know much about it three months ago, although I know a lot more about it today. But we are only amateurs. Furthermore, the revised coat of arms issued in 1957 was not submitted to the college of heralds in London, and there is no college of heralds in Canada. It was not submitted for their advice, counsel and approval as to whether or not this design was accurate. I suggest we have fallen into an error. We are referring to Canada's colours being white and red. I say there is no authority for that suggestion. We are talking about Canada's national emblem being three red maple leaves on a silver-white background. I say there is no authority for that suggestion whatsoever, except that statement made by Colonel Duguid in 1945.

Mr. Matheson: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member whether he has given serious consideration—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member's time has expired, unless he has the unanimous consent of the house to continue.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Matheson: Mr. Speaker, I should like to know whether the hon. member is overlooking in his comments the fact that a royal warrant of Queen Victoria in 1868 conferred—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Before the hon. member for Leeds can be allowed to ask a question I think we must ascertain whether hon. members will extend the permission of the house to the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre to speak beyond his allotted time.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Drouin: Mr. Speaker, I do not see any objection to the hon. member who had the floor being allowed to answer the question asked by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson) but I am against his being given more time.

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Apparently the hon. member does not have the unanimous consent of the house to continue. I regret that we cannot hear him.

Some hon. Members: Closure.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. It is very difficult for the Chair, in view of comments being made on both sides of the house, to determine clearly whether or not the hon. member has unanimous consent to continue. Do we have unanimous agreement?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I hear at least one no, and in the circumstances I regret that the hon. member may not continue.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, I bow to the will of the house.

Mr. A. M. McLean (Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, I originally had no intention of entering this debate on the flag, but after so many opposition members stating that the backbenchers in the Liberal party should get up and state their opinions I concluded that I should do so, and give my reasons for the position I take. It is not against my conscience that I do so, Mr. Speaker.

First let me say I am a Canadian, a Legion member and a past president of my local Legion branch. I am a life member of the Legion and I served in the first great war under the union flag or, as it is called, the union jack. Sometimes I think I belong to the lost generation, the generation of the union jack. All these things I do not think should keep me from thinking and stating that Canada should have a distinctive flag.

As a Canadian, my ancestors have been here for upwards of 200 years. Before the first great war I was what you might call a Britisher—not an Englishman, Mr. Speaker,

but a Britisher. Canada was a part of the empire and I was a British subject. For me, when the empire was at war Canada was at war. At that time I was not alone in those thoughts. Sir Wilfrid Laurier was an ardent champion of the empire. In fact, in 1898 his postmaster general brought out a stamp and the stamp showed the British empire all in red and Canada in the centre. The words on the stamp were, "We hold a vaster empire than has been". Even the Transvaal and the Orange Free State of South Africa were incorporated in red, although I believe they were not annexed by Britain until two years later.

For many reasons the first great war changed the opinions and ideas of a great many people, and after the war for me Canada came first. On returning home I thought in the words of the poet:

> Breathes there the man, with soul so dead,
> Who never to himself hath said,
> This is my own, my native land?

If I was not before, Mr. Speaker, I was a Canadian then; but the union jack was still my flag. It has been said by opposition members that the cross of St. George, the cross of St. Andrew and the cross of St. Patrick, together forming the union jack, have always stood for high ideals, justice and freedom and that in fact they represent our Christian faith. I would say that on balance in the past this was probably true. But what about a Scotsman whose forebears were forced out of Scotland under this same flag? Can he look back and, remembering the forced emigration from Scotland, the clansmen who were evicted from the highlands, the homes that were burned and the people who died on the emigration ships, think that that flag at that time represented high ideals, justice, freedom and the Christian faith for the highlanders? The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. MacEwan) can perhaps bear me out.

Reading John Prebble's "The Highland Clearances", one finds that in the summer of 1791 George Dunoon advertised the sailing of the *Sarah* and the *Dove* from Fort William in Scotland for Pictou, Nova Scotia. Had the laws then covering slave ships applied to these emigration vessels, they would not have been allowed to carry more than 489 passengers. Dunoon filled the tiny holds with 700 emigrants from Lord Reay's country and the clan lands of Seaforth, Fraser and Cameron. If they believed his promise that in Nova Scotia they would find a tree that supplied fuel, soap and sugar, they might have found the nightmare voyage endurable, but it is unlikely. Forty nine people died on the *Sarah* alone and the suffering of all was so terrible that it was remembered in Nova Scotia for more than a century.

You might say, Mr. Speaker, why did they go? Well, the lairds or the chiefs of the clans owned the lands and they could not resist English money. The Scottish highlands were rented or bought up for sheep ranches. The people were evicted from their homes and if they did not move their homes were burned. They had to emigrate. It is surprising to me, Mr. Speaker, that so many of these people, including myself, still have a great love for their native land, Scotland, and for the flag which looked down on these terrible scenes. Perhaps it is because we can forget the past. I heard a member of the opposition say that a country that forgets its past has no future, or words to that effect. However, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that most of the trouble in the world is because we cannot forget the past or do not wish to forget the past.

Look at the trouble on Cyprus, Mr. Speaker, the trouble on the Israeli border, the trouble in Kenya. In fact, it seems to me that the trouble all over the world is caused by people who cannot forget the past. My great-great-grandfather was scalped by the French and Indians on a raid down the Saint John river, but I do not see that this is any reason for me to keep on remembering it so that I should hate all Frenchmen and all Indians. Apparently we were a bicultural people at that time.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Boutin: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

[*Text*]

Mr. McLean (Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the opposition members—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is rising on a point of order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Boutin: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has just said that his ancestors were scalped by the French. I wonder where in history books that fact is mentioned and, consequently, I feel that this gratuitous statement should be deleted from the hon. member's speech.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is obvious that the point of order raised by the hon. member for Dorchester is not well taken. He could ask a question which the hon. member for Charlotte could answer, but he cannot raise a point of order in this connection.

Canadian Flag

[*Text*]

Mr. McLean (Charlotte): Again, I heard an opposition member say that his father came to this country and found freedom. A great many people have come to this country and found freedom, but it was not always thus. We did not always have responsible government in Canada.

Mr. Mandziuk: We do not have it now.

Mr. McLean (Charlotte): Louis Joseph Papineau and William Mackenzie had to go to the United States. We had a rebellion in 1837. We did not always have responsible government in this Canada of ours. It was my great-grandfather and great-great-grandfather and many of the great-grandfathers of the members present who made this country and laid the foundations of freedom for those who came after to enjoy and for the present generation to enjoy.

It has been said by an opposition member that the Canadian red ensign is known all over the world as representing Canada, and is the only red ensign. I would point out that in 1939 there were six red ensigns. The British mercantile marine had one, Canada had one, Jamaica had one, British Guiana had one, Tasmania had one and Newfoundland had one. I have known the union jack and the red ensign for over 70 years and to my mind the red ensign has always been a secondary flag.

As of 1939, Pear's Encyclopedia states that the flag flown over Canadian government buildings outside Canada is the red ensign, but that inside Canada the union jack is used. Before the first great war we had no embassies abroad but after the war in the early thirties, I believe, embassies were established and there was no way to distinguish a Canadian embassy from a British embassy if they both flew the union jack, which was the flag of Canada. So apparently the secondary flag, the red ensign, was flown over these buildings. Hence Pear's Encyclopedia states that in 1939 the red ensign was flown over Canadian government buildings outside Canada and by the Canadian mercantile marine, but inside Canada the union jack was used.

The union flag was introduced in 1606 after the union of England and Scotland and first bore the crosses of St. George and St. Andrew. It was ordered by James I to be borne on the maintop of all British ships except ships of war. On ships of war the union flag was borne upon their jackstaffs. I believe this is the reason why it is called the union jack. The cross of St. Patrick was added in 1801 on the union with Ireland.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are three ensigns and the ensign is flown upon the ensign staff of the vessel indicating its nationality. The red, white and blue ensigns represented the divisions of the British fleet but in 1864 the divisions were done away with and new uses were allocated to the three ensigns. The white ensign is the exclusive flag of the Royal Navy and the Royal Yacht Squadron. The red ensign is flown by British merchant ships and ships not belonging to the Royal Navy. The blue ensign is flown by the Royal Naval Reserve and by certain yacht clubs.

The Cambridge Encyclopedia states that colonial war vessels flew the blue ensign with the colony's badge in the fly. Recently I made a voyage on a Canadian government fishery vessel to Campobello and I noticed that the vessel flew the blue ensign and it had a badge in the fly, I presume denoting the colony. I would also point out that in Jamaica the flag with the crosses flew for nearly 300 years, 100 years longer than in Canada. When Jamaica became independent this flag, which had represented the power and prestige of the British for 300 years, was pulled down or lowered not by a citizen of Jamaica but by a member of the royal family, Princess Margaret. I would point out also, Mr. Speaker, that the blue ensign, the flag of Kenya, was pulled down or lowered not by a citizen of Kenya but by a member of the royal family, Prince Philip. Can the opposition be more loyal to the crown than the royal family itself?

It has been said by members of the opposition that the crosses on our flag represent the Christian faith and the government is engaged in pulling down the Chistian faith; that they are apparently about to raise a non-Christian flag. Some rather vicious propaganda has come across my desk in this regard. In one propaganda sheet headed, "The Sign of the Times", it states:

> Christian haters have taken the cross off the soldiers' graves, so take the cross off the flag—the next will be the cross out of the churches.

I do not believe that any member in this house would agree that this is true. I would point to the Irish republic, a Christian state from early days and the emerald isle of St. Patrick. I suppose the Irishmen in the Irish republic are more Roman Catholic than the Roman Catholics themselves. Yet when they got a new flag, Mr. Speaker, did they put on it the cross of St. Patrick? No, they did not.

The Irish republic has a flag consisting of three stripes, green, white and orange. I can imagine that the green is for the emerald isle and the white is probably for honour or the Christian state. However the orange, that colour stumped me, unless it was put on for the orangemen of the six counties of northern Ireland with whom they wish to unite some time. The stripes are all of equal width, the green being nearest the pole. This argument, therefore, about Christianity and the flag seems to me to fall flat when we consider the flag of the Irish republic. In fact, many Christian countries have crosses on their flags and many Christian countries have not. Are we to say that the great republic to the south of us is not a Christian country because a cross does not appear on its flag?

I want a distinctive Canadian flag, Mr. Speaker. I have 12 grandchildren and I do not want them living in the past. I want them to live for the future. I want a distinctive Canadian flag for that future for them. Then, they and all other grandchildren in Canada can say, "This is my flag; this is the Canadian flag which represents the Canada of the future". Canada is a great country, Mr. Speaker. It is going to be still greater in thought, in word and in deed. I see the future of Canada in the bright, young and intelligent faces I look upon as I travel across our wonderful land.

Mr. W. H. A. Thomas (Middlesex West): Mr. Speaker, since the day the session began this house has probably not faced a more important or a more serious decision than that concerning the new flag of this country. The flag, in itself, may not be important but that for which it stands is most important. Someone has said it represents the soul of the people, and I believe that. I believe that no amount of effort, no expense and no amount of time should stand in the way of this house choosing and offering the Canadian people a flag which will attain the unity of the people. Unity is needed in this country as much as anything else is needed. We have two great races that are undertaking to create, on the northern half of this continent, a great nation. Its future is almost unlimited. We have made a great start.

There have been murmurings recently of discontent, a certain amount of bickering and quarrelling between the founding races of this country. I do not believe that this is serious, and after listening to the speeches in this debate I think that this house and the people of the country can take great hope from what has transpired so far. The government, I honestly believe, has tried to add to the unity of Canada by presenting to the people a new Canadian flag, a distinctive flag, a flag which the people of Canada will be willing to accept as their own. I would commend the government for this, even although I think their approach to this problem is very wrong.

During one of the discussions of a recent budget the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) urged this house to give consideration to the objectives of the government, to take cognizance of what the government was trying to do, to give them credit for trying to improve the economy of this country. Well, I am willing to give the government credit for trying to create a greater measure of satisfaction in this country through the introduction of a flag.

Now we have before us a resolution, an amendment and a subamendment. The principle involved in the resolution is the establishment of a distinctive Canadian flag for Canada. I can agree with that. I can agree with most of the first sentence in the resolution which is to the effect that the government be authorized to take such steps as may be necessary to establish an official flag. I cannot agree with the remainder of it. The right hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) has moved that all the words after "that" be deleted and the following substituted:

> As the proposal to change Canada's national flag will affect the unity and destiny of Canada now and for years to come, the government be authorized to take such steps as may be necessary to conduct a plebiscite prior to any further action being taken by the House of Commons, in order that all Canadians may be given their rightful opportunity to declare their choice concerning a national flag.

Again, so far as the idea of a plebiscite is concerned, I am in wholehearted accord with it. I am speaking for myself when I say I question the words after the word "plebiscite" which are, "prior to any further action being taken by the House of Commons," and my reason for questioning that particular part of the amendment will be made clear as I go along.

The subamendment moved by the hon. member for Regina City (Mr. More) would seek to insert four questions in a plebiscite:

> 1. Are you in favour of the Canadian red ensign?
> 2. Are you in favour of the Canadian red ensign with changes made thereon to show the main heritages of both founding races?
> 3. Are you in favour of the three maple leaves design?
> 4. Are you in favour of a one maple leaf design?

I would like to see the people of Canada offered their choice in this regard, but I would not put these questions in words, I would put them in flag designs. The ballot would contain four, five or six of the most popular designs that can be arrived at through an all party committee or through a commission, and the people would be allowed to mark their "X" opposite the particular design of their choice. If that method were followed I see no reason why a flag design could not be arrived at and accepted which could be a unifying influence in this country.

Some people favour the red ensign; some favour three maple leaves, some favour one maple leaf. But there are other people who do not favour any of these and who are looking for something in the nature of a compromise, and that is the group which has my sympathy. If there is insistence on the unmodified red ensign there will be a large element dissatisfied. If the three maple leaf design is imposed by this house there will also be a great many people dissatisfied. It may be contended that you can never arrive at a design which will satisfy everybody, and I agree with that contention.

However I feel that the greatest amount of satisfaction and the greatest amount of unanimity can be reached through the acceptance of a flag which is acceptable to the majority of the people in this country. I have in my hand, and I suppose most members of the house have received this little flag, a design which may be folded, composed of a red cross and a blue cross arranged on a white background, with a maple leaf superimposed over the centre. This has been suggested by one of our colleagues from the province of Quebec. Another suggestion by one of our colleagues from Quebec is a flag divided diagonally from the upper outside corner to the lower inside corner, the upper inside triangle being red and containing a small union jack—quite small, not a quarter of the flag as it is in the red ensign—and the outside triangle, being white and containing a fleur-de-lis. I am only suggesting these as possible compromise flags which would tend to satisfy everyone and which would tend to unity rather than division.

The opposition has a job to do. Under the rules and traditions of parliament it is the duty and right of the opposition to prevent the government from taking action which might not be in the best interests of the country as a whole. The official opposition believes that the procedure—and I repeat the word procedure—being used by the government in seeking to establish a new national flag is harmful to national unity and should be abandoned in favour of a different approach. The procedure being followed amounts to an autocratic imposition on the majority of Canadians against their will, and despite their protests, of a political, unilaterally chosen, unsatisfactory, party labelled flag.

A summer recess has been offered parliament as an incentive for acceptance, and a general election has been threatened for refusal. The stubborn persistence of the government in forcing this flag issue, in the way it is forcing it, has disrupted the orderly processes of parliament, has delayed the sessional program of legislation and is degrading the image of this institution. The government's methods have failed to promote unity and have failed to bring to the people of Canada the satisfaction that can rightfully be expected through the establishment of a distinctive, acceptable national flag.

The government's methods of approach have proved a failure. Widespread dissatisfaction and disunity have been the result. The time has come to adopt a new approach to this flag problem. The new approach suggested is the abandonment of the government's nation-wrecking, unity-destroying flag resolution in its present form, in favour of a continued search for other more satisfactory flag designs, through the medium of an all party committee, with the final choice to be made through a national plebiscite or referendum.

This is not a sudden unconsidered idea on my part. On February 24 I asked the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) the following question on the orders of the day as shown on page 136 of *Hansard*:

> 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?

To which the Prime Minister replied:

> 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.

I hope that as a result of this debate the Prime Minister can see his way clear to adopting such a course.

I have searched for the judgment of others to support my contention that the government is on the wrong track and in this regard I would refer the house to an editorial, already mentioned on several occasions during this debate, which appeared in the *Globe and Mail* some three months ago under the heading "Collision Course". It appeared in the issue of June 2, 1964. Even three months ago the editor who wrote this article could see where the situation was leading. The first paragraph reads as follows:

> In his haste to give Canada a distinctive national flag, Prime Minister Lester Pearson has set his government and the nation itself on a collision course. There is still time for him to alter it. But there is not much time.

It seemed for a while during recent weeks as though an irresistible force had met an immoveable object. Something had to give. I am relieved, as I am sure all members of this house are relieved, that the government has seen the light to the extent that the threat of an election as a result of an adverse vote in the house has been rescinded. I believe the government has greatly increased its popularity by so doing. If they are willing to go the rest of the way and adopt an all-party approach to this flag issue, I am sure their stock will rise even higher. I am asking for a new approach through an all-party committee, the final selection from among several popular designs to be reached through a plebiscite or referendum.

The editorial article to which I have referred goes on to mention four errors the Prime Minister made in the method he used to provide Canada with a distinctive national flag. The first, the article says, was in setting a time limit of two years within which the new flag was to be produced. The second was to make the flag issue a question of confidence in the government, with a threat to dissolve parliament if the proposed new flag did not gain acceptance. Hon. members will recall that the Prime Minister started out with the idea of a free vote. He later changed his mind and made the issue a question of confidence. Now he is back to a free vote. We want him to change his mind further and make a new start altogether. By doing so he would make himself, his party, and the country generally, a lot happier.

The Prime Minister's third error, in the opinion of this editorial writer, was in giving the flag issue precedence over other pressing business in this house. On June 3, the day following the appearance of this article, the right hon. gentleman outlined 38 items of business, passage of which was required before a summer recess. The flag resolution was not even mentioned. Yet 27 days later, by June 30, when the Prime Minister announced the final five or six items of legislation that he wished completed before a summer recess could be declared, this flag resolution had assumed such importance that it dominated the whole legislative program. The question is: What happened during the month of June to give the flag resolution such importance?

There have been some interesting speculations arising out of this question. One of them is that the flag issue was deliberately injected into the program in order to create a deadlock and provide an excuse for an election. If this was so, the bluff was called by the opposition. If the government wanted an election they were offered an opportunity to have one. Responsible members of this house will not be bought off or bluffed out of doing their job according to the dictates of their consciences.

The editorial writer in the *Globe and Mail* listed a fourth error. He said this was the bringing in of a doublebarrelled flag resolution covering both the government's design of three maple leaves and the union jack. By skilful use of the rule book the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) got the government out of that political sand-trap. The doublebarrelled resolution would have meant defeat in the house; government supporters would not have been willing to take the chance. This so-called fourth error lends further credence to the proposition that the government, for a time at least, was inviting defeat in order to justify an election.

However that may be, the situation was all changed as of Friday last when the Prime Minister lifted the election threat from the house and declared that any vote on the flag resolution or on the amendments thereto would be entirely free.

The *Globe and Mail* editorial writer ends with the following conclusion:

> So we could have an election on, of all issues, a national flag. In such an election, we would be saying that the party with the most popular flag was the one best fitted to run the country. Canada should not—must not—get itself into this ludicrous and dangerous situation.
>
> This is a time for statesmanship. Mr. Pearson should call in the leaders of the four opposition parties and thresh out the whole matter with them.

I am glad to say he has done that. The article goes on:

> He should attempt to find agreement to a method of proceeding with the flag resolution that, by keeping the debate within bounds, would spare

the nation from being pitchforked into an election it does not want, on an issue that would threaten national unity.

I submit that editorial articles in the newspaper having the status of the *Globe and Mail* are worthy of consideration and it is my view that the contents of this article make good backing for the contention that the government is on the wrong track in its search for a national flag, and that the sooner it changes its approach the better it will be for all concerned. This editorial also supports strongly the proposition that the flag should not be a unilateral party choice but should be made an all-party project. We in this party are not asking that the government abandon their search for a satisfactory flag design. We are in favour of a distinctive national flag for Canada; a statement to that effect is in our party manifesto. What we are asking for and begging for, imploring, demanding and insisting upon, Mr. Speaker, is that the government cease its unilateral party policy and adopt an all-party approach.

I submit that the government is fully aware that they are being somewhat stubborn in this matter. As proof of their stubborn attitude, consider one paragraph of the Prime Minister's speech of June 30, as reported at page 4906 of *Hansard*. He said:

The government has been urged to postpone the flag resolution—

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the Prime Minister was discussing the legislation which should be completed before a possible summer recess. This was at the time when he was suggesting there were 38 or 40 different pieces of legislation to be dealt with. He said:

The government has been urged to postpone the flag resolution, as it is obstructing other legislation and as it is, as we all admit, a measure which is controversial and arouses deep and genuine emotions. So far as obstructing other legislation is concerned, I think it is quite clear that there never will be a time when this flag issue, which is an issue of vital national importance, will not be controversial and will not interfere with other legislative proposals to which some hon. members would, for various reasons, wish to give priority over it. So, whenever this resolution would be introduced in the house there would be that difficulty.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that if the government would stop being stubborn over having their own way in this matter, and would adopt an all-party approach and give up their high pressure rush, their troubles with regard to a flag would disappear and a greater measure of unity could be achieved. In spite of warnings and protests in parliament and from outside, the Prime Minister has consistently refused to alter his approach

to the flag issue. He has stated time and again in the house that the flag resolution must be carried through to a decision before a summer recess can be allowed. Well, the time is getting rather late for a summer recess; I am afraid it will have to be a Christmas recess. In his June 30 speech the Prime Minister made another statement, as is reported at page 4907 of *Hansard*. He was still speaking of the items of legislation which he said should be completed before a summer recess could be declared:

In any event, when the matters I have mentioned are dealt with, we shall return to the flag resolutions and the debate on those resolutions would be continued until a decision is reached on them.

He went on further to say:

The target date I should like to submit is the end of July. If we meet that target date it would be our desire and, I think, the desire of all members of the house, for parliament to recess until the middle of September.

It is rather sad to consider those words in retrospect, Mr. Speaker. Here we have the bribe and the threat; the bribe of a recess if the resolution is accepted; the threat that there would be no end to this session short of dissolution, because the Prime Minister must know full well that there are many members in this house who are not prepared to accept the proposition that a unilaterally chosen, party labelled flag shall be imposed as a national symbol on the people of Canada, against the will of a majority and despite their protests.

As further support for the suggested remedy that we are seeking in this matter, I submit the contents of a letter from 12 responsible citizens who have attained a status in their various fields of work which entitles their collective opinion to the fullest consideration. This letter is addressed to the Prime Minister under date of May 27, 1964. I believe copies of this letter were forwarded to every member of this house; at least, I received a copy. Its contents are endorsed by Dr. D. G. Creighton, professor of history at the University of Toronto; Dr. Eugene Forsey, director of research of the Canadian Labour Congress; Mrs. H. A. Dyde, of Edmonton; Dr. W. L. Morton, professor of history, University of Manitoba; Mr. T. H. B. Symons, president and vice-chancellor, Trent university; Mr. Jean Palardy, author, Montreal; Dr. Denis Smith, assistant professor of politics, Trent University; David M. Harley, barrister and solicitor, Toronto; Eric McLean, music critic, Montreal; Mr. Walter Pitman, a respected ex-member of this house—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Thomas: I am glad to see that some of his colleagues remember him. He is head of the history department of Kenner collegiate, Peterborough; Dr. Macgregor Parsons, Red Deer, Alberta; Mr. Scott Symons, assistant curator in charge of Canadiana Collections, Royal Ontario Museum. The letter is not long, but I fear I shall not have time to read it. I will leave it till later, Mr. Speaker, and read it if I do have time. However, I should like to put the last paragraph on the record at this time:

> We respectfully suggest that you withdraw the maple leaf design for the time being, and that you convoke at once a private meeting of the parliamentary leaders of all parties to agree upon a new design which asserts our history. We profoundly believe that the present proposal will only deepen the spiritual malaise of Canada.

I consider this to be one of the finest analyses I have seen regarding the Canadian flag. I will read the rest of that letter, if there is time, before I finish. I wish to submit, as further evidence of dissatisfaction with the government's course of action, an editorial in the July 24 issue of the Montreal *Gazette*, which reads as follows:

> Though a new Canadian flag is far from having been officially adopted, it has been flown a good deal across Canada in an unofficial way. Canadians have had the opportunity to see it as a flag, not merely as a design. And it must be said that it is a poor looking flag. Whatever may be said about the flag issue in general, this particular flag lacks life and colour; it is a drab thing, scrawny and weak.
>
> It is not altogether surprising that the product is poor. For though Canada has had years to contemplate designs for flags, the particular design selected by the government in the end was drawn in a curious crash program.
>
> The designers did their work in nine hectic days. The flag that won the cabinet's approval (with slight later changes) was that of a retired commander of the Royal Canadian Navy, who regards himself as an enthusiastic amateur in the field of heraldry. He worked, as he says, "with one eye closed from 10.30 at night until shortly after 1.30 in the morning."
>
> The design shows rather sadly the one-eyed rush and fatigue with which it was conceived. Not even those most enthusiastic for a new flag have been able to show an equal enthusiasm about the design proposed. These three scratchy maple leaves, dying on a severed stem, have been flown enough already, in an unofficial way, to make clear that they can respond to even a bracing breeze with nothing but a dismal flap.

Mr. Speaker, that is a further indication in a responsible newspaper editorial, as evidenced by the policy of that newspaper, that the present proposed flag does not command the unanimity and the sympathy of the people of this country.

I have received hundreds of letters on this flag issue, as I expect have all members of this house. Hundreds of these letters from Legion groups, the daughters of the empire, Canadian corps associations, women's institutes and others are in favour of the red ensign. Hundreds of other letters are in favour of the government's flag and other designs.

I am opposed to allowing the government to continue on a course of action which will tend to divide the people of Canada into two groups, and then to chose between them in such a way that for generations to come one half of the people of Canada will have bitter feelings towards the other half.

The government's proposal will not bring unity, but discord, and there is no sound reason why they should continue to follow such a policy in such a rush. I believe that a flag design can be chosen through the employment of the proposed methods, which will be more acceptable to all, and in the choice of which there will be no winners and no losers, and from which will result national unity rather than division.

In dealing with the flag issue this house is playing for keeps. I should like to stress that fact, Mr. Speaker. If we discard the red ensign and what might be a compromise flag, and the present resolution succeeds in passing this house, as it appears it will at this stage if there is a vote, we will not be able to undo what we will have done. If we take a sensible attitude we will not be able to undo our actions because we cannot have a new flag every time the government changes. I repeat, no amount of effort, expense, trouble or time should be allowed to stand in the way of the choice of a flag which will be acceptable and tend to unify this country. I think it is possible to find such a design if we adopt an all party approach and let the people make their own choice. For that reason I am in support of the principle of the subamendment as well as, I may say, part of the amendment and part of the resolution.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Terry Nugent (Edmonton-Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, I should like to comment on some of the remarks made by several hon. members who have preceded me in this debate. I was particularly interested in the remarks of the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill), who dealt with the history of the maple leaf both in France and during the last war.

I remember being ordered toward the end of the last war to wear the maple leaf insignia on my tunic. If my memory serves me

correctly only certain troops were instructed to wear that insignia, and those were army troops such as ordnance and supply. I do not believe that the members of regiments who formed the fighting force were ordered to wear the maple leaf patch. When the troops who were ordered to wear this patch saw the design there was an expression of disgust, distaste and annoyance. The patches consisted of a golden maple leaf within a dark circle, to be worn on the shoulder. They were considered to be very ugly in design, and I remember that we could not understand why we should be forced to wear them. I am sure they were worn only because of a threat of military punishment. There was such resentment that quite a long time after the order was issued, at a party in the officers' mess at headquarters, a senior officer pointed out to a brigadier that practically none of his officers were wearing this insignia on their uniforms as required. I assure you there was a good deal of trouble about this situation, and one result was a parade at eight o'clock the following morning of the entire officer group of that unit. I presume this parade was held in an attempt to make sure that the maple leaf patch was worn on the tunics of those officers. I might add, that unit was the largest in the Canadian army.

Mr. Speaker, I point out these facts to give some indication of the reaction to the order requiring these particular army troops to wear that maple leaf insignia. I remembered this situation again only when the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre referred to the maple leaf insignia being used for various purposes at various times.

It is perhaps because I grew up in western Canada that I cannot understand why the maple leaf is supposed to be significant and emblematic of Canada. The use of the insignia to which I referred was introduced only late in the last war, and only to a limited degree. So far as the outfit, to which I was attached, is concerned, it met with nothing less than resentment.

It was a pleasure to hear the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre describe the use of the maple leaf to indicate wartime truck routes. I have never before heard anyone attempt to twist the meaning and acceptance of the use of the maple leaf insignia during the last war into a suggestion that there was a great demand for its use by Canadian troops. I have never heard the significance of the use of that insignia by Canadian troops referred to as a demand for the replacement of our national flag by a flag including that particular design.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the great propaganda campaign, and the attempt to stir up the feelings of Canadian people by misrepresentation, as well as the attempt to minimize the agitation that has been created, I feel it is essential to bring these misrepresentations to light whenever an opportunity presents itself.

I was much intrigued by the remarks of the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. McLean), and I must say I have a good deal of respect for that hon. member. He certainly spoke with conviction. However, I think it is incredible that a man of his age will state, as did some other members in the far left corner of this chamber, that we should not consider the past at all but only look to the future. If any member asks, what is Canada today, I am sure the answer can only be found in our history, those things that Canada has done, the opportunities that have been given to people in this country, the actions that Canadians as individuals and as a nation have taken throughout the years. Canada is a land with a reputation for upholding its end in international obligations, but we have to look at history to see that we have taken our share in world conflicts and world conferences and have made our time, money and resources available to help others.

I certainly hope the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. McLean) is not suggesting that we should not look back and recall these things when somebody asks what Canada is today. I think it would be a betrayal of every soldier who ever fought with distinction in a Canadian uniform to say that we should not look back if the question is asked, what is Canada. If it is not the sacrifices of those men who fought in two world wars, the Korean war and the South African war, if our history of valour on the field of battle and in defence of democracy is not a part of present day Canada, then I do not know what is.

Certainly those who say we should only look to the future must have their tongues in their cheeks. Canada's future is bright and promising but it has been made so only because of the achievements of the past. I suggest that the hon. member for Charlotte and others who are taking a specious look at the question and saying we should forget the past and look only to the future have no idea how to look to the future. They have not, unless they take into consideration what our parliamentary institutions are based on, what our history of democracy and our system of justice mean. Unless they look to the past and understand

it they have no conception of the manner in which we should proceed in the future.

In the thinking of some hon. members who say that a new flag is something of the future and that we should quit looking at the past, I suggest we can put our finger on one of the misconceptions that may have caused this house and the whole country so much trouble in considering the question of whether we should now change our national flag completely. I should not have to remind members that there have been instances such as in Germany during the 1930's when there has been a failure to realize what the system of democracy is based on. Spurious claims and some flag waving were made use of to divert the attention of the people of that country from the lessons of the past, with the result that they lost their democracy. If those who resist most strongly a change in our national flag base their argument solely on the premise that the union jack and the red ensign stand for our history of democratic government, for the achievement of our nationhood and as a reminder of our parliamentary system and our system of justice, and take the stand that it is necessary to keep these reminders in front of us in order that people like the hon. member for Charlotte will not forget the importance of the past, then I think we have an almost undefeatable argument.

I must say that since the flag debate first began I have resented the efforts made in the house and throughout the country to say that we have no flag. Efforts have been made to say that the red ensign is not distinctive and that it has never really been Canada's flag. I thought the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Harkness) did the house and the country a real service when he pointed out in his speech that the red ensign has in fact been Canada's national flag for 100 years. For the life of me I cannot understand why some members keep saying in this debate that we must get a national flag. Certainly the question is whether we now want to change our national flag, and the more people say we must get one the more they are adding to that type of propaganda which has been foisted upon the people to mislead them into thinking that Canada does not now have a national flag.

I have just been home for a week end, for a change, and had a chance to speak to quite a group of people. It was one of the largest gatherings I have attended since I came here in January, and after such a long while I found it most refreshing to have a chance to hear people speak very bluntly and simply about what is going on in this chamber these days, express their feelings about the flag debate and about whether they want a new flag, or the present flag changed. I am not going to pretend there is anything like unanimity on this matter. I believe that the strongest feeling throughout the country is: Why is parliament fooling around with the flag? Why does it not get on with the business? I think that is a fair summation of the majority feeling that I encountered at home.

There are quite a number who do not become vehement about the red ensign or the new flag and who in fact care very little about the matter, except to the extent that the present argument may disrupt the country. These people cannot understand why the subject has been brought up now. They cannot understand why it has taken so much time and why other business has not been proceeded with. I think there are some questions that the government owes it to the country to answer. I have talked to other members and I find that the situation in my constituency is not much different from that in other constituencies. Certainly the newspapers reflect the situation to quite an extent. I would say there is a general feeling across the country that the flag debate is interfering with more important business and there is an inability to understand why this is so.

I have asked the Prime Minister before, as have other hon. members, to explain why it is necessary that the flag debate should go through to a conclusion now. We have had the red ensign for 100 years. Certainly there is no doubt in the minds of most members of the house that, improperly handled, this subject can do more to destroy unity in this country than any other action of this or previous governments. Why then must it be rammed through with such haste? If those people who are so desirous of having a national flag and who put all the pressure they can on the government really want one that much, if it means that much to them, then it should be so important to them that they would not begrudge the time necessary to make sure that it is done properly and that the matter is handled in such a manner that it will bring credit, not only on any new national flag but on the people who support it and on the manner in which it was introduced.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I know if I were one of those who desired to get rid of the red ensign—and there is a certain group in this country who do not care what the new flag is as long as it is not the red ensign and has no union jack on it—I am sure I would say,

let us make sure we put this over in such a way that it will not be resented; it must stand for a feeling of unity in the country; it must be a unifying force. We do not want it taken as a symbol of our dissatisfaction or as evidence of political opportunism. There is no reason I can see, therefore, and I would be only too happy if the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) or some member of the government would explain to me where my thinking is wrong, why there must be such haste in acting on this matter.

It could be allowed to sit for a while or referred to a committee. Let everyone have a full opportunity to discuss it. Let us have the various groups throughout the country appear before the committee if they so desire. Let us take it slowly, by stages, and make sure that there is no suggestion of political partisanship. Let us make sure that every faction has its feelings satisfied, to this extent at least, that it has had a full, fair and impartial hearing. There is no injustice that rankles so much as that which results from a feeling that the right to be heard has been denied. There is no punishment meted out in the courts which causes people to become hardened criminals more quickly than the suggestion that they have been denied a fair hearing. I submit that any member who wants a new flag, who wants to do away completely with any suggestion of our present flag and substitute another, must support that line of reasoning.

I resent the suggestion that those of us who prefer the red ensign are just stalling. I am not standing here speaking in the hope that I will put off the evil day, Mr. Speaker. Certainly, when I say that I prefer the red ensign I am aware of the fact that if an election were called my preference would not be shared by a majority of Canadians. There are some who would not want the red ensign in its present form. I am quite willing to go along with a change in that regard. I hope if there is going to be a change in our national flag that change would not be so drastic as to erase all the symbols that I should like to see on our flag to indicate our heritage. However, Mr. Speaker, I will accept that if it is the wish of the people. I do not believe I am so different from those people I represent who would resent not having their voice heard. I will even put up with taking away the red ensign. I will put up with taking away any symbols of our past. I would even put up with the proposed flag, provided it resulted from the choice of the majority of the people of this country and provided it were brought about in a manner that would satisfy all sections of the populace. I would put up with it if all reasonable designs and reasonable suggestions were considered and if parliament was striving its utmost to keep politics out of it.

If this new flag were arrived at in such a way that it would be obvious from the manner in which this house handled it that all these considerations had been taken care of, and that once the new flag had been adopted it would serve to unify the country, then I could accept it. It should of course show respect for history and for the future of our country. I hope I am not being too repetitious, but I have said in this house before that what a new flag is most likely to stand for, if it is a complete departure from the old one, is a feeling of the manner, the method and the time at which it was introduced. I suggested that had there been a national catastrophe and had we changed governments and a flag had been introduced at that time, then most people would, for some time to come at least, associate the new flag with that national catastrophe. I have suggested before that when there is no previous association with the design that is being offered on the flag, then it becomes of importance to see that the method by which it is introduced evokes only happy memories, memories of respect by one part of the country for another.

I have perhaps dwelt long enough, Mr. Speaker, on the method by which a flag is selected. We are speaking on the subamendment now, on the questions that should be put in a referendum. I should like to deal rather briefly with the questions on the referendum; however, I see it is now six o'clock.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED UNDER ADJOURNMENT MOTION

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to the provisions of standing order 39A, it is my duty to inform the house that questions to be raised at 10.30 are as follows:

The hon. member for Lake St. John (Mr. Lessard):

[*Translation*]

Agriculture—feed grain for eastern Canada

[*Text*]

At six o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

CANADIAN FLAG

OFFICIAL ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW DESIGN

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Pearson:

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 the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Diefenbaker, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. More.

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate those voices shouting "carried, carried" before you called order. I am sure they were referring to the remarks I made when we adjourned at supper time. It is my fervent hope that they have now seen reason, and they are suggesting to me that the trained seals on the government back benches are now going to recant and reflect the views of their constituencies and the responsible views of a member of parliament, instead of following the views of those members of the Liberal party who think in terms of the adhesion or cohesion of the Liberal party rather than the serious question affecting the house in this debate.

I think at six o'clock I had just mentioned the subamendment, the matter of the national referendum or plebiscite, and the questions which should appear in that referendum. I should say at the outset that I am not in entire agreement with the subamendment and I cannot really understand the form in which it is presented. In this subamendment on the question of a national flag as it should be put to the people of Canada we have the red ensign as it is, and the red ensign as it might be amended with some relationship to other ethnic groups in our country. Then we also have that peculiar monstrosity presented to the house by the government as a projected flag, and we also have a one maple leaf design.

I want to make it clear at the outset that I am not at all averse to a national referendum in which people may have a broad choice, but I am totally unable to accept the proposition that in that national referendum this Pearson pennant, as we have known the three maple leaf design proposed by the government, should take equal precedence with the flag that has been so proudly Canada's for 100 years. To me this is preposterous, and I would not be so vehement about it unless it had failed in every requisite that one would think of in connection with a national flag.

It has not been arrived at by any process that the people of this country would like to think would be associated with a flag that represents them. It does not represent the people of this country. It was brought in as a political manoeuvre, presented in that manner and sustained only in any sense of the word because of the political implications behind it. To suggest a national referendum, where that sort of a pennant would take equal precedence with the flag that is so revered and treasured by such a large percentage of the people in this country, is to me just out of keeping with our responsibilities to this country.

I may say that if that flag had anything about it that is artistically pleasing, perhaps I would find some excuse. If I thought that as other than a political gimmick it was attractive even to the members from Quebec, I might not resent it so much. But, Mr. Speaker, I cannot forget the spectacle of the members of the Creditiste group coming into the house one day, each of them with a little pennant on his desk. That was the flag referred to earlier today by one of my colleagues, red and white with a green maple leaf, divided diagonally between red and white. I must say I do not pretend to be an artist. In this, as in other respects, I am an ordinary citizen of my community where art is concerned; but to me, if we are going to have a flag which is not everything a flag should represent, then at least it should have the advantage of having a pleasing appearance.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) took the trouble on behalf of a group in his constituency—I believe the sons of Norway, who are plugging that same flag—to bring a copy of it around to every member of the house, and I will say it had the distinction of being very attractive. It was not a muddied up or muddled up flag such as that which the government suggests.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that there is not a man, woman or child in this country who would not like our flag to be at least, if not beautiful, then presentable. This cannot be

said for the three leafed monstrosity that this unartistic government presents to us. If I, in pursuance of the question of what should be in the referendum to be submitted to the people, can describe the so-called Pearson pennant, as I am sure it is known across the country, I would say the first thing it brings to mind is a presently noted song. Perhaps it is not too respectable but it deals with the subject of General Jubilation T. Cornpone. I think it is a take-off of a Li'l Abner character, a general who fought all the famous battles, described as Cornpone's anguish, Cornpone's humiliation, Cornpone's defeat, Cornpone's disgrace and Cornpone's retreat. If the government is really suggesting, or if any member of the house wants to put that pennant on a national referendum on the same basis as our revered red ensign, I can only say that I think my reaction will not be too different from that of so many people in this country who listen to the radio or television occasionally and who have some imagination.

To me, this proposed flag with a blue border at each end and three red maple leaves in the centre on a white background sounds like an emblem of that great general, Jubilation T. Cornpone about whom the song was written. The Canadian public cannot be blamed for associating this proposed flag with the political record of the Liberal party. The first blue bar represents the first disgrace which the party suffered—the 60 days of decision. Then, in keeping with General Cornpone's military career, which was a complete failure, we come to Cornpone's humiliation. The first little red maple leaf represents that famous budget—the budget which was put forward and subsequently revised. I am sure this is what is going through the minds of the people of Canada when they look at this pennant. The second maple leaf represents something else—the much heralded pension plan. I am sure all members have heard about Cornpone's defeat. I have in mind the first time this pension plan was brought in, and the manner in which it was presented. The government said: You will take this plan because we presented it; it must be the greatest. The Liberals presented this flag resolution in the same way, though you would never know it today. I can see how the people of Canada will associate the proposed pennant with these events.

General Cornpone, as we all know, had a famous retreat. Talking about a retreat, what happened to the redistribution bill? The Liberals had a great idea. A member of the New Democratic party suggested a slight amendment. The Liberals went along because the N.D.P. wanted it. Then they found the official opposition would have no part of it. Where is the redistribution bill now? We had thought, from some of the opinions expressed in this house, that the Liberals had really wanted to correct some of the anomalies in the representation of constituencies in this House of Commons. Where is the bill now? Cornpone's retreat.

If this flag were ever accepted by Canada, the last blue bar would represent the most shameful thing of all. It would represent the division caused in this country by the political machinations of the present government in treating as a mere political tool something which is sacred to so many people. What colour is the background to all this? It is the white background of surrender—the surrender of every ideal known to members of this house on the altar of political expediency. Yet members across the way want us to accept this design and consider it in our minds on the same basis as the red ensign, which has represented everything in Canada which we think is worth fighting for and worth retaining.

I suggest the first sign of sense shown in connection with this whole debate is that the Prime Minister is now prepared to consider another course of action. I cannot understand why the right hon. gentleman does not do his thinking before he acts. We in this house have seen so many reversals, so many somersaults, so many withdrawals of ideas, that the one question in the mind of each one of us and of people right across the country is: Why in heaven's name, don't they think a little before bringing these things forward?

When the Prime Minister first introduced this resolution he had in mind that there would be a free vote. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Watson) has put the evidence on record. It was only after the right hon. gentleman's political henchman got to him that he changed his mind. These men, working behind the scenes, said: Look, this is how we can win so many votes from this group or that. So he changed his mind and some days later he said the government would stand or fall on the resolution. Now, after all this time, the Prime Minister has found that the people are asking: Why should the flag issue have priority? Is it not worth a close, careful and even lengthy scrutiny by parliament? Does the government have no legislation which is urgent or important and which needs to be discussed? These are the questions

being asked in the country. The people have asked them long enough and hard enough for the message finally to sink through to the Prime Minister, and he has retreated to the position which, I submit, he should have taken in the first place.

I believe that when he first introduced this legislation the Prime Minister really believed that it should not be a party matter. Those of us in this house who are aware of the right hon. gentleman's record have never considered him to be a politician, first. I have never considered him to be a statesman, but at least he was a diplomat. As a man who in diplomatic negotiations had to put Canada first, his first thought when he brought in this resolution was for the good of Canada. Then the Liberal politicians got to him. We all know the Liberal politicians. They are people who can sell a lie ten times as fast as a Liberal can tell the truth. They are afraid of the truth because they might not be able to sell it. But I think the truth has finally sunk into the mind of the Prime Minister and even into the minds of those tremendous politicians who belong to his cabinet. They have finally come to realize that to play politics with a symbol such as our national flag, even though it means different things to different groups, is dividing this nation and causing such rifts—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired.

Mr. Reynold Rapp (Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale): I realize that it is my duty to speak for the second time on the Canadian flag. The first time I spoke on the subject was on May 28, 1963, during the debate on the address.

Before I begin to speak on this resolution or, rather, on the subamendment, I think I might draw attention to what my dictionary has to say regarding the definition of the word "flag". It says: "A piece of cloth of bunting upon which, usually, some device is placed, used as a standard or ensign". But to me, Mr. Speaker, the important question is not so much what a flag looks like but what it stands for; what it stood for in the past and what it will stand for in the future.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Rapp: I am speaking from personal experience in this regard. I may be the only member in this house who has lived under the hammer and sickle, and I know what this flag stood for and what it will stand for in the future. I also realized before I came to Canada some 35 years ago what the Canadian flag stood for. But much more important to me was what it would stand for in the future. I raised a family, and I know what some of these young people had to go through in countries where freedom is not interpreted in the same way that we interpret it here. I am referring to countries in which schools were used to indoctrinate young people with communistic ideas, with nazi ideas. You can understand, Mr. Speaker, what this flag meant to me and what it still means to me. You will understand how I feel when, as a parent, I see the union jack flying over a school. I and parents like me know this will not be a school in which our children will be indoctrinated with these ideas; that this is a school in which freedom is taught and where freedom means something.

It is not my only duty, Mr. Speaker, to tell you what I had to go through and what this flag means to me; but as the member representing the riding of Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale it is also my duty to speak on behalf of my constituents. I would be remiss in my duty if I did not follow their advice and put forward representations on their behalf. I have received many letters on this question. The resolution which was introduced by the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson), which was responsible for my receiving these letters, reads 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. More.

I would like to read some of the letters I have received from my constituents, and in particular from Legions in my area.

Mr. Lessard (Lake St. John): Dispense.

Mr. Rapp: I received a telegram from the Sylvania Legion which says:

> The Sylvania branch No. 54 of the Canadian Legion goes on record favouring the red ensign as the official flag of Canada.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss in my duty if I did not act on behalf of the people in my riding, after they have elected me three times, and bring their views before the attention of the house and this government. I also received a letter from the Leroy and Melfort branch of the Canadian Legion stating that they were in favour of

retaining the red ensign as our national flag. I could go on and on in this respect; there have been similar letters from other branches of the Legion. As I said in my previous speech on this subject, the Prime Minister has introduced this new design that is not one of which the people of Canada will approve. I have received many, many letters and many telegrams to this effect from various organizations. At the time when there was not a member representing Saskatoon one lady asked me to put forward her view and the view of her group that the red ensign should be retained as the Canadian flag.

Why should there be a new Canadian flag, Mr. Speaker? Why should this new design have been introduced in the way it was? Why was it not declared during the election campaign that a new Canadian flag would be introduced into parliament? I and my opponents had many joint meetings. At those meetings not one of my opponents mentioned that the Liberal party intended to put before parliament a new Canadian flag. Certainly some time after the election it was said that their Prime Minister had stated that within two years a Canadian flag would be approved; but so many of these Liberal promises were made during the election campaign and we have heard nothing more about them since this government took office. If these other promises cannot be kept, why is this flag resolution so necessary? However, Mr. Speaker, believing in democracy as I do, I think there are ways and means of arriving at a solution in respect of our flag. As I say, a flag is not just a bunting; it represents much more than that.

If the house agrees, a compromise could be made. There could be set up a committee composed of representatives of all parties. However, I would be opposed to this if the committee were instructed to discuss only the flag introduced by the Prime Minister, because if this were the case that flag would be nothing but a political flag; nor would I like to see any other flag introduced by the government. The committee should be empowered to recommend a flag and have it approved by the house. Mention was made of a 15-man committee. The composition of the committee was also mentioned as being seven from the Liberal party, five from the official opposition, and one each from the other opposition parties. I think that the report or recommendation from the committee to the house should not be that of just a majority of the committee, but it should be approved by the house. There is nothing unusual about such a committee. We have a similar situation at the United Nations, where the Russians have the power of veto which they requested. The reason for this is that the rest of the members of the United Nations are democratic or more or less democratic countries, while Russia is a communist country, and if any question was decided by a majority vote, there is no question about it that the Russian government would lose out every time.

Mr. Speaker, I am very sincere, as I am sure are other members who have spoken before me, when I suggest that the resolution presently before the house involves a political issue. I think the flag issue should be taken out of this chamber and referred to a parliamentary committee, which may come to a conclusion in respect of a Canadian national flag which can no longer be called or referred to as the flag of the Liberal party, a flag of the Conservative party, a flag of the N.D.P. or a flag of the Social Credit party. I am sure most members will agree that a decision made by an all-party committee will not be considered as a decision of a political nature.

Mr. Speaker, I have not been home since the resolution now before us was presented to the house, but I do know the tenor of thought in my constituency. I have received a great number of letters expressing a desire to retain the red ensign rather than to adopt the flag proposed by this government. The general trend of expression in these letters is in favour of this issue being decided by referendum. I have received several letters from people who live in my own home town, which express a desire for me to return and report on the progress of this flag debate. Many of these letters have perhaps been precipitated by the reading of the copies of *Hansard* I have sent to my constituents. They have asked me to explain the lack of speeches made by members of political parties other than Conservative, and have expressed some astonishment at the absence of speeches of Liberal members. I agree with this opinion and suggest that those on the opposite side of this house should stand in their places and either support the flag proposed by the government or express a contrary point of view. I must report to all hon. members that my constituents do not appreciate the attitude adopted by those members in favour of the proposed design who pretend by acquiescence to be in favour of that flag. I suggest that they should stand and be heard.

Mr. Speaker, in reference to the subamendment, I suggest that if the committee proposed therein cannot come to something approximating a unanimous decision, the national flag for Canada should be decided by plebiscite. Such a plebiscite should include questions similar to those proposed by the subamendment. I would certainly like to see these two questions proposed on any plebiscite: Are you in favour of the Canadian red ensign? Are you in favour of a distinctively Canadian flag embodying the three maple leaf design?

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Rapp: I know you all say "yes", but why do you not get up on your feet and take part in this debate?

Mr. Speaker, perhaps a third question should be included in a plebiscite to this effect: Are you in favour of a distinctive Canadian flag? I think those three questions should be included in any plebiscite presented to the people.

I am very disappointed that in Canada today there is a question being raised about a change in the Canadian flag. Thousands and thousands, and perhaps millions of Canadians have come to Canada from foreign lands. Many of these people realize that the countries which they left adopted ensigns other than those of tradition, such as the swastika, but were left with something emblematic of a dictatorial power. Flags such as the red ensign have great histories. Our soldiers have fought several wars under the red ensign. To ignore the requests of these veterans to retain it, and that which is symbolized by it, is to ignore the sympathies of the majority of Canadians. I think the sympathies of these people who have fought in wars on behalf of Canada should be given full and thorough consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to refer to one very short letter I received from a South African war veteran. This man is not one of my constituents but lives in the province of British Columbia and has not authorized me to disclose his name. He is a very outspoken gentleman and has said that when he enlisted as a young man for service in the South African war he did so under the emblem of Canada. He has lived his life since in Canada under the red ensign, and he states that in his senior years his heart bleeds at any suggestion that Canada abandon the red ensign as its national flag.

Mr. Speaker, I could spend another 30 minutes reading portions of letters and telegrams I have received from individuals who wish to voice an opinion in respect of any flag to be adopted by Canada. However, in conclusion I must state that I think it is my privilege and duty, as it is of every other member of parliament, to stand up in this chamber and express the views of the people I represent in respect of the retention of the Canadian red ensign. In spite of my own feelings, I think those members of this House of Commons who favour the three maple leaf flag design, or any other design, should stand up and express that feeling. These members were not sent to parliament to remain in their seats, silent, but to take part in debates of this kind, whether emotionally charged or not.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Albert Horner (The Battlefords): Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in this debate because it involves something that affects every Canadian citizen. It involves a subject which every Canadian should have the right to discuss, and concerning which he should express an opinion. In view of the dissension between the two founding races, this matter should be allowed to remain in abeyance until the emotional factor has died down. Once the flag resolution has been voted on the matter will be over and done with, and if careful planning and consideration is not given to both points of view, the ties that have bound these two peoples so closely may be broken for all time.

Mr. Speaker, in speaking on the subamendment moved by the hon. member for Regina City (Mr. More) I must say I am in favour, because I feel it outlines the proper procedure to be followed in respect of an issue such as this. If at the outset the flag issue had been introduced to this house in such a way as suggested by the subamendment, I am sure emotionalism would have been absent from the debate.

Before continuing I should like to say that I support the red ensign, I am sure I speak for the majority of my constituents, who represent every nationality in the world and live in perfect harmony. These people set an example to be followed by people all over the world.

Many people of Ukrainian origin live in my constituency, and I cannot agree more with the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Starr), than when he stated that he came from people who believe in tradition and do not throw tradition out the window when it has served its usefulness. These people respect the traditions of people of other nationalities. They feel strongly about the union jack and red ensign.

These people are proud and hardy people who were not afraid to settle in some of the remote areas of our country. These are the people who, when the chips are down, were not afraid to answer their adopted country's call. The same can be said, Mr. Speaker, for Ukrainians, the Rumanians, the Dutch, the Germans, the Scandinavians, the Polish, the Russians, people from Greece and France, in fact, all these people from wherever they came. This country was the country of their choice, a land of freedom, a land of opportunity.

Again, we have the Doukhobors of Russian origin who, I am proud to say, are my neighbours at home and who, because of their religious beliefs and their refusal to bear arms, were persecuted in their own land under the Czarist regime. They came to this country and found their way of life, of toil and peace. These people are the people who today, sir, are some of the best farmers, lawyers, doctors, teachers and engineers. They have excelled in any profession they chose and they were able to achieve this under our flag. Do you think these people would want to see the Christian crosses stripped from our flag? The same can be said for the other minority groups who have also played their part in the development of this country.

People of every nationality have developed our country and have had some part in our heritage. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, can you honestly see the fairness in taking away from a majority in order to satisfy a minority?

We talk about the two founding races. What about our Indian people who were forgotten by the Liberal government? It took the Conservative government under the leadership of the present Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) to give them some of the recognition they deserved—representation in the Senate, the franchise, the right to better education and better housing. These people were not a bit backward in answering their country's call in time of need, and the ones I have talked to are in favour of the red ensign.

This three maple leaves flag design is the choice of the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson), a Prime Minister who is the leader of a minority party and who acts like he was the leader of a party with a great majority, a man who was a Nobel peace prize winner and who is now acting like a dictator. He has said: This is my design, my flag, the one you will accept or face an election. Of course, Mr. Speaker, the thought of an election struck fear into the Liberal party, with their many unfulfilled promises of the 1963 campaign when the flag was hardly mentioned; and of course this also shook some of the members of the other three parties so that many of them jumped into line.

How about the way this flag was chosen? I read that the Prime Minister had invited a group of reporters to his home and when they arrived they found the Prime Minister waiting for them and nursing a scotch and soda. Drinks and sandwiches were then served. I am not a drinking man and maybe this flag looks better after you have had a few drinks. Maybe some of my hon. friends opposite have viewed it in that light. Finally, after looking at many designs, the Prime Minister picked up the flag with the three maple leaves and said, "This is it, this is my design", just like a president of a company calling in his salesmen, introducing a new product to them and saying: Here it is, get out and sell it. I will not say whether they all did but some have tried, I think without too much success. So some reporters have turned on the Conservative party and have blamed them for carrying on a filibuster, which we all know could not be further from the truth.

If the Prime Minister and the group he leads—apparently it is not a party any more—are afraid to let the people of Canada speak out for themselves on this issue, then I am going to speak out for what I am sure the majority of my constituents want, and I do not care whether it takes four days, four weeks or four months. Twice in a generation men were prepared to give four years of their blood and sweat, and in many cases their lives, in order to fight for the freedom for which our flag stands. Then the Prime Minister goes to Winnipeg as a guest speaker at the Royal Canadian Legion convention and unfurls his three maple leaves flag design. What alternative did those Legion members have but to boo and heckle this so-called flag? This was the only way they could show their disapproval of his choice.

Unlike some members I did not send out a questionnaire to my constituents but I did receive many letters, all of them supporting the red ensign, not one supporting the Pearson political pennant. When the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) referred to the Liberal campaign literature containing their election promises, there was no mention made of the flag. Why was this contentious issue dragged into this session like a cat being dragged backwards by the tail? Was it to cover up for all the other legislation that was not ready, for instance, the Canada pension plan, the legislation based on the report of

the MacPherson royal commission on transportation and the legislation to assist Canadian magazines based on the O'Leary report, just to mention a few?

During the last campaign, meetings were held with all the different party representatives present. I do not think my Liberal opponent mentioned the flag but he did talk about $2 a bushel for No. 1 northern wheat and $3 a bushel for the first 300 bushel unit. He talked about two ministers of agriculture, one for eastern Canada and one for western Canada. This was also promised by the Prime Minister when he was campaigning in the prairie provinces. I do not know what he said in British Columbia but apparently from what we have heard from the other side of the house and from the Postmaster General (Mr. Nicholson) regarding the Fraserview homes for veterans, it is fine to make promises when you are in opposition but you should not be expected to carry them out when your party is elected as a government and you are a minister of the crown. I would not think my Liberal opponent in the last election would walk into any of the Legion branches in my constituency and say, "I think we will take down the red ensign and replace it with the three maple leaves flag".

Look at the way the flag issue has been introduced. Is this the action of a man who cares? I think not, Mr. Speaker. Instead it is the action of a dictatorial prime minister, an arrogant, bureaucratic and careless government. After all, there are 10 provinces in Canada, so why not call a meeting of the representatives of the provinces and have them decide on a design they could all accept instead of having some of them flying the red ensign, some the union jack and others flying something else?

I do not have to tell hon. members that people are becoming very flag conscious these days. When I was home I attended fairs in my constituency. I could not help but notice that in the parades practically every float had a flag, some of them four or five, and I did not see one Pearson flag. The flags were the red ensign and the union jack. I think people are beginning to realize that something is going to be taken away from them. In western Canada we are not flag wavers but we do believe in what our flag stands for and nobody is going to take that away.

People have talked about the blood that flows in their veins in this house. I will tell you the kind of blood that flows in my veins. It is Irish on both sides, and if the Prime Minister thinks he is going to ram this flag down my throat he has got another think coming. When I went home in the early part of June at the time the flag issue was first mentioned people said to me: What is the matter with you members? You are getting $18,000 a year and you are wasting time discussing the flag. Have you not got something better to discuss? But when I told them what it was all about they changed and said: Do not let them take our flag.

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Mr. Horner (The Battlefords): Why do hon. members over there not get up and speak?

There was only one man, the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan), who had the courage to stand up yesterday and say where he stood. I do not believe his constituency is too much different from some of the others in Toronto. I would say to some hon. members opposite, "Enjoy yourselves, because it is later than you think." Why do not hon. members opposite want to let this question go to the people? If they are so sure they are right and the majority of the people are with them, let the question go to the people. If the people decide that this is the flag they want, then that is fine; I will accept it. However, I will never accept the manner in which the Prime Minister is attempting to ram this flag through this house.

I should like to refer to the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Dupuis)—that is a good portfolio for him, because I never heard him say anything in this house. I want to tell him that they are going to be looking for Liberal candidates in my constituency. He can come out there to run and bring his 100,000 flag stickers—

Mr. Dupuis: Do you want some?

Mr. Horner (The Battlefords): —that will assure my re-election.

No, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you what hon. members opposite would like. I can say that my remarks are going to affect some members in the third, fourth and fifth parties. They would have liked to have shoved this flag question through quietly, then have a recess. They could have gone away for a couple of months and come back smiling and tanned, hoping the people had forgiven and forgotten. I do not believe it is going to work that way.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would again suggest that this issue should be referred to a committee, as has been suggested, in order that a design may be brought forward which

would be acceptable to all. I hope that it would be a design that would unite and not divide.

Mr. L. E. Cardiff (Huron): Mr. Speaker, I do not suppose there is any other member in this house or at least not very many of the members in this house, who have caused you as little bother as I have. I do not speak very often in the house. I have been here longer than most of you, and I always thought I could learn a lot more by sitting in my seat and listening to others than by talking. I have learned all I know by listening to others. I did not rise very quickly a few minutes ago because I was expecting perhaps we would get a speech from the other side of the house. I would be content to sit down and let anybody speak in my place. As a matter of fact, the only reason I am taking part in this debate is because of the fact I represent a riding that has instructed me to speak for it.

I have received a lot of mail, but I am not going to bother reading it to you. I received a lot a petitions signed by hundreds of people who favour the red ensign. I am speaking tonight because I favour the red ensign and I believe at least three quarters of the people in Canada favour the red ensign. Why the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) insists on making us take this flag, regardless of whether or not we want it, is more than I can understand. The Prime Minister was appointed—he was not elected, he was appointed by the Governor General—to the highest position any man in Canada can hold. As such, he is supposed to be a statesman. He cannot run Canada with one province; he has to have support from all the provinces of this country. I cannot understand anyone who would offer us a flag without giving us a choice. Then he said that there would not be a free vote and if we voted against the flag there would be an election. I, for one, would welcome an election on the flag issue. However, I would not welcome it in so far as the unity of the country is concerned because it would split the country wide open.

I have been here for a long time. I have never quarrelled with anybody. I have been able to get along with the French, the same as I do with the English. I have a French community in my riding. I never got one letter from those fellows, and they are fine fellows, just as good as any others in my riding. I never got one letter from the French in my riding insisting on this new flag. I have received a lot of letters from the people in my riding and with the exception of two, all those letters favour the red ensign. The two letters did not oppose the red ensign but wanted something added to it. As I said before, I am a red ensign man. I do not want to say anything tonight that will offend anybody else. I do not think that is the way we should go about this matter. There has been enough acrimony in this debate, and I do not want to add any more. We have been able to get along in this country for years without quarrelling, so surely in this enlightened day and age we will be able to get along for the next hundred years without having any interruption.

I was rather surprised when the leader of the separatists at the other end of this room said one day that he would welcome a revolution in Quebec. I think that was a terrible thing to say.

An hon. Member: Who said that?

Mr. Cardiff: The leader of the Creditistes at the other end of the room. I heard him say it because I was in the house when he said it. I think that is a terrible thing to say. Whenever there has been a revolution in another country, there has been a lot of bloodshed. If that is what you want, a lot of bloodshed, well I understand a lot of blood was spilled over this carpet yesterday when I was not here. We cannot stir people up emotionally, and this is an emotional issue, so the best thing to do is to be careful of what you say. You should not stir up somebody else who may be more emotional than you are yourself. I am one of those whose temper can be aroused, too, but I do not like to quarrel with anybody. I like to get along with people. I think the fact I have been here for so many years is the result of my ability to get along with men, and women too, for that matter.

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Cardiff: I have often said that I never saw a horse that I could not drive. A horse is not much different from a man, and there are some of them to whom you have to give a good licking in order to get along with them. There are some men you cannot get along with either, unless you give them a good licking. I believe in the old style; I believe in cracking down on a man who won't mind his own business. I believe that very often the old laws we had years and years ago are more effective than the laws they have now.

However, I do not intend to take too much of the time of the house tonight. The last

speaker brought out many of the points I intended to bring out, so I do not intend to repeat them. The hon. lady member from Northumberland (Miss Jewett)—I do not see her in the house at the moment—made a statement when she was speaking on the flag issue two or three weeks ago. She said that she was appealing to fellow M.P.'s to disregard their own personal preference for a flag, and also the feeling of their constituencies about a flag which would best serve Canada. I was elected a member of parliament for a certain area and I intend to speak for the people in that area. When it comes to the point where I cannot speak for them they can replace me with someone else, and that is exactly what will happen. You know, Mr. Speaker, you can pick the best man in any community but you do not know what you have got until after you have got him. You do not know what his reactions will be until after he is elected a member of parliament.

Some people come here thinking they are some special creation and they forget all about their constituencies, but those people do not stay here for long, and during my time I have seen a lot of them leave. Mind you, they were a lot smarter men then I and could make wonderful speeches, but when it came down to solid facts they forgot all about the people who elected them. They did not pay any attention to their mail. I have seen fellows with mail piled a foot deep on their desks and who thought all they had to do was get up in the house and make a speech. More people talked themselves out of this house than talked themselves into it, and I would suggest to the younger members of the house that if you want to stay here, don't talk too often and then they don't know how stupid you are. That is the reason why I have stayed here so long.

When this flag issue first came up I thought the Prime Minister would at least give us a choice. I am sure hundreds of designs were submitted to him, as they were to all of us, but in my opinion he picked the one that was the least attractive. Had he gone to the Indians or Eskimos I am sure he would have found an artist among them who could have drawn a better flag than he produced.

I do not understand why the Prime Minister will not accept the amendment proposed by the Leader of the Opposition. This is the best way out that I know for him, and he should let the people tell him what flag they want. I myself do not want any particular flag. If the majority of the people want another flag I will go along with that, but I do object to having no choice whatsoever and I cannot understand this attitude of the Prime Minister and why he has been so ill-advised.

During the time the Liberals were in opposition they had two members who had more to say than anybody else, and knew how to run the country, or at least they said so, when the Conservatives were in power. Now they are in the cabinet, and if this is the advice they have given the Prime Minister, all I can say is that it is not very good advice. I suggest that he take advice from some of his backbenchers who have more sense about flags than he himself has.

I have a daughter-in-law who is a Ukrainian. Her family has been in this country for a generation and she can speak Ukrainian. She has a family of four, the youngest being about nine, but she has never tried to teach her children to speak Ukrainian. These people were satisfied to come to Canada and live like Canadians. In fact all the different nationalities that have come here in the last 25 years do not clamour for us to speak their languages. They are good people, fine people, and have contributed a lot to this country, but they do not demand that their languages be spoken, and why a minority language should be forced on the rest of Canada is more than I can understand.

I do not think the Prime Minister can stay prime minister unless he is ready and willing to do the things that the ten provinces want him to do. The sooner he gets that into his head the better he will get along. If he is the statesmen he should be, he will not listen to any minority group and do the things they want him to do. He does not have to do those things, and he does not have to be embarrassed about it either. At present he is embarrassing his own members who are trying their best to follow him against their will. I will not disclose any names, but some of them have told me they do not want to go along with the Prime Minister but what else can they do when he says, "Either vote for my flag or else there will be an election"? Like a great many others they do not want an election and I do not believe the country wants an election.

Surely to goodness there is not any group who would want a flag which the majority of the Canadian people would not accept? I hope the Prime Minister will take this advice from me. I have been here longer than he has. I do not pretend to know as much as he does, but surely I could not have stayed here for this length of time without being able to

figure out the best thing to do. I have been in some pretty good fights since I came here, and I say to the Prime Minister that the easiest way to work this thing out is not to quarrel about it but to talk it out, and talk sensibly to each other.

I hope I have not said anything that has offended anybody in the house because I did not get up for that purpose. I would not want to offend anybody; I like my friends too well for that. I like my people at home, and I had to get up and say something about the flag because this is the flag they want, and so long as they want it I am satisfied to speak for them. If we cannot get it, then I hope to goodness we can appoint a joint committee of the house and the Senate to go into the question and bring back a recommendation. If there is an overwhelming majority of the committee in favour of that recommendation then I would say accept it, and it does not have to be a unanimous recommendation. I do not think it would be possible to achieve that, but it should be a great majority before we accept anything.

The Prime Minister has said he will allow a free vote, but now that so much time has elapsed I am afraid a free vote would not count as much as it would have a month ago. He should take a second look at this matter. I believe he acted like a school teacher when he said, "Either you pass this flag or you don't get any summer holiday." You cannot talk to grown men like that. I was whip of this party when we had 208 members to handle. I got along fine with them and from my experience I can tell you that you cannot tell grown men what they have to do. They know what they have to do without anybody telling them. You can ask them to do something, but you cannot tell them.

I hope the Prime Minister will come to his senses before he has destroyed the unity of Canada. If we are to have unity in Canada it has to be unity in ten provinces, not in nine, or one. We have to be all united and the sooner we are all united and go ahead with something more important than the flag, the better it will be for Canada. If the government has any legislation that is more important than the flag, why does it not introduce it? Why does it put the flag ahead of important legislation? Nobody told the government to bring in the flag and nobody insisted on its being introduced. Because we are talking to stop the government from passing this flag, and this is the only hope we have of stopping it, the Prime Minister thinks this is a filibuster. This is not a filibuster. This is a question which, once it is settled, is settled for all time. The decision, once taken, cannot be altered. I hope the Prime Minister—and this is all I intend to say—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Cardiff: Now listen, boys, and learn a little more. I could stand here and speak for a long time. I have plenty of notes I have not looked at yet. Nobody else has seen them; I wrote them myself. But I do not like reading notes, even though in this particular debate I would prefer to have used my notes so as to avoid the possibility of my saying something which, later, I would find I had not really intended to say; sometimes we are led away on such occasions as this into saying things we might afterwards regret. On this occasion, let me remind hon. members opposite, I could go on for another half hour, at least. I do not know how much time I have left to me, but I have not been called to order yet and I wish to thank the Chair very much.

Mr. J. N. Ormiston (Melville): Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to take the wise advice of my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Cardiff) and sit still and learn a little more; but as this debate progresses and the month of August draws to a close I find it difficult to stand up in this chamber without indulging in a little reminiscing.

The minds of many of us on this side of the house, when we think of the many trouble spots in the world today, turn to an occasion almost 25 years ago, when we had to stand up and make decisions—decisions which, once reached, could not be treated lightly. In September, 1939, many of us, with little or no idea of what the future held, decided that Canada was worth fighting for and that our way of life should be retained, never of course thinking for one minute that the symbols which we cherished then would have to be surrendered on the altar of political expediency.

When the original resolution was introduced, it appeared, because of the heavy propaganda with which it was launched, that those opposed would be submerged by weight of numbers. But the constructive approach by members of this party has kept debate at a high level. Now it appears across the country that resistance has stiffened and that support for a more democratic choice for a flag design is being registered. It was to this end that the subamendment was introduced, and if it were adopted would show in no uncertain terms the divergency of opinion regarding a national flag.

By supporting this subamendment, the members of this party are being more charitable than were some other members of this house when Bill C-97 was introduced on October 2, 1963, and Bill C-83 on March 25 of this year. On both those occasions attempts were made to prevent first reading of a bill which would adopt by statute the red ensign as Canada's national flag. Because of the action taken with regard to the introduction of these particular bills, I am fully convinced that the people of Canada wish a choice in the design of a national flag. No amount of verbiage on the part of this government can conceal the fact there is bitter resentment not only regarding the design of the Prime Minister's flag but in the method used to secure its adoption. Many views were expressed to me, not all favourable, at a time when the flag issue was not so controversial as it is now. Needless to say, I am now glad their opinions were given at a time more free from emotion and sentiment. However, as I suggested, all submissions were not in favour of the red ensign as it flies today. There were those who suggested modification as defined in the subamendment. In a mood of compromise there have been suggestions that the present flag be retained, with further recognition of Canada's multicultural existence. At least those who feel additions are needed to a truly national flag should at least have the opportunity to put forward their ideas.

Still, it is obvious there are those with strong convictions who are willing to seek some common ground on which to settle this controversial issue. The subamendment introduced by the hon. member from Regina City (Mr. More) is the most sensible device yet suggested to give the people of this country the right to exercise that freedom of choice which is presently being denied them. It is hard to understand in this day and age why a minority government should use such an arbitrary method of forcing on the Canadian people a lacklustre flag, supported by illogical arguments and dedicated to rancour and division.

On the other hand, those who favour the three maple leaf design would have an equal opportunity to vote for the flag of their choice. They would be doing this on an individual basis and should be glad of the opportunity to register their opinions without political pressure or fear of any recriminations. It should be an honour for those who wish to relegate the red ensign to history to stand and be counted in support of a design which appeals to their particular fancy. Those who wish all symbols of our British heritage obliterated from our flag should welcome a plebiscite in which they could favour a design bereft of those emblems of our Christian civilization. This arboreal mutation of sea and tree is entitled to that recognition which the faithful can promote in a flag combination of wood and water.

If the government feels the Canadian public is overwhelmingly in favour of its design, then of course it is justified in the action being taken, but most indications are to the contrary. The government would immediately acquire considerable respect if even one or two of the suggestions made in this debate were considered.

Surely the suggestions made in the subamendment are not so outrageous as to be ignored completely. Surely reason and compromise are not words so foreign to our vocabulary that they must be disregarded. The official opposition has made it possible to discuss the flag issue in terms of the wishes and desires of all people in Canada, as opposed to the government's hard-headed stand on the three maple leaf design or nothing.

With the submission of literally hundreds of designs there must also be thousands of individuals whose creative imagination might yet produce a flag design acceptable to many people in this country. But under existing conditions there is no incentive or effort to produce anything but hostility.

A great disservice will be effected if the present amendments are ignored and the government proceeds on its present course towards that situation best described as an irresistible force meeting an immovable object. While I am personally in favour of any measure which will ensure Canadian unity and understanding, I cannot easily relinquish my feelings for that flag which has been recognized for a hundred years. The red ensign is a flag of dignity and nobility. It is a proud emblem of a great nation. It inspires pride and confidence in our democratic institutions over which it flies. It is an appropriate mark of our past and a distinguishing figure of our future. Those who have fought under its colours have an abiding pride in the traditions it represents. Those who promote its continuing existence today are remaining true to a trust which will ever be maintained by all who will never yield where principle or honour is concerned.

I have not used any documents in the course of my remarks, or excerpts from newspapers, or letters. However, these only serve

to assure me that there is an ever increasing weight of public opinion which is dissatisfied with the method devised to promote the government's flag. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, the press can be of tremendous value at a time like this by faithful and objective reporting. But regardless of whether or not the voice of reason is heard, there will be no abject surrender on a topic which tears at the very roots of a nation. This is a time to bind and not to cleave, and I trust that methods may yet be found to mend our differences and resolve our difficulties.

Mr. J. E. Pascoe (Moose Jaw-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I make no apologies for speaking on the subamendment that is now before us. I consider that it is the responsibility and, if I can be more emphatic, the duty of each member to speak on the flag issue and the move of the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) to take the red ensign from us. After all, as has been explained by many hon. members, the Prime Minister asked us all to express our views. This is not a filibuster. Members of the official opposition are doing what they were elected to do, namely to exert a restraining influence, and if I could be more blunt I might say to block foolish, unwise and unwanted government action. I am one of the majority of Canadians who consider that removal of the Canadian red ensign is unwise, foolish and unwanted. I repeat, this is not a filibuster. We are doing what must be done in an effort to prevent a great mistake that Canadians would have to live with for a long, long time. We are acting responsibly in the public interest, and to a greater and greater extent the public is beginning to appreciate this, in spite of certain biased press reports and certain statements by government leaders.

We are not holding up government legislation, as has been explained by other speakers, because there is no urgent government legislation before us. There should be government action on many pressing problems, but none of this very essential action has been taken, or at least it has not been directed into definite legislation that could be considered by parliament. How can we be accused of holding up government legislation, when the Prime Minister admits that he has nothing more for us to do now but pass his flag? The Prime Minister has told us that if we conclude the flag debate on the terms he has dictated, we can have a recess. I was going to say "a summer recess", Mr. Speaker, but that season is now past. As other speakers have said, we in the official opposition place our duty and responsibility above the offer of a holiday. By using up our own holiday time we cannot, in any fair way, be accused of holding up government legislation that is not ready for us.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, each member of this house should make his or her position clear on this very upsetting and emotional flag issue thrust on the country by the Prime Minister. I will make my position clear at the beginning of my remarks. I think the Canadian people should have an opportunity to express their wishes on such a personal and emotional question as a national flag. That is why I am speaking in support of the subamendment. As has been pointed out by other speakers, holding a plebiscite is not a very common practice in our system of democratic government. I agree that this is so. But in this particular matter of choosing a national flag, I think it is essential, in the interest of general acceptance of that flag, that the people be given an opportunity to express their views and thus make the choice by a majority decision. This is all we are asking in the subamendment and the amendment.

This particular flag issue is not an ordinary problem of government policy that can be changed by removing the government at the next election. With an ordinary piece of parliamentary legislation concerning economic or fiscal policy, that can be revised or removed by a succeeding government without too much effect on the public, I do not consider that a plebiscite is necessary. But this flag issue is entirely different. It is an intensely emotional question, and if a flag is chosen it will remain as our national flag and cannot be changed by a succeeding government. That is why we should have a plebiscite.

The subamendment clarifies the amendment moved by our leader proposing such a plebiscite. The Prime Minister and his supporters are opposed to this suggestion of a plebiscite. Why? They say a plebiscite would bring out —and these are their words—divisions in this country and would create new dissensions. The Prime Minister should have thought of this before he decided, apparently all by himself or at least with only a few advisers —or should I say, ill-advisers—to foist his three maple leaf design on Canada.

I am sure—and others have made the same statement—that foisting an ill-considered flag on the people, without their consent by their vote, will create a great deal more division and dissension than could ever be caused by a plebiscite. I firmly believe that the people—at least, those in the area for which I speak—

want to be consulted about the flag; they want to have a hand in making this very important decision, this very emotional decision. I believe the Prime Minister is beginning to realize this at last. I think the great volume of letters he is receiving is having an effect on him. How else can one explain his apparent change of mind, or at least his changed attitude? Now he says he might consider the setting up of a special all-party committee to study the issue and bring in a report. Of course, there are strings to this offer; but at least it appears to be a softening of his earlier dictatorial attitude. If we cannot have a plebiscite, the matter of an all-party committee to study flag designs and bring in a recommendation might be considered.

The members of that committee would have a great responsibility and must be able to represent the views of the majority of their constituents. When and if such a committee is set up, each member should have received over 50 per cent of the votes cast in his constituency in the 1963 federal election. In this way those members would be considered as speaking for the majority of their constituents.

Mr. Speaker, it appears that agreement in respect of such a committee has not been reached. I will now return to the question in respect of the plebiscite. The subamendment moved by the hon. member for Regina City (Mr. More) lists four choices, or questions. The first is in respect of the retention of the Canadian red ensign in its present form. The second relates to the red ensign with changes, emblematic of the main heritages of the two founding races. The third relates to the three maple leaf design, commonly referred to as the Pearson flag. The fourth choice relates to the one maple leaf design.

Mr. Speaker, when I speak in support of the subamendment I am speaking for the many constituents who have written to me. I have received more than 800 letters expressing support for the red ensign. I received my first letter today in favour of the Pearson flag. In addition to those individuals who have written in favour of the red ensign, many have expressed support for a plebiscite. In view of the fact we are considering that subject at this time I should like to quote portions of several letters I have received. I think it is my duty to do so in an attempt to show that I am not speaking merely from a personal feeling, but from the point of view of my constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I only intend to read short portions of these letters, and I will name those places from which they emanate.

The first letter was written from Strasbourg and states in part:

> We consider it an insult to our intelligence that we have been denied a referendum.

The second letter is from Watrous and states in part:

> Regarding the flag. Most of the people that I have spoken with are in favour of the red ensign and those that are lukewarm on the subject at least feel there should be a vote on the matter.

The next letter is from Pense, and states:

> —75 per cent—

Referring to this district—

> —in favour of having a vote on the matter.

The next letter is from Nokomis and in part states:

> Regarding the flag issue—: Everyone I have talked to concerning this issue are of one mind. A vote should have been held asking if a distinctive Canadian flag was desired by the people.

Another letter I received from Strasbourg states:

> I don't think Mr. Pearson should be allowed to get away with such high handed tactics in regard to a flag we have had for so long. The people should have a chance to voice their opinion in such an important matter.

I received this letter from Semans, which states:

> As for the people around here, whether they are for the red ensign or not, the vast majority feels that a new flag should not be imposed on us without a national referendum. They feel that, if the majority of the Canadian people want a new flag then a new flag it should be, but if the majority want the red ensign then the red ensign should be maintained.

Mr. Speaker, I received a telegram from the Semans, Saskatchewan, branch of the Canadian Legion which was accompanied by four pages of signatures, and which states:

> We strongly deplore the arbitrary action of your minority government—

This telegram was sent to Mr. Pearson.

> —in dictating to the people that they shall have a new flag. This contravenes the democratic rights of every Canadian. We respectfully urge that the government call a national plebiscite and restore to the people their democratic privileges of deciding whether they want the red ensign or a new flag.

Mr. Speaker, in order to show that the point of view I am presenting is not that held only by the people in my constituency, I should like to refer briefly to statements from other sources. The first is from Toronto in the form

of a circular letter which states in the third paragraph:

> One way we can be effective is to demand a plebiscite or national vote on the flag issue.

The second quotation I should like to refer to appears in an editorial in the Toronto *Telegram* of August 2, 1964 and in part states:

> The Canadian ensign must not be lowered without the consent of the people.
>
> 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.

Mr. Speaker, I think that brief reference to this important editorial indicates the whole gist of it and expresses the opinion of the majority of Canadians.

I should now like to quote from an article which appeared in the Victoria *Colonist* as follows:

> —the request to the egocentric Prime Minister to allow the citizens of Canada to vote about the flag.

They were referring to a national plebiscite.

I should like to quote from an article appearing in the Ottawa *Citizen* of June 29, 1964, after the Prime Minister first introduced this new design to replace the red ensign. This article refers to a poll taken in Winnipeg in respect of the flag issue, and not a flagpole.

> Seventy four per cent of those polled favoured a national referendum on the flag.

I should like to now quote from a letter I received from the dominion president of the Canadian corps association. I am sure every member of parliament received a copy of this letter. The president states:

> 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 finalize this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to mention this matter in the House of Commons when the hon. member for Northumberland (Miss Jewett) is not in her seat, but I told her I was going to make reference to the amazing statement she made in which she asked every member to vote in favour of Mr. Pearson's design, disregarding the expressed wishes of their constituents. As I say, I was very amazed at that. I took her to task in an earlier speech and evidently what I said came to the attention of the newspaper in her district. She represents the constituency of Northumberland. The editor of the paper there saw my comments and sent me a copy of the Cobourg *Sentinel-Star* for July 22 last in which is published the results of a poll conducted in her constituency of Northumberland. The headline is "Northumberland wants ensign, favour nation-wide vote, county people are emphatic, decisive choice is made". The report goes on to say that in the survey 626 people were asked for their opinions and the result was considerably more than two to one in favour of the red ensign. With regard to the question of a plebiscite, which we are now considering, the question asked in the poll was: "Do you favour a vote on the issue of a national flag"? The survey showed that 358 favoured a plebiscite, 130 were opposed and the remainder either had no opinion or preferred a plebiscite provided no cost was involved.

As I say, I am sorry the hon. member for Northumberland is not present, but I am sure she received a copy of this newspaper survey. To continue further on the matter of a plebiscite I should like to read an excerpt from an editorial which appeared in *The Legionary* for July, 1964. I think it should be put on the record. It reads as follows:

> *The Legionary* believes that the flag question is such an issue and again strongly urges the Prime Minister to let the Canadian people decide, 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.

I think that brief editorial comment certainly sums up the stand we in the opposition are taking. Finally, with regard to the need for a plebiscite I should like to refer to a report which appeared in the Amherst *Daily News* on December 29, 1961 before the Prime Minister became prime minister. He was being interviewed at a press conference held in Halifax and was being questioned with regard to a flag. He expressed the opinion then that there should be a distinctive flag, and was asked this question:

> How would you poll the people on this?

This was his reply:

> We would poll the people when we have a general election. And if they don't like the idea of a distinctive Canadian flag which can't be

mistaken for that of any other country, they'll let us know in no uncertain terms.

That was the statement that the present Prime Minister made at a press conference in Halifax on December 29, 1961. I think I have put enough quotations on the record to show that the people of my constituency want a plebiscite, and I believe it is just an average constituency that is representative of a great part of Canada. The galleries have been crowded during the flag debate. These daily visitors from all parts of Canada have heard our side of the question, and when I say "our side" I mean the views of members of the official opposition. I have met some of the visitors afterwards and they have expressed surprise at the silence on this question on the government side. I might add that I too am surprised at the silence of government supporters. The gallery visitors and Canadians generally will have to place their own interpretation on the absence of personally expressed opinions in support of the Prime Minister's flag.

I am not a lawyer, Mr. Speaker, but I understand that in court it is recognized legal practice that when the defendant has a poor case he says as little as possible. Perhaps this explains the silence of the government and its supporters. During a period of heckling directed against one of our speakers the Solicitor General (Mr. MacNaught), who is in the house now, was challenged to tell the house why he was supporting the Prime Minister's attempt to remove the Canadian red ensign, which has been our officially recognized flag for so long. His reply was that his vote against the red ensign would be his speech. I do not think Canadians will accept such an offhand attitude. They will want to know why he is voting against our present flag, why he, the Prime Minister and their colleagues are so determined to remove the Canadian red ensign from flagpoles all across Canada.

We would like to hear from more government members. I do not throw out a challenge, because that might be embarrassing to them, but I point out again that the people in the galleries and people all across Canada want to hear their explanations or excuses. The voters want to read in the newspapers or hear on radio or television why government members want to have a flag that severs all connection with our past history. In the hope that at least one of them will rise to defend his intention to vote against the red ensign if we ever come to the vote, I will conclude my remarks by inviting any member on the opposite side of the house to rise and defend his position.

Mr. G. H. Doucett (Lanark): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the debate this evening on the subject that is before the house I consider it to be a great privilege as well as a duty on behalf of the historic riding of Lanark which I have the honour to represent. I first wish to express my congratulations to the many members who have taken part in the debate. As a former speaker said this evening, they have distinguished themselves and their speeches have been of a very high calibre. With that I agree, and while I should like to mention all of them, time does not permit.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to hear some of the government supporters express their views, especially some of my next door neighbours, and others a little more distant from my riding. I should like to hear my neighbour to the east who represents that great county of Carleton. I would also be delighted to hear my good friend and neighbour to the north, that budding politician who is making a great bid for the Liberal leadership in the province of Ontario. I should also like to hear from the minister who represents that historic constituency within which lies what is known as the limestone city, Kingston.

Yes, I would go a little farther west to one of the other ridings I know fairly well, and in which many of my friends and acquaintances live, that of Hastings South. I would be delighted to hear the young member who represents that riding express his views on this very important issue that is before the house. I think it is a very important issue, Mr. Speaker, but I do not believe it is an urgent one. I fully realize that feelings on this issue are mixed, but the extent to which they are mixed we cannot be sure. Surely when an issue strikes at the very soul of a nation, consideration should be given in an attempt to arrive at a fundamental solution.

In my opinion, the government is off to a poor start. Should there be a plebiscite or should a committee be established? This is something to which I believe the government should give serious consideration. The proposal now before the house is mentioned in the resolution, but I am not going to take the time of the house to read it. It will never bring about, Mr. Speaker, that which the government, I hope, would wish, and that is greater unity throughout Canada. The amendment before us offers all our people some alternative. Surely, the selection of a flag is

not a one man task. Perhaps as a result of the strong feelings that exist in Canada today regarding language and culture, it is extremely difficult to unravel the threads leading to the subject of the flag, all the pros and cons of this particular issue, and to consider unemotionally and with understanding all the suggestions put forward by the various groups and organizations across this great country, all of whom desire to be known as Canadians.

A flag is described, as explained tonight by the hon. member for Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Rapp), as being a piece of cloth or a device attached to a staff or halyard, used as a standard, symbol or signal. I feel certain that if Canada is to survive in the present state of confederation, such a flag must become a symbol of unity to all Canadians. Various groups hold very strong views as to what such a flag should contain by way of symbols and devices. These feelings arise from deep seated loyalties and allegiance to one or other of the founding races of Canada. The decision as to just what a national flag for Canada is to become is a very difficult one for those charged with that responsibility. While the decision will be difficult, it will also be historic and must be approached with a full realization of this position. On this decision undoubtedly will rest one of the greatest contributing factors to our country's unity or disunity for generations to come.

There are three flags prominent in the discussion concerning a flag for Canada. First there is the union jack. This flag, pure and simple, is essentially the military flag of England. It was ordained by virtue of the royal proclamation of King James in April, 1606. It is interesting to note that only 15 years later, in 1621, a flag was granted to Sir William Alexander for Nova Scotia by King James, in the charter of New Scotland. Nova Scotia is the only province of Canada to possess, through royal charter, a flag of its own, and I understand it is the pride of that province to this day. The union jack has claimed the strong allegiance of thousands of Canadians down through the years, particularly those whose ethnic origin is in the United Kingdom. In order to emphasize this point, Mr. Speaker, it is only necessary to recall the United Empire Loyalists who came to this country as pioneers to live under the union jack rather than another flag. All of those great citizens who braved the briny oceans, who came here and hewed their homes from the primeval forests, I am sure have left a heritage for us, of which we should all be proud.

Canada is pleased, I am sure, to regard herself as a Christian country. Most of her citizens, if not actually professing Christians at least have a certain amount of reverence for God, the Bible and all those attributes usually understood by the general term "Christianity". For this reason, the union jack has added appeal because it enshrines the upright cross which is the emblem of our Lord, yes, of our Lord's death on Calvary, for our national redemption and personal salvation.

The red ensign is described in the encyclopedia as a plain red flag bearing the union jack on the upper quarter next to the staff. This is the flag of the British merchant service and of all peoples who are not entitled to use the white or blue ensign. By the addition of a device in the fly containing the symbols of the United Kingdom, the fleur-de-lis for France and the maple leaf for Canada, this flag has been in common usage as a Canadian flag for at least two decades. It has been flown from all public buildings and government establishments in Canada. It has been used by our armed forces in various theatres of the world. It has been generally accepted by all visitors to Canada as the Canadian flag. Our men and women of the services have proudly served under the red ensign in foreign lands. To them it represented all for which they were ready and willing to lay down their lives if necessary and for it many shed their blood.

I should like to just read this poem by John McCrae. I think it is something to which every Canadian should give thought when they are thinking about wiping out the very heritage and tradition of this country, that symbol and that emblem which we have loved and cherished over the years. John McCrae wrote:

> In Flanders fields the poppies blow
> Between the crosses, row on row,
> That mark our place; and in the sky
> The larks, still bravely singing, fly
> Scarce heard amid the guns below.
>
> We are the Dead. Short days ago
> We lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow,
> Loved and were loved, and now we lie,
> In Flanders fields.
>
> Take up our quarrel with the foe:
> 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.

I say that we should give thought to some of those great citizens who fought and died for us. During the world wars the Canadian red ensign, the old red duster as it is called

by many, was symbolic of hope and unswerving devotion to duty on all the seven seas.

There have been strong representations, from national organizations as well as a host of individuals, that this flag be retained and confirmed as our Canadian flag. I, like other members of the house, have received many letters and suggestions for new flags, some from personal individual friends, but I would only like to put on record a couple, one being from the Smiths Falls *Record-News* as follows:

> We felt you would be interested in being assessed the results of a readers' poll taken over the past two weeks by this newspaper. The readers were asked their preference for a national flag as well as a national anthem. The following are the results:
>
> | | |
> |---|---|
> | The ensign | 83.7 per cent |
> | Maple leaf | 16.3 per cent |
> | The Queen | 72.7 per cent |
> | O Canada | 27.3 per cent |

Enclosed with it was an article which appeared in the newspaper and at the end of it there was this poem:

> I am ready to fight,
> With all my might,
> Anyone on the wrong track,
> Trying to pull down our union jack.
> Some say a maple leaf that's all,
> To me a maple leaf turns yellow in the fall.
> My deepest soul
> Within me grieves,
> Flying on a pole,
> Three maple leaves.

I have another article from the same paper in which it states:

> The flag debate seems to have made people and organizations conscious of our present national symbols. A number of residents of the town have started to fly their own personal flag choice from their porches and car aerials. A number of merchants have reported that they cannot keep the red ensign in stock. Latest to join the red ensign group is the Smiths Falls lawn bowling club which erected a flag pole last week.

I would also like to place on the record a letter which covers a petition signed by many hundreds of signers.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. It would be well if we allowed the hon. member for Lanark to continue without being interrupted.

Mr. Doucett: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was about to read this letter which covers a petition signed by several hundred signers:

> We the undersigned feel it is about time that some voices were heard in favour of the red ensign, which a vast majority in Lanark county respect and fly as our national flag. Why a change should be proposed by Mr. Pearson to appease a small vocal group we cannot understand.
>
> Mr. Pearson should be aware that his is a minority government. Only 42 per cent of the Canadian people saw fit to vote for this government, and the majority of our people decided not to do so. There has never been a prime minister since confederation who has caused so much disunity, bitterness, strife and confusion. I personally agree with some hon. members of parliament and many Canadians that Pearson is trying to ram this new flag down the throats of the Canadian people.
>
> We, the people of Lanark county representing every religious and political affiliation along with representatives of the I.O.D.E., Orange associations, I.O.O.F., Masonic, Knights of Columbus and many others etc., etc., are opposed to any Canadian flag which does not incorporate the union jack. May we respectively solicit your support in this respect.
>
> Rarely in Canadian history has a parliament presented such an unattractive picture of itself to the people who elect it, the people who pay for it, the people whose public business it is supposed to transact.
>
> The voters are not amused, the voters are not at all impressed with what they see in Ottawa. We are disgusted and disillusioned.
>
> We, the voters of Lanark county and petitioners go on record as being opposed to the proposed new tri maple leaf flag to replace the red ensign. Every Canadian should be granted the right to vote on this vital matter by means of a national plebiscite.

Of the many letters I have received those are all I am going to put on the record, but I would like to say a word about the proposed new flag. This flag, without any symbols of the two founding nations, is strictly Canadian design and it has been said it meets the heraldic requirements of a flag. It is not known whether this is acceptable to the French speaking population across the country, and it has been received with mixed feelings by other groups.

There are people who cannot see any good in it at all. There is another group which, though being extremely loyal to the crown of Britain, takes the view that unity in Canada is of the greatest importance, and the people in this group would accept the proposed flag in the hope that it might contribute to Canadian unity and make for a stronger Canada, which would in turn strengthen the commonwealth. In this way they feel that they would be serving the best interests of both Canada and the commonwealth. There is yet another group which subscribes to the thoughts just expressed but which hastens to add that it is in accord only with the principle of a new, distinctive Canadian flag, not with the methods being employed to bring about its approval. No individual, and no government can employ such methods without being political. I feel that a matter which so closely concerns the life of this nation should be settled in such a way as to cement the unity about which a former prime minister, Right Hon. Louis St. Laurent,

said, and I say, "Without unity, all is futile".

I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, and through you to the Prime Minister, that while the people of this bountiful land wait for important legislation to be dealt with, he, their commander in chief, obstructs the country's march to economic fulfilment by protracted debate on an issue which history records was settled years ago. The voice of Canada from sea to sea is vibrant and strong. I say to the Prime Minister: If you would have ears to hear, its voice speaks by day and by night. Can this house ignore the wishes of men and women who long since decided what flag should represent Canada on the ramparts of freedom? Is the petition presented weeks ago by the hon. members from Cumberland (Mr. Coates), York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) and Kootenay West (Mr. Herridge) bearing nearly 20,000 names to be treated as a mere scrap of paper. Are not these 20,000 people who took the trouble of signing a petition to send to the parliament of Canada deserving of some consideration?

The history of this country is steeped in tradition. I trust that the Prime Minister and the members of his government will give heed to the traditions they know to be a part of this great country's inheritance. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Prime Minister if he has closed his ears to the request of more than 250,000 gallant men and women who gave their services and offered their lives for their country, and who are now denied the right even to express their views by balloting on the flag of their choice. When the right hon. gentleman met with them in Winnipeg—I will not repeat what he said on that occasion; we have heard it several times—he as much as said: Here is your flag; take it or leave it. I think that is a pitiful experience to go down in the records of this country—that he would say this to people who fought and defended this country under the red ensign.

I fully realize we are living in a democratic country. I stand for the fullest degree of freedom and I hope we shall always have the privilege in this great land of ours to think, speak, worship and go about as we wish. But I do not think a decision of such emotional importance as this should be, or can be, decided by members of the House of Commons and still retain Canada's maximum unity. I feel that everyone who wishes to do so should have the opportunity to voice their views and opinions. The provinces which make up our dominion naturally have boundaries. But Canada is without boundaries from sea to sea and should be one Canada for all Canadians. As I say, I fully agree with the democratic process, but I feel the method employed on this occasion must be one which will keep this country united in order that we may go forward united and build on the great foundation which was so nobly laid by our forefathers.

Mr. Matheson: Would the hon. member who has taken his seat permit a question? May I ask the hon. member for Lanark, my friend and neighbour, whether in view of the fact that he has made reference to the Prime Minister's address to the Royal Canadian Legion in Winnipeg he would read to this house one sentence or paragraph thereof which he regards as being evidence of poor judgment, or poor taste, or as being offensive?

Some hon. Members: The whole speech.

Mr. Doucett: In reply to my hon. friend and neighbour—to use the expression he did—in case there may be some misinterpretation of the right hon. gentleman's statement I will leave it to him, when he makes his own speech, to explain in the greatest of detail what his views are. The hon. member has interrupted every speaker who has spoken in this debate—

Mr. Matheson: Untrue.

Mr. Doucett: And I think it is time they should have an opportunity to speak without such interruptions.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Louis Frenette (Portneuf): Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to take part in this debate, but in view of the slowness of the procedure and the stubbornness of some members of the house, I feel I have to take seven or eight minutes to express my constituents' views and inform the house of the feelings which have developed among the people since this debate started two weeks ago.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the word debate no longer applies here and that what we are witnessing is much more closely connected with the world of entertainment than with parliamentary procedure.

I do not feel that the supporters of a real flag and their opponents have the right to carry on this empty discussion any longer.

More than a hundred speeches have now been delivered on the matter. Everyone has reached his own conclusions. I do not think that any argument can be added which might influence anybody.

An amendment and a subamendment have been introduced and since then speeches have been going on, most of the time outside the questions respecting this amendment asking for a referendum, or outside the subamendment which deals with the questions that might be asked in a possible plebiscite.

The Canadian people are asking more and more embarrassing questions on the nation's business.

Since when does parliament have to consult the people on such and such question after it has been sworn in? What is the role of the government? How far can the responsibility of the members of the government go? Are members of parliament so inefficient that they have to consult their electors as soon as a difficult question must be solved?

Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is high time to put an end to this sham of a debate, for the simple reason that the Canadian people are losing confidence in this wonderful institution of parliament. The Canadian people are also losing confidence in the members of this parliament, who refuse to take their responsibility and are looking for excuses to camouflage the truth.

I agree that each member should have the right to express his opinion in the house, and I respect that opinion. I also agree that the supporters of the union jack or the red ensign should defend those flags, and I recognize their merit. Were I myself in their position, I would do the same. Since they represent ridings where the electors want to maintain those symbols, they are only doing their duty and, for that reason, they deserve our respect.

But I cannot admit that responsible members of the House of Commons should hide behind this referendum smokescreen to reject the responsibility on the Canadian people.

The Canadian parliament has become the laughing stock of the people and its reputation for inefficiency is increasingly spreading, to such an extent that we are justified in wondering whether we could ever make up for all the wrong already done in this connection.

How can we claim to be qualified to administer the country and settle the serious problems of our times, if we are not even in a position to organize our own legislative program?

The deadlock where we now find ourselves is the most eloquent argument in favour of a revision of the whole procedure and I hope that all hon. members will remember that in due time.

The Portneuf people are well known for their common sense and their innate sense of logic. Besides, they proved it in a very eloquent way during the last two elections. They are respectful of order and of our institutions, but in face of the ridiculous situation created by the discussion on the flag resolution, their faith and confidence are seriously shaken. And every time I have an opportunity to meet them, they inform me of their concern and disappointment.

Those people want a genuine Canadian flag and after the information I gave them, they still have confidence that this government will adopt such a flag. That is why I am asking the government to take all the means available to them to bring to an end, as soon as possible, this futile discussion by giving us an opportunity to express our views by voting on the matter.

I do not intend to advance any new arguments in support of the resolution or to refute certain points raised by the official opposition, because I would be afraid to fall into the same errors for which I am blaming certain of my colleagues.

The choice of the design, the timing of the introduction of the resolution, the likelihood of an eventual compromise, all those subjects have been, to my mind, sufficiently discussed. I think the institution of a committee was an elegant gesture on the part of the Prime Minister, but the terms laid down by the Leader of the Opposition were so harsh that they prove, once again, the ill will of some members.

The Prime Minister is blamed for certain withdrawals, certain retreats. It has often been said in this debate that such reversals on the part of the leader of the government are due to the fact that he is no politician. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the Prime Minister is not a politician; unfortunately, there are too many politicians who more often than not give more thought to the next election than to the serious business of the nation.

In reaching a decision, the Prime Minister was not concerned with election results, but with a solemn promise made to the Canadian people. By his courageous action, he gained the high respect of the whole nation and, whatever may be our views on this issue, he should be commended for his courageous attitude.

The manner in which this project was presented may have been clumsy. That is

possible. However, I do not think it would be fair to discredit the whole issue because of that.

Personally, I am glad to be a member of parliament today and to participate in this historic debate. Having had the honour of supporting a truly Canadian flag will be my greatest satisfaction and probably my most pleasant memory as a member of parliament.

The Prime Minister is being criticized for his statement on a free vote. Among those who object to that, is there a single member whose vote will be affected by that statement?

Mr. Speaker, I feel that all hon. members are now sufficiently informed on the issue and that it should be put to a vote without further delay. In my opinion, the longer the final decision is delayed the greater the risk for national unity.

If, after the series of speeches that we have heard, there are still members in this house who do not feel sufficiently informed or enlightened, it will be necessary to consider amending the Elections Act to have each candidate take an I.Q. test, in addition to making a $200 deposit.

In order to maintain the reputation of parliament and its members, under the authority conferred upon parliament for the proper administration of the affairs of this country, I take the liberty to urge on the members of the government the necessity of taking action to close this debate, by extraordinary means, if need be.

Mr. Speaker, you may be sure that if I had the power to put forward a closure motion, I would be greatly pleased to do so, knowing that I would thus be doing my duty as a representative of the Canadian people.

[*Text*]

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): The hon. member for Wellington South (Mr. Hales).

Mr. Hales: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member who has just resumed his seat permit a question? He referred several times to "a distinctive flag". Would he mind telling the house what he means by "distinctive"?

Mr. Dupuis: Not with a union jack on the flag.

Mr. Smallwood: There's a great statement from a cabinet minister.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Frenette: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question of the hon. member, I must say that I do not know whether this is due to simultaneous translation, but I referred several times to an authentic and not to a distinctive flag. Whatever interpretation is given to my remarks, by a distinctive flag I mean an emblem which represents our aspirations and which does not bear any sign of allegiance to any foreign country.

[*Text*]

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Rhéaume: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Ten thirty.

Mr. Rhéaume: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, would the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Dupuis) care to identify himself as the person who made the remark that "distinctive" is anything that does not contain the union jack?

Some hon. Members: Yes, say it.

Mr. Dupuis: I said that, Mr. Speaker. A distinctive flag is a flag without the union jack, or without the fleur-de-lis—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Dupuis: —or without the emblem of any other country on it.

Mr. Smallwood: You should be ashamed of yourself.

Mr. Bigg: A very statesmanlike speech, that was.

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. If there are questions about tomorrow's business, they might be asked now.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under provisional standing order 39A deemed to have been moved:

AGRICULTURE—QUEBEC—PROTESTS RESPECTING FEED GRAIN SUBSIDY

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Speaker, during the question period this afternoon, I said that the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Sauvé) should tell us about his discussions with the Quebec U.C.C. representatives who came to meet him last Friday in order to discuss the possibilities of amending his agricultural assistance project, providing for subsidies as regards feed grain transportation in

eastern Canada as well as other parts of the country.

I had raised that question, knowing—

[*Text*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. I apologize for interrupting the hon. member, but there seems to be more than the usual amount of noise in the chamber. I think the house would want to accord to the hon. member who is now speaking the privileges of the chamber.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lessard (Lake St. John): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We are evidently used to these noises and I was not worrying too much.

I was saying that I was interested—as are most hon. members of eastern Canada—to know what was the intention of the Minister of Forestry concerning the subsidies for the transportation of feed grains.

We learned directly from the minister and also through departmental order No. 1964-1155, that the government intended to establish from September 1 next new rates for the transportation of feed grains in the various parts of Quebec, Ontario, British Columbia and the maritime provinces.

Having studied the figures made available to us, I came to the conclusion that certain areas would continue to suffer discrimination while others seem to have benefited from the special attention of the minister concerned and his officials.

I refer especially to the Magdalen islands, represented by the minister, and to Newfoundland, which will both benefit from a most generous assistance for the transportation of feed grains.

I am happy, Mr. Speaker, that these areas will benefit from this assistance and I have no intention to propose a reduction of those subsidies.

On the other hand, if we compare the proposed rates, we note that $25 a ton will be granted for the transportation of grain to be delivered in Newfoundland, $7 or $9 for grain delivered in Halifax and $15 for grain delivered in the Magdalen islands. Certain factors which I find hard to assess have played a part in all that.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Saguenay-Lake St. John region which I have the pleasure to represent here, allow me to say that the farmers in that area will suffer from the government's new policy because starting September 1, if nothing is changed, they will have to pay 80 cents a ton more for transportation. I think that is far from what we had the right to expect and from what we had asked.

If that is the policy of farm assistance and restoration which the Minister of Forestry intends to advocate to help farming in eastern Canada, well, he has missed the boat entirely; he will have to proceed differently to restore the farm economy in our regions, particularly in the Saguenay-Lake St. John region.

Our farmers have very good land and they only need a little help in order to manage during the difficult period they are now going through.

Since we have been in the house, that is over two years ago, we have been constantly calling for some action to help farmers especially with regard to the transportation of feed grain.

After waiting so long, we finally hoped that thanks to the member for Îles-de-la-Madeleine, whom I trusted and in whom I still have some confidence, a solution would be provided.

But unfortunately, with the representatives of eastern farmers and the leaders of the Catholic farmers' union, I can only deplore this decision of the minister, and I hope that before September 1, he and his officials will acknowledge their mistakes. I hope that they will bring in some changes so that farmers of the Saguenay-Lake St. John area and others will not suffer any prejudice as a result of a mathematical error made by some officials.

We are told that it is a slight increase. Well, Mr. Speaker, in the present circumstances, the farmers are not in a position to support even a slight increase, when they had every reason and every right to expect an improvement in their situation through a reduction in the cost of feed grain which would have reduced their production cost and enabled them to compete on the markets.

[*Text*]

Mr. B. S. Beer (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Forestry): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the hon. gentleman for his question. I regret my inability to reply in his native tongue. I will speak slowly in order that I may communicate the thinking of the minister.

The hon. member has brought to the attention of the house the fact that farmers from the area he represents have had some problems and have expressed some complaints to the minister. The Minister of Forestry recognizes this and suggested to the hon. member

in the house today that last Friday he did receive a deputation from Quebec and, in fact, from all Canada with regard to freight assistance on feed grain. I think he would expect me to say at this particular time that under the former policy—when I say "former" I mean the policy that applied prior to the interim statement made on July 24—certain inequalities did exist. There were areas in Canada where more than freight assistance was being paid by the government and in fact this did represent a subsidy on the feed itself.

It was the hope of the minister that these inequalities might be corrected and that in addition certain assistance might apply on feed grain moved by truck in many areas. It was hoped by the minister and by the government that the application of the assistance on feed grain moved by truck would make it more competitive and would thereby reduce the transportation costs on feed in many areas. While it is recognized that some of the subsidy may have been lost, which was over and above the freight assistance and was actually a subsidy on the feed itself, the reduction as the result of more competitive rates applying in the transportation of this feed will be a compensating factor. I think the minister expressed the thought in the house today that the views of the farmers as expressed on Friday last would be duly considered.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, August 26, 1964

The house met at 2 p.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. CROUSE—REPORTED STATEMENT BY MEMBER FOR RED DEER IN "TIME" MAGAZINE

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (Queens-Lunenburg): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege affecting all hon. members of the official opposition. On page 7 of the August 28 issue of *Time* magazine the hon. member for Red Deer is reported to have said, after the meeting of the party leaders last week on the flag resolution, that the leader of the official opposition refused to consult with his own party. I quote his reported words:

> Mr. Diefenbaker refused to consult with his own party, or to consider any reasonable compromise himself.

I can say, Mr. Speaker, in connection with these matters, that the leader of the official opposition did consult with his party at all times, and the stand he has taken on the flag issue represents the opinion of this party. Either the hon. member for Red Deer is talking through his hat or he has been misquoted by this magazine. Since members of the official opposition know the quotation in *Time* magazine to be a complete falsehood, I would ask that the hon. member for Red Deer withdraw it and dissociate himself from *Time's* incorrect news commentary.

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the question of privilege raised by the hon. member, I should like to say that the leader of the Social Credit party is absent in his riding with his family. I think we may well take note of the question raised by the hon. member, even though I am sure what was said is true.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: At this stage I do not believe any further discussion will be particularly useful. It seems to me that we should await the return of the hon. member for Red Deer.

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): On this question of privilege, the hon. member who has just spoken used the words that he believed this statement to be true. I think he should immediately withdraw those words or present proof to the house that his statement is correct.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The best evidence, of course, will be what the hon. member for Red Deer will have to say on his own behalf. I do not see any purpose in continuing or perhaps in listening to secondary evidence. Let us hear from the hon. member concerned first.

Mr. MacInnis: Further to the question of privilege, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; this is not the time for a discussion of this question of privilege. Certain allegations have been made. Let us hear both sides of the story before we reach a conclusion.

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): On a question of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker, the remark just made by a member of the Social Credit party is certainly a reflection on myself and every other member of the official opposition.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Surely a member of a group in this house is entitled to stand up and say that the matter raised as a question or alleged question of privilege will be brought to the attention of his leader on his return. That is a matter of courtesy.

TRADE

JAPAN—VOLUNTARY RESTRAINTS ON EXPORTS TO CANADA

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the house I should like to table a copy of a letter dated August 25 which I have received from the chargé d'affaires of Japan informing me of the voluntary restraints which the Japanese government is applying on the export of certain products to Canada during 1964. These decisions were taken by the Japanese government following consultations which began in December, 1963 between the Japanese and Canadian governments. The levels of restraint which Japan is maintaining during 1964 provide generally for orderly increases over the 1963 levels. These increases are in the order of 3 per cent to 5

per cent, and in virtually all cases these increases are not greater than the expected growth in the market for the products in question.

By leave of the house I suggest that the chargé's letter be printed as an appendix to *Hansard* in view of the interest it has for a large number of people.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, that should not be printed as an appendix to *Hansard.* As an appendix to *Votes and Proceedings* possibly it would be in order, but not for *Hansard.*

Mr. Speaker: Does the house give consent to the details being published in *Votes and Proceedings*?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Gordon: I would like to take this opportunity to express appreciation for the cooperation shown by the Japanese government in the working out of these arrangements. The discussions have, of course, been long and difficult. We would not expect them to be otherwise, since they affect important sectors of Japanese trade just as they relate to important and sensitive sectors of the Canadian economy.

It might be useful if I reminded the house that last year during the course of consultations the Canadian government agreed to the removal of vinyl raincoats from the list of items under restraint by Japan. Following our policy of not seeking restraints on exports when damage to Canadian producers is no longer threatened, we agreed this year that plywood might be removed from the list of items under restraint.

It might also be useful if I said a word about our discussions with Japan on exports of worsted fabrics. There has been some speculation in the press on this subject and, accordingly, I would like to report briefly on where this matter now stands.

In late 1963 representations were received on behalf of Canadian producers of worsteds asking that Japan be asked to restrain exports. These representations were examined closely; it was apparent that until that time the very sharp increase in imports from Japan had been largely at the expense of other supplying countries, and had not directly affected Canadian producers. It was evident, however, that if imports from Japan continued to grow at that rate Canadian producers would soon be threatened with material injury. Japanese exports of worsteds to Canada in 1963 rose by 60 per cent over 1962. The statistics so far available indicate that imports of worsteds from Japan this year may be up by a further 50 per cent or 60 per cent over 1963. This would represent a total value of imports of Japanese worsteds far in excess of Japanese exports of worsteds to all of Europe last year.

It is important to note that Japanese exports of worsteds to virtually every industrial market except Canada and the United States are strictly controlled, either in Japan or in the importing country. This means that exports from Japan will tend to be concentrated on the relatively open Canadian market.

While we have had a number of discussions with the Japanese, no agreement has so far been reached on how to deal with this problem or the level of restraint that might be warranted. I will be taking this matter up further with Japanese ministers at the meeting in Tokyo next week, and I am still hopeful that some understanding on worsted fabrics will be reached which will meet the legitimate interests of all parties concerned, including the Canadian producers, the Japanese exporters and the Canadian users of Japanese goods.

Hon. J. W. Monteith (Perth): I understand the finalization of these matters will take place in further meetings in Tokyo next week. But the minister said, I believe, in the early part of his remarks that the expected increase in quotas would about balance the increase in the requirements of this country. This, it seems to me, leaves a somewhat narrow margin for any increase in production in Canada and for the increased consumption in Canada of Canadian products.

It has been reported that there has been a worsening of our deficit position, or that there has been a big increase in our imports and a drop in exports; also in regard to the United States there has been a decrease in exports and an increase in imports amounting to 6.9 per cent. I wonder whether the minister is keeping this over-all picture in mind as he looks forward to further increases in imports of goods from Japan. I wonder whether he does not feel this situation is worthy of serious consideration.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): When we have had a chance to examine this list of voluntary restraints on Japanese imports into Canada we shall be in a better position to make a statement regarding it.

However, I think the house should remember—and I am sure the government is aware of this fact—that Japan is still buying from us a great deal more than we are buying from

her. Trade is a two way street, and if Japan and other countries are to buy from Canada they can only do so if they are able to earn Canadian dollars with which to pay for these goods. I think this must be kept in mind when we examine these voluntary restrictions. We shall be glad, in this party, to consider this list and make a statement at an appropriate time.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Speaker, we listened with interest, of course, to the statement just made by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) on trade and financial arrangements made or to be made with Japan. However, in this connection one thing in particular should be borne in mind, and it is this. Even if our trade balance with Japan is favourable we should not forget that the labour content in the goods we import from Japan is much higher than the labour content in the goods we export to Japan. As a matter of fact, our exports to Japan consist mostly of raw materials with, unfortunately, a very small Canadian labour content, so that, as an end result, we are still showing a deficit as far as labour is concerned.

The same thing can be said about our trade with other countries; that is the problem we are now facing and will continue to face unless we change our policy as far as international trade is concerned.

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I have only a few words to say about the statement just made by the Minister of Finance. According to the minister we have a favourable trade balance with Japan since they import more from us than we do from them.

Now, some Canadian associations have complained to the Minister of Finance against some sort of dumping by Japan in Canada. Consequently, I feel the minister is not quite right in saying that after investigating the situation he is satisfied that such dumping does no harm to Canadian trade and industry.

As he knows, there are Canadian and American companies in Japan at present. As the hon. member for Lake St. John (Mr. Lessard) said a moment ago, our raw material is exported to Japan where it is cheaper to process it, and then it is exported back to Canada. Those are our imports. Let no one tell us that our trade and industry do not suffer from the fact that Canadians settle in Japan instead of producing what we need right here in Canada.

We live in an era when it is absolutely necessary to do business with the other nations of the world, but not to the disadvantage of Canada or other nations. That our international trade should balance, that is in order. However, let no one tell us that goods which enter Canada from Japan and which could be produced here in Canada do not hurt Canadian industry. If Canadians expatriate themselves and settle in Japan because labour is cheaper, the necessary action should be taken to encourage production and industry in Canada so that we may have more and more control over our general economy as well as over imports and exports which concern us.

[*Text*]

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

R.C.M.P. OFFICER JOHNSTONE, TORONTO

Question No. 1,494—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Does the R.C.M.P. have on its staff, on duty in Toronto, an officer named Johnstone and, if so, on what duties was the said officer assigned on June 22 and June 23, 1964?

2. Did Officer Johnstone visit the premises located at 50 Walton street, Toronto on June 22, 1964, and, if so (a) was he alone or in the company of others (b) what was the nature of Officer Johnstone's duties on that occasion and what duties were performed by any such persons accompanying him?

3. Did Officer Johnstone on June 23, 1964, have in his possession or under his jurisdiction any equipment that could be used for the tapping of telephone lines and, if so, was the said equipment put to any use?

4. Was Officer Johnstone in conversation with Mr. A. G. Dodd on June 23, 1964, and, if so, what was the nature of such conversation?

5. Has the government any information regarding admissions by representatives of the Bell Telephone Company relating to the tapping of telephone lines?

6. Does the R.C.M.P. own a green 1962 Mercury, licence number 722-412, and, if so (a) does this vehicle resemble a Bell Telephone vehicle (b) how and where was this vehicle employed on June 22 and June 23, 1964?

Mr. D. S. Macdonald (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, this question is in six parts. I am advised by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police that the answers are as follows:

1. There is a member of the R.C.M.P. in Toronto named Johnston and his duties on June 22 and 23, 1964 involved a confidential investigation.

2. No, he was in the area on June 23 on duty of a confidential nature which is not in the public interest to disclose.

3. No.

4. Yes, the conversation related to matters of a confidential nature which are not in the public interest to disclose.

5. No.

6. The R.C.M.P. does own a 1962 Mercury passenger sedan, licence number 722-412. It does not resemble a Bell Telephone vehicle, nor could it be mistaken for a Bell Telephone vehicle. It is not a truck and the R.C.M.P. does not own, or has not used, a green truck.

ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES OF DISARMAMENT

Question No. 1,506—**Mr. Prittie:**

1. Is there any agency or department of the federal government charged with the responsibility for studying economic effects of general disarmament and particularly effects resulting from shifts in the nature of defence procurements and the closure of defence bases and, if so (a) which agencies or departments have these responsibilities (b) what agencies or departments have the responsibility for implementing such plans and studies?

2. During the years 1963 and 1964 to date, what reports have been prepared for the government on the economic consequences of disarmament?

3. During the years 1963 and 1964 to date, has the government of Canada submitted to the secretary general of the United Nations any reports on economic plans for disarmament?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): On September 22, 1961, the secretariat of the United Nations requested member governments to provide certain information in connection with a study which a United Nations consultative group was undertaking on the economic and social consequences of disarmament. On March 18, 1964 the secretary general of the United Nations requested member governments to provide additional information in connection with a further report on this subject which he intended to submit to the 37th session of ECOSOC and to the 19th session of the general assembly.

The government of Canada prepared replies in response to both of these requests for information. These replies are contained in United Nations documents E/3593/Rev. 1/Add. 1-5 and E/3898/Add. 3 of July 17, 1964 and are available in the parliamentary library.

A number of government departments and agencies co-operated in preparing the replies to the United Nations. In the performance of their normal functions, various government departments and agencies generally endeavour to anticipate and prepare for future developments likely to have important economic effects. Any imminent prospect of significant progress on disarmament would, of course, be given appropriate weight in such forecasts or plans.

[Mr. Macdonald.]

AL GRAHAM—APPOINTMENT TO LABOUR MINISTER'S PERSONAL STAFF

Question No. 1,619—**Mr. Coates:**

Did the Minister of Labour recently appoint Al Graham to his personal staff, and, if so (a) at what salary (b) what are the duties associated with the position, and (c) what are Mr. Graham's qualifications for the position in question?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): (a) Mr. Bernard Alasdair Graham was appointed to the staff of the Minister of Labour at a salary of $15,000 per annum; (b) Mr. Graham is a special assistant to the minister; (c) intelligence and ability.

R.C.A.F. AND ARMY RESERVES

Question No. 1,689—**Mr. McCutcheon:**

1. What is the total number of enlisted men in the R.C.A.F. reserve by province of origin?
2. What is the total number of men enlisted in the R.C.N. reserve by province of origin?
3. What is the total number of enlisted men in the Canadian Army reserve by province of origin?

Hon. Lucien Cardin (Associate Minister of National Defence): 1, 2 and 3. For the purposes of these questions, province of origin is taken to mean the place of enrolment on enlistment. Strengths of enlisted men as of 30 June, 1964 are as follows:

	R.C.A.F. Auxiliary	R.C.N. Reserve	Army Reserve
Newfoundland		58	653
Prince Edward Island		44	498
Nova Scotia		112	3,105
New Brunswick		72	2,689
Quebec	145	218	8,165
Ontario	175	773	14,071
Manitoba	166	247	1,888
Saskatchewan	151	128	2,173
Alberta		247	3,663
British Columbia, Yukon and Northwest Territories etc.		299	3,308
	637	2,198	40,213

PURCHASES OF SCALLOPS BY ARMED FORCES

Question No. 1,699—**Mr. Crouse:**

How many pounds of scallops were purchased by all branches of the armed forces during 1962 and 1963?

Hon. Lucien Cardin (Associate Minister of National Defence): 226,564 lbs.

DAMAGE FROM NATIONAL DEFENCE SPRAY OPERATIONS, N.B.

Question No. 1,700—**Mr. MacRae:**

1. Did the Department of National Defence carry out spraying operations in connection with brush control at camp Gagetown and, if so, have complaints been received to the effect that heavy damage was inflicted on crops in the Mangerville area, Sunbury county, N.B., as a result of such spraying operations?

2. Has the department taken steps to ascertain the extent of any such damage and, if so, what are the details of any such damage?

3. Is the department taking steps to indemnify farmers who suffered losses and, if so, what steps are being taken for such purpose and to what extent will farmers be indemnified?

Hon. Lucien Cardin (Associate Minister of National Defence): 1. A contract for spraying operations in connection with brush control at camp Gagetown during the period 2-22 July, 1964, was arranged through Defence Construction Limited. One complaint alleging damage to crops has been received.

2 and 3. No. The contractor responsible for the spraying operations is receiving and assessing claims for alleged damage.

LOSSES FROM ARMY WORMS, MARITIME PROVINCES

Question No. 1,711—**Mr. Coates:**

1. Has the Department of Agriculture taken steps to ascertain the extent of the damage caused by army worms to field crops in the maritime provinces and, if so, what are the details of any such damage?

2. Is the department taking steps to indemnify farmers who suffered losses and, if so, what steps are being taken for such purpose and to what extent will farmers be indemnified?

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): 1. It is not yet possible to make an accurate assessment of the damage caused by army worm infestations in the maritime provinces since the army worm feeds only on plants of the grass family, some of which will show recovery after army worm damage. Moderate heavy infestations were reported in the southern parts of New Brunswick as far north as Centreville and preliminary surveys indicate severe damage in the Moncton, Woodstock, Sussex, Centreville, Long Creek and Hallville areas. In Nova Scotia infestations were reported in the vicinity of Truro, Grand Pré, Canning, Port Williams, Clarence, Wilmot and Bridgewater. In Prince Edward Island infestations were reported at Albery Plains, New Perth and Fortune areas.

2. Programs of relief assistance on account of crop losses are initiated by provincial authorities.

ARMY WORM LOSSES, VICTORIA-CARLETON CONSTITUENCY

Question No. 1,712—**Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton):**

1. Has any information been received from the government of New Brunswick concerning damage to crops in the constituency of Victoria-Carleton, due to army worm infestation and, if so, what are the details of such damage?

2. Has the government considered any method of indemnifying losses incurred by farmers through no fault or neglect of their own and, if so, what are the details of such indemnities?

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): 1. No. However, reports from departmental officials indicate that there were severe infestations in that area.

2. Programs of relief assistance on account of crop losses are initiated by provincial authorities.

ARMY WORM DAMAGE, KINGS COUNTY, N.B.

Question No. 1,714—**Mr. Fairweather:**

1. What is the extent in area and the estimate of value of crop loss as a result of the infestation of army worms in central Kings county, New Brunswick?

2. What federal or provincial or joint programs are being conducted to eradicate or minimize the infestation?

3. What financial assistance is available under federal legislation to farmers who have suffered financial losses as a result of this infestation?

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): 1. No accurate assessment of the damage by army worms in central Kings county is yet available. Surveys indicated heavy infestation in the area.

2. The present infestation of army worms has run its course. The damage is inflicted on crops over a period of 14 to 16 days. The second crop of larvae, the offspring of the late summer moths, have never been known to cause damage. As yet no successful method of forecasting infestations has been developed but survey methods to determine the abundance and distribution of very young larvae have been developed and are used to indicate infestations likely to be of economic importance. Such surveys enable warnings of possible outbreaks to be made in time for producers to follow chemical control measures developed to prevent serious crop losses. Warnings were issued by the department early in July of potential infestations in the maritime provinces.

3. Under the Crop Insurance Act the federal government contributes 20 per cent of the premiums and one half of the administrative costs under approved provincial crop

insurance schemes designed to insure individual farmers against crop losses. However, since a crop insurance program has not been adopted in New Brunswick, this legislation would not be operative in the present instance. There is no other specific legislation authorizing assistance as a result of this infestation.

MAIL CONTRACT, R.R. 2, AMHERST, N.S.

Question No. 1,725—**Mr. Coates:**

1. For what reason were tenders called for R.R. No. 2, Amherst, N.S.?
2. Was the starting point associated with the route in question changed and, if so, for what reason?
3. How many bids were received and what were the amounts of the bids in question?
4. Who was the successful tenderer for the service?
5. What was the amount of the previous contract?
6. How long had the previous contractor provided the service in question?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General):

1. To obtain a formal contract.

2. Yes. Starting point changed to the Amherst post office. It is the general policy to have rural routes start and finish at a post office.

3. Three. Harvey Ralph Noiles, R.R. No. 2, Amherst, $3,200; Walter F. Dickeson, R.R. No. 1, Newport, $3,500; Mrs. Gweneth G. Embree, R.R. No. 2, Amherst, $3,650.

4. Not yet determined. In accordance with the terms of the Post Office Act, an inquiry is now in progress to determine whether the lowest tenderer is able to meet the requirements of the service.

5. $3,319.15 per annum.

6. Forty one years.

CONSIDERATION OF POWER PROJECTS, ATLANTIC PROVINCES

Question No. 1,728—**Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton):**

1. Is the Atlantic development board reconsidering the allotment of the grant to the province of New Brunswick of $20,000,000 for the Mactaquac project in New Brunswick in view of the announcement by the premier of Newfoundland that the Hamilton falls project is likely to be proceeded with without delay and that the power secured from Hamilton falls would become available to the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island through the medium of a distribution station located at Sackville, New Brunswick at an estimated price of 4 mills per k.w.h.?
2. Is the Atlantic development board considering assisting financially in the distribution of power generated at Hamilton falls as an alternative to the Mactaquac project?
3. What, in detail, are the plans of the Hamilton falls project, Passamaquoddy development and Chignecto tidal development now in possession of the Atlantic development board?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): I am informed by the Atlantic development board as follows:

1. No.
2. No.
3. The Atlantic development board has not received official plans or reports concerning the Hamilton falls project.

With respect to Passamaquoddy development, the board has in its possession a copy of (a) the report of the secretary, U.S. department of interior to President John F. Kennedy, July 1963; (b) the report by Passamaquoddy Saint John river study committee to the secretary, U.S. department of the interior, dated August 1964.

On tidal development, upper bay of Fundy the board has (a) a copy of the report made for the New Brunswick government in 1962 entitled "Appraisal of Tidal Power in the Bay of Fundy"; (b) a study on sub-surface conditions at Shepody bay and Cumberland basin, commissioned by the board in 1963 and received June 1964.

FARM LOAN APPLICATIONS, KAMOURASKA COUNTY, QUE.

Question No. 1,735—**Mr. Dionne:**

How many applications for farm loans have been received by the Farm Credit Corporation from farmers of Kamouraska county in the years 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963 and of this number how many were accepted?

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): The Farm Credit Corporation advises that statistical records are kept by fiscal years. For the municipal county of Kamouraska, the answer is:

Fiscal Year	No. Applications Rec'd	No. Accepted
1960-61	1	1
1961-62	2	2
1962-63	13	8
1963-64	12	8

CANADIAN ARSENALS AMMUNITION CONTRACT WITH C.I.L.

Question No. 1,742—**Mr. Beaulé:**

1. What is the amount of the Canadian Arsenals contract for making ammunition on behalf of C.I.L.?
2. Did C.I.L. refuse nearly 50 per cent of the production and, if so, for what reason?
3. What will be the cost of the extra work involved?
4. How many hours of overtime will have to be worked if this contract is to be completed?
5. Who will assume any loss involved?

[*Translation*]

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry):

1. Total value of Canadian Arsenals Limited contracts for making high velocity sporting ammunition on behalf of C.I.L. is $219,684., consisting of nine purchase orders. Most of this volume relates to new Canadian production, having been formerly imported.

2. The first production lot, representing approximately 11% of the above amount, was refused by C.I.L. and returned for re-inspection. Standards of inspection for exterior finish of high velocity sporting ammunition are more demanding than those for military ammunition, which until now have governed manufacture at C.A.L.

3. Costs, in excess of those estimated for the contracts and due to higher quality standards required, are now being established. In view of the different standard of inspection, it is expected that renegotiation with C.I.L. will result in price adjustment.

4. Overtime will continue till September 4 so as to meet urgent delivery schedule of all the various calibres on order and will total approximately 1000 hours.

5. Para. 3 refers.

[*Text*]

INCREASE IN FAMILY ALLOWANCE

Question No. 1,746—**Mr. Ouellet:**

Is the government taking steps to increase family allowances to $30 a month in order to bring them in line with other sectors of our growing national economy and, if not, what are the reasons for not taking such action?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): As this is a matter of government policy any announcement will be made by the government at the appropriate time.

REMOVAL OF TARIFFS ON MEDICAL EQUIPMENT

Question No. 1,748—**Mr. Irvine:**

1. Has consideration been given to permitting the importation into Canada of relaxation chairs and other medical equipment, used in the treatment of retarded children, free from importation taxes or tariffs when these articles are not manufactured in Canada?

2. Has consideration been given to extending exemptions from import tax on tariffs to all medical equipment facilities imported into Canada, when the same or reasonable equivalents thereto are not manufactured in Canada and, if so, what is the decision, or when is it to be announced?

Mr. L. T. Pennell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): In the course of preparations for the last budget, consideration was given to a number of representations requesting that the special end use items in the Customs Tariff providing for the duty free entry of certain equipment and materials used by hospitals, educational and religious institutions be broadened to cover a wider range of commodities, and that duty free entry privileges be extended to additional groups and organizations, both non profit and commercial, which do not currently enjoy such benefits. On the other hand, consideration was also given to representations suggesting that the duty free entry under these items should be restricted to goods which cannot be supplied by Canadian producers.

Having regard to these divergent points of view, it was decided that the best way to ensure full consideration of both sides of the question would be to refer the matter to the tariff board for review and report. The intention to do so was indicated in the budget speech of March 16, 1964.

The tariff board has announced that, in due course, it will conduct public hearings regarding this matter under reference No. 134: Equipment for hospitals and other institutions.

*RED MAPLE LEAF ON COAT OF ARMS

Question No. 1,757—**Mr. Churchill:**

1. What is the special significance of the small single red maple leaf on the coat of arms of Canada?

2. What is the wording of the explanatory note concerning this small red leaf given in the descriptive booklet on Canada's coat of arms published by the secretary of state in 1923?

3. What explanatory note is given concerning this small red maple leaf in the booklet on Canada's coat of arms published by the Secretary of State in 1964?

Mr. J. B. Stewart (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, this question is in three parts.

1. The following is an extract from a memorandum prepared by Colonel C. F. Hamilton whose advice was sought by the committee appointed by order in council P.C. 668 dated 26th March 1919 to inquire into and report upon the advisability of requesting His Majesty the King, through the College of Heralds, for an amendment to the armorial bearings of Canada:

Extract from short memorandum by Colonel C. F. Hamilton, June, 1921:

The maple leaf is our most cherished emblem. In the crest its red colour may be taken as a reference alike to the autumnal glories of our woods, and to the red maple leaf which on our service flags indicated one who had sealed with his life's blood his devotion to his country.

2.

The crest is a lion, in its right paw a red maple leaf, which latter during the great war, came to be used as a symbol of sacrifice.

3. In the description in non-heraldic terms of Canada's coat of arms, 1964, we find the following:

On the royal helmet, draped in a mantle of white and red, is the crest consisting of a wreath or ring of twisted white and red silk on which stands a crowned gold lion holding in its right paw a red maple leaf.

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. J. B. Stewart (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I ask that motions Nos. 134 and 158 be allowed to stand.

Mr. Speaker: Stand.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

CYPRUS—POSSIBLE CHANGES IN SIZE OF PEACE KEEPING FORCE

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, as the matter concerns two departments I will direct my question to the right hon. Prime Minister and ask him whether there has been any request by the United Nations or consideration given by the government of Canada to the reduction by 80 per cent of the Canadian contingent in the United Nations peace keeping force in Cyprus. Has any communication been made to the Prime Minister in this regard?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, there has been no such request received by me or any member of the government; nor has any communication passed between the government and the United Nations on that subject. I am informed that the reports to the effect that such a reduction is being contemplated are without foundation.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Then is any consideration being given at the moment to any increase in the size of the contribution by Canada or other nations to the troops comprising the UN force today?

Mr. Pearson: Well, Mr. Speaker, the matter of the possible increase in the force is, I believe, being considered by the secretary general, but no communication has been received from him on the matter. Nor has any request been made by the Canadian government for any such increase.

[Mr. Stewart.]

Mr. Diefenbaker: Has any informal consideration been given by the government to increasing the numbers in the Canadian force?

Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker, no consideration, formal or informal, has been given.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): A supplementary question. I want to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether he has any information regarding reports that the governments of Greece and Turkey have agreed on a proposal for the union of Cyprus with Greece under certain conditions. Can he give the house any idea what those conditions are, and does he know through diplomatic channels what is the reaction of the Cypriot government to this proposal?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, Canada is not a party to the negotiations in Geneva, and would not be expected to become a party because of the neutral position we occupy as a member of the force itself. There have been discussions between the government of Greece and the government of Turkey and the mediator in Geneva, but beyond that it is not desirable to go at this time.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Could the minister inform the house whether the Canadian government was consulted on the planned reduction of the United Nations force in Cyprus?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister just gave an answer to such a question asked by the Leader of the Opposition, and the answer was no.

Mr. Caouette: I should like to ask the minister a supplementary question.

Since the government was not consulted, could he tell us whether, according to him, the forces to be withdrawn will be those under the financial responsibility of the United Nations or whether the reduction will be proportional to the number of troops maintained by the various countries in Cyprus?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member misunderstood the answer given by the Prime Minister and the explanation I myself gave him in answering his question, a few moments ago.

A reduction of the force is not contemplated. That question is merely based on reports published in this morning's newspapers, but there was no official communication between the Canadian government and the secretary general or Mr. Galo Plaza, the political representative of the secretary general in Cyprus.

[*Text*]

FINANCE

INQUIRY AS TO REPORT OF TAXATION COMMISSION

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance.

Is he in a position to tell us when he expects to table in the house the report of the royal commission on taxation and whether he is receiving in the meantime interim reports enabling him to prepare his next year's budget and to grant Canadians the tax cuts they hope for?

[*Text*]

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I have a meeting arranged with the chairman of the royal commission on taxation for tomorrow morning at nine o'clock, during the course of which I hope to find out from him how the work is going and when he thinks the report of the commission will be ready for presentation to the government. I can assure my hon. friend that the report will be made public very soon after it is received, or perhaps I should say after it is printed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister tell us whether he intends to follow the example of the United States government which is on the point of granting a second tax cut?

[*Text*]

Mr. Gordon: Mr. Speaker, I think we are quite competent to arrange our own directives in these matters.

UNITED NATIONS

PROSPECTIVE OTTAWA MEETING ON STAND-BY UNITS FOR PEACE FORCE

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. With regard to the conference which I understand is going to be held here in the near future involving those countries which have been invited to discuss permanent peace keeping arrangements under the United Nations, can the minister tell the house when he expects this meeting will take place?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the precise date has not yet been fixed, but progress in that regard has been made.

Mr. Nesbitt: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister tell us whether it is to be this fall or this winter? Can he give us some idea?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I would expect it would be this autumn.

COMBINES

REPRESENTATIONS RESPECTING AUTOMOBILE PARTS AND ACCESSORIES

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Chapleau): Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Minister of Justice.

Would he tell us whether he intends to implement the principles of the brief presented to him recently by the national automobile products dealers association?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry but I did not understand the first part of the question. However, I know that I have read such a brief, and if such is the question, the answer is yes; if not, I shall look up the question in *Hansard* tomorrow and give a more detailed answer.

[*Text*]

LABOUR RELATIONS

MONTREAL—INTERVENTION BY FORESTRY MINISTER IN "LA PRESSE" STRIKE

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Georges Valade (St. Mary): Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Minister of Forestry.

Since the newspapers report this morning that the negotiations of the employees on strike at the newspaper *La Presse* in Montreal are moving toward a settlement, would the minister assure us that he will not interfere with this settlement in order not to jeopardize its favourable result?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member can read the answer I gave in this house with respect to this matter, about a month ago.

[*Text*]

EDUCATION

STUDENT LOANS—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT BY MINISTER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. Last week the minister indicated that he hoped he would be able to tell the house last Monday what the final arrangements were under the student loan legislation. Apart from the provincial boards that are required, can he give the house an up to date report?

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I am planning to make a full statement tomorrow on what the situation is up to that moment.

Mr. MacInnis: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Have any instructions been sent out that school principals will have a voice in the processing of applications for student loans?

Mr. Gordon: No, Mr. Speaker.

SUGGESTED PROVISION OF SCHOLARSHIPS IN ENGINEERING

On the orders of the day:

Mr. William Dean Howe (Hamilton South): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Prime Minister. In view of the shortage of professional engineers in Canada, as recently announced by the national employment service, and the recruitment of foreign engineers, would the government consider the provision of attractive scholarships to encourage students to enter this field?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I shall be glad to look into that question, Mr. Speaker. Of course the student loan provisions will soon be in effect, and should help.

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

REPORTED DENIAL OF CLAIM OF FORMER AGENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question to the Minister of Justice which relates to the so-called blood bombing. In view of the radio story this morning that Mr. Cowlishaw is going to return to Ottawa to visit us if something is not done, and thinking of the welfare of the members concerned, I wonder whether the government is contemplating any investigation of Mr. Macdonald's claim to ascertain whether it has any validity.

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I may answer yes to that question at the moment.

Mr. Knowles: Be it on your own head if you don't.

Mr. Scott: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the very distinct success of the ombudsman in New Zealand in handling complaints of this kind, does the government not think it is about time we gave serious thought to creating some similar office in Canada, so we would not have to have these complaints brought to our attention quite so dramatically?

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, as an individual at least I am ready to answer in the affirmative.

PUBLIC SERVICE

PROTESTS RESPECTING RECENT SALARY INCREASES

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, despite the apparent closing of the door yesterday by the President of the Privy Council I would ask the Prime Minister whether he has received any representations from civil service staff associations asking for reconsideration of the matter of pay increases, in particular an interview with him, and whether an interview will be granted. Would he say at the same time that if such a meeting does take place and the arguments advanced are of a reasonable nature they will receive favourable consideration?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, an interview has been requested in messages I have received this morning, and that will be arranged. I am always anxious to give sympathetic consideration to reasonable arguments.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the difficulty which has arisen regarding the salaries of civil servants, may I ask the Prime Minister if the time is not appropriate for introducing legislation to provide for recognized collective bargaining rights for all public servants?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, as my hon. friend knows, the government has arranged

for an examination to be conducted by Mr. Arnold Heeney into the whole question of collective negotiation inside the civil service. That examination is being proceeded with, and we hope to have a report on the results before long.

CANADIAN FLAG

SUGGESTED POSTPONEMENT OF DEBATE TO CONSIDER OTHER BUSINESS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. M. Fisher (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Prime Minister whether he has had any indication from the various representations which have come to him that there is a substantial body of opinion among people who are neither pro red ensign nor pro maple leaf, requesting him to shelve the flag debate and get on with other more important matters.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have had a great many communications expressing the hope that a decision will be reached on the flag question shortly, and then we can get on with other important business.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Any excuse is a valid alibi, I suppose.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): May I ask a supplementary question in connection with the answer which the Prime Minister gave the hon. member for Port Arthur. I want to ask the Prime Minister, if it appears that the flag debate is going to continue for a prolonged period of time, whether it would not seem advisable to convene the committees of the house so that we might make some use of the time we are here? None of the committees are working at the moment. If we are going to be tied up for the next month on the flag debate, it would seem that the committees ought to be convened so we can get on with some useful business during this hiatus.

Mr. Pearson: I understand there is a meeting of one committee scheduled for next Tuesday. The hon. gentleman's suggestion that we might schedule meetings of other committees is one that certainly should be considered, so that while this debate is going on in its present form some useful work might be accomplished.

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): May I ask a supplementary question of the Prime Minister. Would it not be advisable to give at least two full days per week to a discussion of the main estimates, which have been so seriously neglected by the government this session?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, the work of the house will be announced to the house in due course from time to time. At the present moment nothing could be more important than to bring the present debate on the flag to a decision, this debate having already gone on for 15 days and no decision having been made on the subamendment or the amendment or the resolution.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): You asked everybody to talk.

Mr. Georges Valade (St. Mary): May I ask a supplementary question. Is the Prime Minister aware of the fact that when we discussed the bill of rights the Liberal party spent a month obstructing that project?

Mr. Pearson: I think the bill of rights debate was a very useful one. It only took a few days, and there was unanimous agreement. The bill was improved as a result of the amendments made by the opposition, and a decision was then taken. At the moment, Mr. Speaker, we have had 119 speeches on the flag and we are still on the subamendment to the amendment to the resolution.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): In view of the fact that the flag was not even mentioned in the speech from the throne, and it was not mentioned as one of the important matters the Prime Minister said required priority, does the Prime Minister not feel that some of these other things he has not got ready might be got ready and brought before the house so we would be able to do that which we should be carrying out, namely improving the economic condition of this country and doing something on behalf of trade, the statistics on which show a very serious situation?

Mr. Pearson: On this matter I confess I share the frustration of the hon. member for Three Rivers and other members of the house. I do agree that it would be desirable if we could come to a decision on this matter. For that purpose, if my friend would only accept the arrangement proposed by the leaders of all the other parties, then a reasonable time limit could be agreed upon and we would be able to proceed with these matters to which he refers.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Speaking of frustration, has the right hon. gentleman read the very significant remarks of the hon. member for

York-Humber that this flag which was brought before the house was never before the Liberal caucus, nobody knew about it and the Prime Minister just brought it in on his own?

Mr. Pearson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I read those interesting remarks, and I read them in conjunction with the remarks of the hon. member for Berthier-Maskinongé-Delanaudière.

AGRICULTURE

JOINT LOANS TO FARM GROUPS FOR EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

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 Minister of Agriculture. During his peregrinations in western Canada about a month ago he stated that on the 25th of July there would be introduced in the house a measure to provide loans to groups of farmers to enable them to purchase farm machinery in the most economical manner. I would ask him whether the legislation has been drafted and a resolution has been prepared, and is this not something that might well go on the order paper if indeed, as he said, it is all ready?

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, as I am just a barnyard boy sometimes I do not understand the right hon. gentleman's words.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Hays: We do have a piece of legislation that will soon be ready to go on the order paper.

An hon. Member: Soon?

Mr. Hays: The policy has been decided. We hope the matter will receive attention by the house and that we will get the legislation through soon, because the farmers need it.

Mr. Diefenbaker: So there will be no misunderstanding I say to the minister at once, put this resolution on the order paper and it will receive immediate attention, if he is so concerned about the farmers. Will you do that?

Mr. Hays: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that the right hon. gentleman has thrown a bit of a monkey wrench into this deal.

Mr. Diefenbaker: A monkey wrench into a non-existent resolution.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

TURKEYS—REIMPOSITION OF QUOTAS ON IMPORTS FROM U.S.

On the orders of the day:

Mr. C. O. Cooper (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. I have received many complaints from turkey raisers in Saskatchewan asking that the minister reimpose the quota system on turkeys coming in from the United States.

Mr. Winch: You have got protection now. What more do you want?

Mr. Cooper: My question is, would the minister consider reimposing the quota system on imports of turkeys from the United States?

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the turkey people are having a meeting, I think on September 14, at the Fort Garry in Winnipeg, and I shall be at that meeting to explain to these people why we do not feel we should impose these quotas at this time.

QUEBEC—EXTENSION OF ARDA PROGRAM TO SAGUENAY REGION

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Forestry in his capacity as minister responsible for the administration of ARDA. Has he given consideration to the request I made recently to the effect that he should recommend to his officials responsible for the administration of ARDA to choose the Saguenay-Lake St. John area for their next survey of farm problems?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): Mr. Speaker, this responsibility does not rest with the Minister of Forestry but with the minister of agriculture for the province of Quebec.

[*Text*]

REDISTRIBUTION

SUGGESTED ALL-PARTY CONFERENCE ON LENGTH OF DEBATE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Transport. Assuming that when we get to other important business one of the early items might be a resumption of the discussion of the legislation regarding redistribution, I wonder if the minister would

consider convening an informal conference of representatives of all parties, similar to the one he convened before we ever started the redistribution debate, to see if we might come to some understanding and avoid another protracted debate on that important subject.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): I think that is an excellent idea. If I had any indication at all that the representatives of the parties would be willing to come to such a conference with an open mind, with a view to overcoming the impasse we reached on that bill and which resulted in another protracted debate, I would be very happy to consider any reasonable proposal at all. I said so during the debate. If I had such an indication we would have such a meeting on Monday.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Nice co-operation again.

Mr. Pickersgill: I rise on a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The right hon. gentleman said there was nice co-operation between myself and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pickersgill: I only say, sir, I wish we could get the same co-operation from the right hon. gentleman.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same question of privilege. As the remark suggested there was knowledge on the part of the minister that I was going to raise that question, let it be quite clear that I told no one I was going to ask that question.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Naturally I accept the two denials, and I expected the same course would be followed on this as on so many other matters in which that fine spirit of co-operation has been shown at all times.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am having a little difficulty trying to get the names of hon. members who wish to ask questions, and time is running out. The hon. member I have next on my list is the hon. member for Quebec East.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

QUEBEC—PREFERENCE IN APPOINTING PERSONNEL OF TELEVISION STATION

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Robert Beaulé (Quebec East): Mr. Speaker, may I put a question to the Secretary of State?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Since the opening of the C.B.C. television station in Quebec city has been announced for next month, can the minister assure us that, in the hiring of the staff, their qualifications being equal, preference will be given to candidates from Quebec city and vicinity rather than to those from outside?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member is surely aware, that is the sole responsibility of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and I am convinced that, in carrying it out, the corporation will take into consideration the views expressed by the hon. member.

[*Text*]

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

INQUIRY AS TO ISSUE OF THREE MAPLE LEAF STAMP

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. A. Webb (Hastings-Frontenac): I should like to direct my question to the Postmaster General. Will the minister indicate whether the distribution of the three maple leaf postage stamp is part of a campaign to promote and publicize the tri-leaf flag design?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): I am rather surprised that this question was not asked months ago. The three maple leaf design was decided upon in or about the month of July last year, long before the question of the flag ever came up.

Mr. Webb: May I ask a supplementary question. Will the minister then undertake to see that ample stocks of Canadian stamps bearing the head of Queen Elizabeth are available at all times at post offices throughout Canada?

Mr. Nicholson: I gave that assurance at the time my estimates were before the committee. If the hon. member or any hon. member of this house can draw my attention to the fact that my direction is not being respected in any post office throughout the country, I will see to it that it is implemented.

Mr. Korchinski: Is the Postmaster General now considering a single maple leaf design?

USE OF MAILS FOR DISSEMINATION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION LITERATURE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. E. Walker (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Postmaster General. Is he prepared to take any action regarding the use of Canadian mails

for the dissemination of hate literature which originates in another country?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, when a question of a similar nature was asked by the hon. member for York Centre some months ago I asked members of the house, if they had envelopes or containers which showed the addresses from which this literature was sent, to forward same to me, and I indicated we were prepared to take action. It will be recalled that at that time we did close the two known postal office boxes that were in use in Canada.

I might also say that, as a result of the injection into the mail stream of a number of brochures and letters very similar to those which originated from the Toronto address earlier, which latter ones emanated from Winnipeg and B.C., I sought the advice of the Department of Justice, and in late July I issued an interim prohibitory order refusing the use of the Canadian mails to the particular organization involved. If hon. members have any other envelopes or containers that carry the address of this organization, which I believe is the national white American party, we would consider taking similar action.

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington South): As a supplementary question, would the minister give consideration to making it compulsory for the return address to appear on all such distribution of mail?

Mr. Nicholson: I know my officials have discussed this with the Department of Justice as a possible course of action. I do not know whether this is one move that can be implemented, but I shall inquire and inform the hon. member later.

TRADE

NON-PARTICIPATION BY CANADA IN GHANA FAIR

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce but in his absence, and in view of the fact that my question has a lot to do with the welfare of industry, maybe the Minister of Industry would care to answer it. Could the minister advise the house why Canada will not be an official exhibitor at the Ghana international trade fair next February, in view of the fact that some 31 other countries are going to participate?

[Mr. Walker.]

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): I am not aware of the answer to that question, Mr. Speaker, but I shall take it as notice.

THE MINISTRY

POSSIBLE CHANGES IN NATIONAL DEFENCE PORTFOLIO

On the orders of the day:

Mr. William Skoreyko (Edmonton East): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Prime Minister a question. Is the Prime Minister considering appointing the Associate Minister of National Defence to the national defence portfolio and, if this is the case, what will happen to the other minister? Will he be elevated to the other place?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the present minister is doing a remarkably good job—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pearson: —and I am sure he will welcome the continuing assistance of the associate minister in that job.

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, last week the Prime Minister indicated to the house that the Minister of National Defence spoke for the government on matters concerning personnel. I would like very much to know just what the duties of the Associate Minister of National Defence are, if they do not include speaking for the government on personnel matters?

Mr. Pearson: He has many duties. Indeed, he is much busier than his predecessor was in the previous government.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

TELEGRAMS DEMANDING RESIGNATION OF NORTHERN AFFAIRS MINISTER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Mr Speaker, in order to prove that co-operation is not a one way or two way street may I, on behalf of the right hon. Leader of the Opposition and myself, inform the house that the telegrams which he and I received this morning demanding our resignations from the House of Commons were not intended for him and me, but were copies of a telegram sent to the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources.

Mr. Simpson: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order. We started the question period at 2.25 and by virtue of the

recent standing order, temporary if you wish, the half hour period ended at 2.57. It is now just three o'clock.

CANADIAN FLAG

OFFICIAL ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW DESIGN

The house resumed, from Tuesday, August 25, consideration of the motion of Mr. Pearson:

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 the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Diefenbaker, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. More.

Mr. Jack A. Irvine (London): Mr. Speaker, in speaking at this time on the subamendment I think I would be remiss if I did not say a word or two in commendation of my colleagues for the many outstanding and patriotic addresses they have made in the house, and I think you will put up with me for a moment when I say many of us were so pleased last night that the hon. member for Huron made such an outstanding address. I believe he is the oldest member of the house in terms of age and the second oldest member of the house in terms of years of service.

I have no intention of speaking on the flag, but I do intend to speak on the subamendment which was moved by the hon. member for Regina City on August 13, and which is recorded at page 6806 of *Hansard* for that date. I think it would be only proper for us to refresh our minds by taking another look at the question he proposed at that time. The first one was, "Are you in favour of the Canadian red ensign?" The second was, "Are you in favour of the Canadian red ensign with changes made thereon to show the main heritage of both founding races?" The third was, "Are you in favour of the three maple leaf design?"

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Irvine: The fourth was "Are you in favour of a one maple leaf design?" I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, the action of hon. members on the other side in putting punctuation marks at the end of each of those sentences.

I think this proposal would give every Canadian an opportunity to exercise his freedom of choice, an opportunity to express his opinion as to what we should have by way of a national flag. It was my privilege to address the house on July 2, at which time I spoke at great length on the subject of the flag. As a result I have received many letters. I have a file here which any member who wishes may examine; it contains some 200 or 300 letters on this subject sent to me between the date of that address and today. These letters are not all from people with Anglo-Saxon names, though there are, of course, a large number which bear such names. There are also a great many letters from people whose names indicate a French background. Then again, a great many of the names suggest a background which is neither Anglo-Saxon nor French. For example, I have had letters from people with names such as Steve Marti, G. W. Snetsinger, Mike Hillcoff, J. Melkonian, Janet Schaef, A. C. Petrouski, Dr. H. C. Soltan and Zudy Martinovic. I could mention further names, but one which comes to my mind immediately, because it is a name which was borne by a man who rendered signal service to this house, is the name Aberhart. So these people do not all come from one national background.

Many of these letters are interesting. I do not intend to read them all, and I know hon. members will be happy about that. At the same time I must direct the attention of the house to some of them. I have letters from as far away as Manitoba. Many are from Quebec. There are some from New York state, some from Michigan and one from a correspondent in England. Among all these letters there is only one in support of the proposed new flag, and I am thankful to say it did not come from within my riding. As I say, one of these letters came from England, and I should like to quote a small portion of it:

I was shocked to read recently in one of the daily papers here in England, that Canada was to have a new flag. A few days ago, I received a letter with a strange stamp on it, but it was a Canadian stamp. The sender of the letter informed me that the design of the stamp was that of the proposed new Canadian flag, which, the writer thought, was to become legal the following week.

As one of your supporters I am writing to protest very strongly against the proposed new flag.

I have another letter which came to me as recently as yesterday. I should like to quote a portion of it because I think it is important and would make a contribution to this debate. It comes from the city of London under date of August 21, and it says:

I did want to say thank you for your recent copy of 'House of Commons Debates' with the particular reference to your part played in this tremendous issue of the national flag.

Canadian Flag

I want to express my appreciation of the way in which the Conservative party have fought this issue. I cannot help but feel very proud of all that has transpired upon the floor of the house, not unmindful of the many hours the honourable members must have spent in meetings, sittings, etc.

It has been a very grave and grim summer for all concerned, but little do we realize, so far from the actual scene of action, how wearying and, at times, discouraging, this all can be to the human mind and body.

Once again, my sincere thanks for a job well done. Whatever the outcome, whatever flag flies as our official national flag in the days to come, the Conservative party of Canada can well remember with honour this glorious summer of 1964.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Irvine: It is apparent that the words which have come from this House of Commons and gone out across the country are making an impression upon the people of this great nation of ours.

I should like to quote now from an article which was published in the London *Free Press* under date of May 23, 1964. It was written by Mr. Arthur R. Ford, who is editor emeritus of our paper in London. It is headed "Will New Flag Provide Unity?"

For my part I think it is a mistake nationally for a minority government to press this issue. Personally I think it will divide the country more than ever. I have a high regard for Mr. Pearson, for his achievements in his career as a Canadian diplomat. He has raised the status of Canada at the United Nations and in the international world.

Mr. Pearson, however, is asking a lot from Canadians of British or U.E. Loyalist stock to pull down the union jack, although most of us will accept it if it will put an end to the movement in Quebec for separatism, associate states and terrorism and bring about national unity, but I doubt whether the new flag or the new anthem will satisfy the Quebec extremists.

Most people in this part of Canada are prepared to go far, and to lean backwards, to meet fair and reasonable demands of French Canada. They earnestly want to join with them in building a greater Canada. They realize that the old Quebec is disappearing and that a new and modern Quebec is rising. The University of Western Ontario, a number of years ago, led the way by establishing a summer school at Trois Pistoles to give students of the university an opportunity, not only to learn French, but to understand French Canada. In recent years there has been a movement in the schools to broaden the use of French.

There are certain principles, however, which they are not prepard to surrender. They want a continuation of the connection with Great Britain, through a common membership in the commonwealth of nations. They want to retain the monarchy with the Queen of Great Britain also the Queen of Canada. They want a retention of the British parliamentary system of government, which stands for the possession of those precious freedoms which we have long cherished—the freedom of speech, the freedom of the press, the freedom of association, the freedom of religion and equal justice.

[Mr. Irvine.]

This is part of an article which was written by one of Canada's most outstanding writers, and I know it came directly from his heart.

Some time ago the Prime Minister said in this house, at the beginning of the flag debate, that everyone would have an opportunity to speak. In fact he urged that all members should get up and express themselves, and I believe it is the right and duty of every member to stand up and express himself on behalf of his constituents. This cannot be considered a filibuster. We received an invitation from the Prime Minister himself to stand up and speak on behalf of our constituents.

On May 25, in answer to a question asked by the hon. member for Peace River, we were given to understand that the debate would proceed without interruption and that every member would have a chance to speak. This can be seen by turning to page 3533 of *Hansard*. Now there is talk of limiting the debate to one week in which to decide something of great national importance whose results we shall have to live with for many years to come. As late as yesterday the Prime Minister made a statement in this chamber in answer to a question. He said:

I still think we should proceed along the course already indicated, and I do not like to think that there is total irreconcilability between positions.

But by his very words, Mr. Speaker, he did admit that there was division. These are some of the things to which I think we should be giving serious thought now. We know there is great division throughout this entire country, perhaps more division than we have ever had in our whole history.

I know the hon. member for Moose Jaw-Lake Centre referred last night to the article in the Toronto *Telegram* of August 22, 1964. He quoted one part of it. As a result of his quotation I went through this article, and I believe there are two or three more points that should be brought to the attention of this house and I hope ultimately to the attention of the people throughout this great country of which we are privileged to be citizens. This article goes on to say that the vote cannot be free. It says it is impossible for a vote to be free under these circumstances. Then the article says:

At this stage, with party lines hardened, it is difficult to conceive of a truly free vote.

Having shown, belatedly, a willingness to retreat from his earlier stubborn demands for the banner of his choice, he now should go one step further and measure public sentiment by plebiscite.

Perhaps Mr. Pearson fears the outcome of such a testing of public opinion. Letters and petitions

expressing determination to retain the ensign have been impressive.

There is no reason why this obstructive and divisive bill should not be shelved pending a reference to the people. There is no urgency. Most Canadians outside Quebec appear to be quite satisfied with the flag we have now. In Quebec, the matter is of little importance as there they fly the Laurentian flag with its white cross and fleurs-de-lis.

Until Mr. Pearson softens his stand, the opposition is justified in continuing a modified filibuster.

Regardless of what they may call it, they say they feel we are justified in the stand we have taken; and I think this is the general opinion of Canadians across this country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Irvine: This article continues:

As distasteful as such devices are in parliament, no other method seems practical in the face of Mr. Pearson's stubbornness.

The way out of the parliamentary impasse is clear; a plebiscite to end the long debate and to allow parliament to get on with more important legislation.

This is the way the people across this country of ours are feeling. I would admit that perhaps three or four weeks ago there was a slightly different feeling; but today, with the number of letters I am receiving in my office and the number of letters I know many other hon. members are receiving, the general idea is "Don't give up the ship. Keep fighting. You are doing a good job". I received word just the other day that the city of London has recently ordered its flag requirements for the next five years. The flag they ordered was the Canadian red ensign.

We could go on at great length, Mr. Speaker, to test the pulse of the people of Canada at the present moment. In the Ottawa *Citizen* of August 22, last Saturday, there appeared an article on the subject of the flag. I would like to quote one small paragraph that says:

And if the Prime Minister is retreating from the three-leaf flag, the three-leaf flag would appear to have little chance of ever being run up the parliamentary flagpole.

What weakened Mr. Pearson's position?

Further down it says this:

The red ensign is now stronger than ever.

If not above the battle, it at least flew over the battlefield—and its position seems considerably stronger at summer's end than it was at the beginning.

Mr. Pearson is ready to throw the design of a new flag back into committee—a far cry from hopes that it would be flying by July 1, or for the royal visit in October.

Then we have the Ottawa *Journal* of August 20, last Thursday. I could go on at great length with these quotations, Mr. Speaker. Many quotations have been given to the house, but these quotations have not been referred to. In this article appearing in the Ottawa *Journal* it says—and this shows the difficulty that is confronting the Liberal front benchers—

When the caucus met Tuesday, the Prime Minister missed the assault by the backbench on the cabinet because he was chairing that conclave of the party leaders seeking the elusive negotiated peace in the flag war.

There is an indication that the apple in the bottom of the barrel has gone bad; and we know what happens to the whole barrel as the result of something like that. I know many hon. members of this house have read these articles, and some hon. members on the other side of the house must be very much concerned about this whole question. The feeling is there, and that feeling is growing day by day. And we talk about a free vote. How could there possibly be a free vote? Many hon. members on the other side of the house have already declared their intentions; they have gone to the point where they just cannot go back. In some cases they have told their constituents how they stand. I know, from speaking with some of them personally, that they would like to make an about face now, but how can they do it?

What about the Secretary of State for External Affairs? I think he has passed the point of no return. A recent public opinion poll carried on in Windsor indicated a majority support for the red ensign. What will the minister do now? What is going to happen to him? It is not that I am too concerned personally, but as a minister he may be bound to the Pearson pennant alliance to a point from which he cannot retreat. Which way will he jump? We know he is pretty adept at jumping, but we do not know which way he is going to jump. I'll bet he is somewhat concerned at the moment.

Some of the other things that have come out in the way of propaganda sometimes make one wonder why we do not have a minister of propaganda in this house. They talk about the cost of keeping the house open. I believe that recently—I may be wrong, and if I am I stand to be corrected—the secretarial staff were told they would be employed throughout any recess we might have. Every member gets his pay whether he is here or not. What is the expense of keeping this house open? We have many visitors here in the summer; we have to keep it open for them to come in. Perhaps there is the cost of printing *Hansard, Votes and Proceedings* and things of that type. But we have no

business before the house at the present time, and the time we are now taking, as good Canadians is for the purpose of standing up in this house and fighting for these things we think are right. We are using our holiday time, or our recess time, for that purpose.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Irvine: It is interesting to hear the questions across the floor of this house. I am not too sure that the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition may not be perhaps a little closer to a compromise than we all expect. Wouldn't it be nice if, as Canadians, we could just sit down together and work this thing out and come to a solution that would be satisfactory to everybody? But we cannot do it that way. The only recourse we have is a plebiscite.

I say these things, Mr. Speaker, as a member seeking only to further unity, national unity. It is my hope that they will come together and in some way establish an all-party committee which would select a flag which would be of truly non-partisan design.

The subject which is before us is the subamendment. It is my opinion that we should have a plebiscite, Mr. Speaker. However, let me go a little further and ask: Should we have a plebiscite now? To this question I would answer no. I would say, let us file away until the next election, which may not be too far off, this whole contentious issue, which is upsetting the country and causing so much division among the people. Then at that time let us have a plebiscite on this matter. If we were to have a plebiscite now we would have to put the whole of our election machinery into action. Through enumerators, we would have to prepare voters lists and employ all those people and services which are necessary in order to hold a plebiscite. This would cost just about as much as a general election and would be a waste of $15 million. There is no reason why this matter cannot be filed away and left aside until such time as we have an election. Then we could have the plebiscite, whether it be in November or March or a year hence. In the meantime let us get together as good Canadians should, and make sure that this parliament works in the best interests of the people in the Dominion of Canada. In this way we can kill two birds with one stone as well as save ourselves some money.

By approaching the subject in this way we will provide three opportunities to the people of Canada. First of all, we will give them a chance to simmer down and think about the matter a little less passionately than they are thinking about it at the moment. It would give them an opportunity to think clearly. The people are mad, and they are mad because they may be losing their red ensign. They are mad about that, and the great waves of protest are growing daily. We are not afraid of having a plebiscite because we know what the answer will be.

In addition, we will save $15 million. I think it was the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) who said "What's a hundred million?", and we know he was being facetious. But $15 million is a lot of money, and we should have it if we can.

The most important thing we shall be giving the people is this. We will be giving them the opportunity of exercising their freedom of choice. We cannot let down now. We must carry on. The only alternative for us if we bow down and accept the flag which has been presented by one person is, in essence, to let the people of the country down and give in to what is almost a virtual dictatorship.

Mr. William Skoreyko (Edmonton East): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to participate in this debate for the second time. I do so only because the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp), for one, made in my opinion a rather provocative speech and I thought it only appropriate to answer him today. Second, the subamendment before us should be given serious consideration by the government. It is quite obvious that the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) is not interested in considering anything but the original or initial resolution, but it is with the hope that he will reconsider the matter that I take part once more in this debate. I also want to deal with some of the recommendations made by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Hamilton) whose speech a few days ago could well be considered one of the better ones delivered in this house for a long time.

I might just say that I am very interested to see the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Hays), a fellow Albertan from the city of Calgary, in his seat today. I welcome him back. It is of course my hope that he will participate in this debate during the course of this afternoon because I know how some of the people of Calgary feel about this question. I should also like to know how the minister himself feels. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it appears at the moment as if our country is getting along on its own in spite of parliament rather than because of it. Again I plead with the Prime Minister to give this matter serious consideration, or if you like reconsideration.

When one looks at the subamendment introduced by the hon. member for Regina City (Mr. More) he finds it poses four questions, namely: Are you in favour of the Canadian red ensign? Are you in favour of the Canadian red ensign modified? Are you in favour of the three maple leaves design? Are you in favour of a one maple leaf design? What possible objection could the Prime Minister see to a plebiscite on this question during some future election? What he would in fact be doing is allowing those people, and there are many of them, who have not communicated with their members of parliament either by petition or letter or telephone, and who feel strongly with respect to the questions involved in the subamendment, to express their viewpoints on the subject. What is more fair, Mr. Speaker, than to give these people the opportunity to mark an X against the appropriate question during an election? It would then give the red ensigners the opportunity to express their point of view. It would give those who feel strongly about the red ensign but would be quite willing to accept a slight modification to express their point of view. Then again it would allow those who are in favour of either one of the two other designs to express their point of view as well. What could be more fair than that, Mr. Speaker? I do not understand the Prime Minister's reticence with regard to action on this matter.

The hon. member for Qu'Appelle suggested, as an alternative: Why not refer the matter to a parliamentary committee? Although I think this would be my second preference, I see nothing wrong with turning the question over to a parliamentary committee composed of an equal number of members from the two largest parties in the House of Commons, and members from the other parties in the house.

I suggest there are approximately 3,500 designs in the possession of the government at the moment. Surely the committee could study these designs, select half a dozen and then unanimously decide on one design out of the half dozen they have chosen from the 3,500. If it is insisted that a time limit should be imposed on the committee, then I say that to my mind this is not workable and will not work. I think the committee should be instructed to sit for a given number of days, and it might be a year or two years before a final report is received by the house. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Hays) laughs. I think this is a very reasonable alternative to what the Prime Minister has proposed. Hon. members know what his proposal is. He proposes to shove it down people's throats.

Mr. Godin: Why not ten years?

Mr. Skoreyko: I did not hear the comment.

Mr. Godin: Why not ten years?

Mr. Skoreyko: I see nothing wrong with ten years if that is how long it takes the committee to decide. At least there would be one consolation. The people of Canada would be united when a final decision was made. You will not unite this country by forcing a flag down the throats of the Canadian people.

Let us talk about the resolution. I have more regard for relevancy than the Minister of Trade and Commerce had when he spoke on this subject, and it is my hope that when the Minister of Agriculture rises to participate in the debate he will also be relevant. Since the introduction of the resolution letters have been written to members of parliament including the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker), the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) and all the cabinet ministers. Polls have been conducted by various groups, organizations and newspapers. Petitions have been signed with thousands of signatures on them. Some have been sent to the Prime Minister and some to the respective members of parliament. On many occasions inside and outside the House of Commons speeches have been made on the merits, pros and cons of a flag.

I want to deal with some of the polls that have been conducted throughout the country since the resolution was introduced. I might point out, Mr. Speaker, and you will probably find it as interesting as I do, that in one recent survey conducted by a well known international magazine the city of Edmonton had the greatest percentage per 1,000 telephone calls in support of the red ensign of any city in Canada. Edmonton is a cosmopolitan city like Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver, and the suggestion that certain ethnic groups, people of certain racial backgrounds, support or do not support either of the flag proposals before the house is wrong. People generally in the city of Edmonton, and I know this applies to Calgary also, are predominantly red ensign supporters.

I refer now to a survey that was conducted by the Edmonton *Journal* early in May of this year. The *Journal* polled residents of the city of Edmonton and district on whether or not they were in favour of the red ensign and after about a week these were the results. A total of 1,636 ballots were cast in favour of the red ensign compared with 862 in favour of a distinctive Canadian flag, and

a large number of people simply said it did not matter to them at all.

Mr. Godin: Would the hon. member give us the question that was asked?

Mr. Skoreyko: I will be very glad to deal with that.

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Mr. Skoreyko: I am still on my feet, Mr. Speaker. For the benefit of the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Godin) I am trying to find the question that was asked in the poll but I do not seem to have it in front of me at the moment.

Mr. Godin: I asked that question because from the remarks of the hon. member I understood that the question was, "Are you in favour of the red ensign". In my opinion that question alone would not elicit the type of answer that would give a proper indication of the opinion of the people.

Mr. Skoreyko: I have just arranged to have my office called—

Mr. Godin: Mr. Speaker, it is not—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Edmonton East has the floor.

Mr. Skoreyko: I know that the hon. member for Nickel Belt is jealous. He wants to support the Prime Minister whether he is right or wrong, and I do not blame him for inquiring—

Mr. Godin: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I do not think any member should refer to another member of the house as doing something, right or wrong, on the basis of partiality. I have had occasion to make a speech in the house on this matter—

Mr. Skoreyko: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Nickel Belt is rising on a question of privilege and perhaps the hon. member for Edmonton East will give him an opportunity to state his point.

Mr. Godin: Mr. Speaker, I was drawing the attention of the house to the fact that no member of parliament should indicate that another member is doing something on the basis of partiality, which was the intent of the remarks of the hon. member. I had occasion to make a speech in the house on the matter of the flag and it is unfortunate that the hon. member was not present to hear it.

Mr. Skoreyko: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has muddied up his question of privilege so that now no one understands it. I did not accuse the hon. and learned gentleman of being right or wrong with respect to the resolution. I said he was supporting the Prime Minister and he did not care whether the Prime Minister was right or wrong. I did not accuse the hon. member of doing anything—

Mr. Godin: On the question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I insist that the remarks of the hon. member indicate that some members of this house—it happens to be me on this occasion—are doing something on the basis of partiality. The hon. member says that no matter if the Prime Minister is right or wrong I will support him. I support the Prime Minister because what he has done is good for Canada.

Mr. Skoreyko: Mr. Speaker, this is precisely—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I can understand the feelings of the hon. member for Nickel Belt but I really do not think it is unparliamentary to suggest that an hon. member is either voting or speaking because of partiality. I would suspect that many speeches made in the house are inspired by that feeling. I do not really think the hon. member has said anything up to now that is unparliamentary and should be withdrawn.

Mr. Skoreyko: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I feel very badly that the hon. member should consider my remarks offensive. I understand his blind desire to defend the Prime Minister's actions, whether he is right or wrong. I say that he is wrong and I intend to prove that before I conclude my remarks, if the hon. member will permit me to continue.

As I pointed out, the Edmonton *Journal* conducted a survey by ballot, and the ballots will be delivered to my desk in a few minutes, I hope. The readers were asked to sign their ballots as evidence of their good faith, but the names would not be recorded on the ballots themselves, which would go forward to a distant point for tabulating. The results would be published as the reports were compiled. I have already put some of the reports on the record, Mr. Speaker. I was more than amazed that the city of Edmonton would respond so overwhelmingly in support of the ensign.

Mr. Moreau: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Skoreyko: I would grant the hon. member that courtesy if he would promise me he would get up and make a speech on the

flag issue after I have listened to his question.

Mr. Godin: It seems to me it is the privilege of this house, if an hon. member purports to give evidence which will convince any hon. member of this house of one thing or another, to ask the hon. member to inform the house properly of the facts behind the evidence he is producing. This is what hon. members are now asking. We should have the privilege of knowing the facts behind the evidence which he is producing.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I do not believe the point of order or question of privilege is well taken. It seems to me this is a question of debate. If the hon. member feels the arguments advanced by the hon. member for Edmonton East cannot be substantiated, he can say so in reply to the speech made by the hon. member.

Mr. MacInnis: I rise on a question of privilege. I would call Your Honour's attention to the wording of the statement on the prior question of privilege. The hon. member used the words, "if the member has any evidence to convince any member in this chamber". The hon. member has evidence that will convince me and many members on this side, therefore his statement in reference to any member does not hold water and there is no question of privilege.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We cannot permit a debate on the point.

Mr. Skoreyko: As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, the results of the survey taken by the Edmonton *Journal* were indeed impressive. A month or two after the original survey in May, another survey was taken. By this time the article to which I am referring, dated June 26, had been written. It is entitled "Two out of three favour red ensign" and deals with the question on a national basis, with the exception of the province of Quebec. I should like to read one paragraph from this news article because I think hon. members from the city of Toronto would find it very interesting indeed. Before I do, I may say that the city of Edmonton survey shows that two of three *Journal* readers favour the red ensign as Canada's national flag. Toronto has plumped most heavily for the ensign, with *Telegram* readers casting 7,865 ballots for it and 1,839 for the Pearson flag. I am just wondering how the members from the city of Toronto, 18 of them in all, feel when they sit on their hands in the House of Commons without expressing a point of view.

An hon. Member: One did.

Mr. Skoreyko: Yes, and I dare say hon. members across the house wish he had never opened his mouth.

There is another comment in an Ottawa report by Patrick Nicholson dated August 21, a few days ago. I am still dealing with the poll that was started originally in the city of Edmonton by the Edmonton *Journal*. This article says:

> It quickly became obvious that "Mike's maple" had attracted overwhelming support among French Canadians, while the lukewarm enthusiasm for it elsewhere was gravely tempered by the resentment, as some M.P.'s expressed it, that this was "yet another concession to French Canada".

I want to deal with the aspect of this remark because, as a political party, we have been accused of using the words "massive concessions". I want to assure you that of all the speeches I have read, one man used those words and used them deliberately, and that was the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp).

I continue to quote from the article:

> The lopsidedness of cross-Canada sentiment on the flag issue has just been revealed by a nation-wide poll, whose sensational results were given front page prominence in Ottawa's thoughtful French language newspaper, *Le Droit*.
>
> This poll discovered that a majority of Canadians, in every province except Quebec, prefer the Canadian ensign to the maple leaf design. It also ascertained that about one third of all Canadians would prefer some other flag, such as the union jack or another design, or were ignorant or indifferent about the whole issue.

The hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Godin) looks at me as though he were familiar with the article and wished me to quote another paragraph. If he asks me to do so, I will.

Mr. Godin: I would prefer to hear your views.

Mr. Skoreyko: Why will the Prime Minister not consider the modification of the red ensign? Why will he not consider an alternative? I suppose, to be fair, one ought to give him the benefit of the doubt. However, I must ask this pertinent question—

Mr. Moreau: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I have been listening with a great deal of attention to the hon. member's remarks and I have not raised a point of order dealing with the relevance of his remarks to the subamendment. However, in view of the fact the hon. member has spoken on the resolution, I feel his remarks referring to some loaded newspaper poll are not relevant to the subamendment and I would ask Your

Honour to bring him to the point now before the house.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Edmonton East indicated at the start of his speech he intended to be relevant to the subamendment. He did say that his remarks were to be relevant to the plebiscite question. I assume that the quotation he just read a moment ago will make some reference to the question of the plebiscite and the subamendment.

Mr. Skoreyko: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. We seem to be having a number of interruptions in the house this afternoon, with foghorns, and the hon. member down in the corner who is determined I am not going to be able to send this speech out to my constituents for their benefit.

I said earlier that I wanted to know why the Prime Minister would not consider a modification of the red ensign, or an alternative design? I want to ask a number of questions in this regard. He has refused to consider a plebiscite. He has given what amounts to a refusal to consider the feasibility of a committee to study the flag question, and by refusal I mean he has insisted that a time limit must be imposed on hon. members if and when the committee reports to the house.

I need not remind you, Mr. Speaker, that over the years the changes in the rules of the house have been of a nature such as to tend to curtail the amount of time a private member has to express his opinion, and I find most objectionable any suggestion that there should be further curtailment of the time of a private member. I can understand the hon. member sitting in the back row who has contributed very little, if anything, to this debate, and he has not suggested that he will. I am looking forward to reading his remarks when he makes them.

Mr. Moreau: On a point of privilege, I would like to inform the house that I intend to speak on the main resolution, if we ever get back to it.

Mr. Skoreyko: That is not a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, but it is a neat trick if he can get away with it—get back to the resolution so that the government has a free hand.

Mr. Godin: Let us vote on the amendment if you want to hear him.

Mr. Skoreyko: The hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Godin) was complaining about this being my second contribution to the debate, but I have not yet heard his contribution.

Mr. Godin: On a point of privilege, I made no reference, but the unfortunate position is that his second contribution is no better than his first.

Mr. Skoreyko: Neither are his interruptions. These are the four questions I want to ask the Prime Minister: Is he not proud of the union jack? Is this why he wants to get rid of the red ensign, because it has a small union jack in the corner? Is he not proud of it? If he is not, why is he not? The state of Hawaii has the union jack on its flag. The people there are very proud of it and they refuse to accept any other design, despite the fact that there is not any country in the world more proud of its flag than the United States, or any part of the United States.

How can the Prime Minister justify shoving down the throats of Canadians a flag that does not have a cross on it? These are the three questions I would like to ask the Prime Minister. I talked a moment ago about the pride which Hawaii has in its flag, and in that connection here is an interesting clipping from the Edmonton *Journal*:

> Thousands of Albertans who have visited Hawaii must have seen widely displayed there a flag incorporating the union jack.
>
> It is, of course, the state flag of Hawaii: a union jack in the upper corner next to the staff and eight vertical stripes, three white, three red and two blue.

Mr. Moreau: What about the subamendment?

An hon. Member: Why the hell don't you get up and speak?

Mr. Skoreyko: I hear a chirp from the backwoods. I cannot identify the member because he will not stand. He has no guts. The article goes on to say:

> No nation treats its flag with more reverence than does the United States, and no state is prouder to be part of the U.S. than is Hawaii. Nevertheless, the incorpration of the union jack in the state flag of this "melting pot" of nationalities suggests that Hawaii does not wish to forget the British role in its history.

What was that British role in Hawaii's history? Captain James Cook, the English navigator, discovered the islands in 1778, and if it had not been for the attitude of the British parliament Hawaii would still be a colony or a holding of the British empire. The article goes on to say:

> It would be preposterous to charge that Prime Minister Pearson is not proud of the union jack.

I posed that question a moment ago, but I had very little or no response.

> But has he been unduly influenced by men who irrationally and perversely oppose the incorporation of the union jack in Canada's national flag? Certainly there is no national symbol anywhere that can rightfully evoke greater pride and reverence.
>
> Will the day come when the shortest trip Albertans can take to see the union jack proudly waving in the breeze will be Hawaii?

I ask the Prime Minister, what are his reasons? Is it that as a Britisher himself he dislikes the union jack? Why doesn't the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Hays) get up and answer?

Mr. Godin: On a point of order, so that the house may understand the meaning of the remarks of the hon. member would he indicate is he suggesting—

Mr. Skoreyko: I have not yielded the floor.

Mr. Godin: —that this parliament should adopt the flag of Hawaii?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. Is the hon. gentleman rising to ask a question or on a point of order?

Mr. Godin: On a point of order. So that the house be properly informed I would like the hon. member to indicate if he wishes this parliament to adopt the flag of Hawaii?

Mr. MacInnis: On a point of order, the hon. member rose and interrupted the speaker on what he said was a question, and the Chair sat and allowed him to proceed with his remarks, and then suggested the hon. member was rising on a point of order and gave him recognition. It is time he was put in order when he gets up.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): I did not at first hear the remarks made by the hon. gentleman. If he rose and posed his question to the hon. member who was speaking, without the consent of that member, then he was out of order.

Mr. MacInnis: Then why wasn't he ruled out?

Mr. Skoreyko: Mr. Speaker, you have been more than generous in the half hour I have been on my feet. I have been trying to explain to the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Godin), and in very plain common language, what it is I am talking about, and he does not understand. I said I was posing four questions to the Prime Minister. Is he not proud of the union jack? Why should he be ashamed of it? Can he justify stuffing down the throats of Canadians a flag that does not have a cross on it?

In talking about the true meaning of the union jack to people of British ancestry, who have been connected with it for generations, I want to make brief reference to a newspaper article which is headed, "That Leafy Flag Repudiates the Cross," and I shall quote a few short paragraphs from it.

The article is by Frank Chubb, minister of St. Stephen's United church, Edmonton, and I think the quotation will be very relevant indeed. I am quoting it for the benefit of the hon. member who spent the last half hour interrupting me and who has finally left the chamber.

> It would be hard to conceive of a greater affront to us as a Christian nation than that of being informed arbitrarily that the cross must be removed from our flag.

I suggest this is precisely what is happening now as a result of an action taken arbitrarily without consultation either in caucus or in cabinet. As I pointed out in the course of my last speech, the article by Val Sears obviously had some significance because of the objections which were raised. This flag design was born over a bottle of scotch and soda. Now I can understand why they want to leave the cross out of it. The article goes on to say:

> If it symbolizes anything, the flag represents what the nation stands for. Has the idea of sacrificing for the good of others now become so unpalatable to us as a people that the cross must come out of our flag?
>
> If so, the prospects for our future as a nation have reached an all time low.

These are the views of a minister of an influential religious body in Canada. May I say, for the benefit of hon. members opposite, that I do not intend to quote at length. I just want to put on record one other passage from this article. This is what the writer says about the significance of the cross:

> We Canadians had preserved this rich heritage in the corner of the red ensign, the flag adopted by the Canadian government and people in 1945.
>
> Now Mr. Pearson says it must go.
>
> He seems to believe that three leaves off an eastern Canadian tree are more than adequate as a substitute for the three great crosses on our flag.
>
> Along with the crosses must go the coat of arms we requested from His Majesty King George V a scant 43 years ago.
>
> What a tribute to infidelity and fickleness.
>
> Certainly it is time for Canada to take on individuality and responsibility as a nation, but must a child disown its parents in order to achieve healthy maturity?
>
> I should think that the opposite is the case!
>
> The Canadian coat of arms on the red ensign traces our heritage back to 1,100 years before the

birth of Christ. A Canadian worth his salt should be able to feel a bit of a thrill as he sees outlined against the sky these symbols of the glory from which he has sprung.

When someone pretending to "lead" the people of Canada suggests that we repudiate the cross and reject our heritage, when all he can offer in return is a handful of leaves, the time is ripe not merely for dissent, but for revolution.

These are strong words. These are strong feelings expressed by a man of the faith.

I now wish to deal for a few moments with a speech which was made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp). I do not want you to remind me about relevancy, Mr. Speaker, because I intend to be as relevant as the man to whom I am making reference at the moment, and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that if the Minister of Trade and Commerce was not as politically blind and partisan, with the attitude of a bureaucrat—

An hon. Member: Oh.

Mr. Skoreyko: He did, you must agree, refuse to fulfil his responsibilities as a deputy minister because of political partisanship. He resigned not only because he could not get along with his staff but because his staff did not particularly care for him. The only way in which he could vindicate his honour was to get elected to this parliament where he could again display his bureaucratic arrogance. But he is not going to get away with it.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce made a speech to this house on the sub-amendment and his total disregard for relevancy only indicated to me that he is completely ignorant of the moral, political, cultural and historic aspects of the question involved. He showed no concern about any of these aspects. His concern was merely: How best do I advance the Liberal party?

Mr. Dupuis: Out of order completely.

An hon. Member: What, the Liberal party?

Mr. Skoreyko: The Minister of Trade and Commerce said that while Quebec Conservatives sat on their hands—or, rather, I will quote from the article before me. It says:

While Quebec Conservatives sat on their hands, Mr. Sharp asked the opposition for the source of Mr. Diefenbaker's idea to modify the red ensign by the inclusion of a fleur-de-lis. He called it "a clumsy and gratuitous piece of appeasement—a bone thrown out to a troublesome minority."

These are his own words. Neither the Conservative party in this house nor any member of that party has ever used in reference to the French speaking Canadians of this country, the words "troublesome minority". The words were uttered by the Minister of Trade and Commerce and they are disgusting for a minister of the crown to use with that bureaucratic attitude of his.

As I was going through some of the interesting clippings I have in my possession I noticed another article bringing to the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce the fact that he would not be able to get away with this partisan political attitude of his. This newspaper article reminds him that the arrogance of the Liberals helped to defeat them in 1957. Mr. Sharp, it says, revealed that it is one of the best Conservative assets today. How right he is.

In conclusion, I want to deal with one or two other aspects of this subject. I want to deal with the question of copyright as it affects the new flag. If the Prime Minister were to agree to a referendum, would parliament have the right to turn this matter over to the returning officers and ask them to include this design on the ballot during an election before the copyright has been cleared? I ask this because there was an article which appeared in the press very recently which I found most interesting, although I do not agree with some of the views which were expressed. The writer, Mr. Charles Lynch, said:

One of the unresolved problems confronting the government over the maple leaf flag is getting the design copyrighted.

When Prime Minister Pearson sent to the patent and copyright division here last week to find how many maple leaf copyrights there were he was told that 327 commercial firms hold a copyright on the maple leaf and 24 others have a copyright on three leaves.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that the course of action that would have to be taken by the federal government would be tantamount to the expropriation of a copyright. If this were the course of action taken in fact, I suppose that attitude on the part of the government would be no different from the attitude of the government in any "red" country, if you like.

It is not too many months ago, sir, that I read an article dealing with brand names and copyrights and how the cancellation of these copyrights affects business. My wife probably buys the majority of her meats and meat products from Canada Packers under the "Maple Leaf" label, but I am wondering if she could tell me who manufactures that particular brand. This was the concern of the advertising people, that literally thousands of women buy, not only food, not only

clothing but all sorts of household commodities daily and identify the product by the copyrighted name. The minister is looking at me; I see that he agrees with me wholeheartedly. What, then, happens to Canada Packers copyright; a name they have maintained with a degree of dignity for years and years—"Canada Packers Maple Leaf" products?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. I must interrupt the hon. gentleman to tell him that the time allotted to him has expired.

Some hon. Members: That's enough.

Mr. Skoreyko: If I may rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am sure there would be no objection to allowing me to continue.

Some hon. Members: Oh, yes there is.

Mr. Skoreyko: I had prepared notes sufficient for the alloted time. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, with due deference, that had it not been for the interjections of the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Godin) and a number of others, I would have had adequate time to complete my remarks.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): I recognize the objection which the hon. member raises, but I am sure he will recognize that if he accepts a question, he accepts the question on his own time. On the other hand, if he is interrupted a number of times during his remarks, some allowance should be made for that time. The hon. gentleman's time was up eight minutes ago and I have given him that extra time because I was advised by the Deputy Speaker when I came to the chair that a number of interruptions had been made. I believe I have made a fair allowance for the interruptions which were made during the hon. member's remarks.

Mr. Churchill: I am raising a point of order with regard to your statement, Mr. Speaker, that a member accepting a question accepts it on his own time. We will have to be protected by Mr. Speaker in this regard, because yesterday I did not accept questions from the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson), but he persisted in making a statement and was permitted to do so. So if we are to have questions accepted and taken out of our time for speaking, we will require the protection of the Chair with regard to interruptions.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): I am sure the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill), who is as well or better acquainted with the rules than I am, will agree that if a question is asked of an hon. member who is making a speech, he has the right to accept or reject the question. I would say to the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre that my own opinion in this regard is that if any hon. member wishes to ask a question of a member who is speaking, the member who is speaking has the right to accept or reject that question. I feel that no question should be asked until the member speaking has given his consent or otherwise. The hon. member for St. James (Mr. Rinfret).

[*Translation*]

Mr. Maurice Rinfret (St. James): Mr. Speaker, since mid—

[*Text*]

Mr. Nasserden: On the point of order that was raised, Mr. Speaker, I think it is also the accepted practice that a member should ask his question after the member who has the floor has completed his remarks; and this practice has not been observed by members on the other side of the house.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dupuis: Mr. Speaker, as regards the point of order, I should like to remind the hon. member who has just spoken that should his suggestion not to allow any member to direct questions to the member who is speaking be applied, his own leader would never be able to speak in this house, as he is always asking questions of other members right in the middle of a debate.

[*Text*]

Mr. Simpson: Whom did you get that from—Pick?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. I think it is the general practice of the house when a member is speaking for another member to ask a question; but it is still up to the member who is speaking to decide whether he will or will not accept the question. If the member who is speaking decides he is not going to accept the question, the member seeking to ask the question has no right to persist. The hon. member for St. James.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rinfret: This house has been discussing since the middle of June the resolution introduced by the government, for the adoption of a distinctive Canadian flag.

As early as January 27, 1960, when he was leader of the opposition, the right hon. Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Pearson) stated clearly the position of the Liberal party on this flag question. At that time, he proposed

to the then Conservative government to put before parliament legislation which, and I quote:

—if it were adopted by the representatives of the people, would settle the issue of our national flag; parliament would then agree to adopt a distinctive flag which, unlike the red ensign to which parliament has never given official recognition, could not be mistaken for the flag of the United Kingdom or some colonies and could be easily identified as the Canadian flag.

Is it not consistent that now that he has become the leader of the Canadian government, the right hon. Prime Minister should propose a resolution in order to give Canada a distinctive national flag?

Like many other members, the right hon. Prime Minister received a number of letters from people complaining about measures that might be taken to replace the red ensign. The Prime Minister answered to those bona fide correspondents that he wanted to assure them of his unqualified respect for the union jack and the red ensign and for all they represent of our history and traditions as symbols of freedom and democracy. Nevertheless, it is time that Canada should be given a distinctive flag which would have the top position on the mast.

Canada has been waiting for a flag long enough. I am both happy and proud to see that the government has now seen fit to take steps in that direction. Our confederation will soon be a hundred years old. Discussions on the flag have been going on for years, right from the very beginning of our confederation, and until now it has always seemed that no agreement was possible. Will any further delay in finally adopting a national flag make for better understanding?

With the coming of the centennial and the world fair, there are other reasons besides the basic ones for adopting a distinctive flag now. There is the matter of convenience which should not be minimized.

Indeed, it is inconceivable that this country could welcome millions of visitors to those great events without being able to fly a flag unmistakably its own.

Since every country has its flag, why should Canada be an exception? The flag is actually a factor of national unity, in peacetime as well as in wartime. If other proposed flags are controversial, it is all the more necessary to cast them aside and start anew with a new emblem.

Now, the other flags mentioned, which were not approved officially but only tolerated, give rise to controversy. Therefore, they should be discarded as distinctive flags. As a country,

Canada takes part in all important international conferences. It is a middle power, but with bright prospects for future development in every respect. And such a country would be without a distinctive flag? You will admit that this is paradoxical.

Former generations were cautious on this subject. They did not jeopardize the future. The government is now convinced that Canada should have its own flag and it gives praise to the previous leaders who, in their wisdom, refrained from tying its hands in this connection.

The time has come for Canada to choose a permanent distinctive flag that will be kept by future generations since it will have been given a "clear" and official status.

All the present differences will be forgotten if this house puts aside narrow considerations and sectional interests to take the proper decision which is quite simple, that of giving the country an emblem which will be respected both at home and abroad, an emblem that will confirm the good reputation our country enjoys throughout the world, as travellers back from Europe, Asia and Africa can testify.

It has been said that the flag issue was liable to create emotional rather than rational reactions. Mr. Speaker, if the flag issue can give rise to purely emotional reactions, it can also be objectively dealt with as any other problem. It is up to us, as members of parliament, to be rational. Now, to give the country a distinctive flag for reasons of convenience, especially to consolidate unity among Canadians, is not an emotional but a rational issue.

Regardless of the emblem selected, there will undoubtedly be few but vocal reactionaries and disgruntled people. It is not possible to satisfy everybody. Considering the information gathered by the members of the house as a whole and after thinking the matter over and listening to a debate which has been going on for several weeks, I am firmly convinced that the people of the ten provinces want a distinctive flag.

I think that an autonomous country such as Canada has been since the Statute of Westminster has to adopt a flag whose design will not be reminiscent of any other country. Why should the country's emblem include reminders of Canada's ties with England and not with France? On the other hand, if we were to adopt a flag representing the two former hegemonies, it would be necessary to load the flag with complicated symbols and it would still not satisfy anyone. It is better to eliminate the symbols recalling France or

England and thus not only prevent differences of opinion from continuing unabated but also prevent the new flag from becoming unacceptable to new Canadians who make up a large percentage of our population.

Thus we would have a common flag for the whole population, a flag which would not perpetuate the old quarrels we want to forget, which is a great advantage. The inclusion of symbols representing the motherlands would only feed old grudges. The adoption of a distinctive flag seems to be the only sound way to put an end to useless discussions on that issue.

The three maple leaves, the central element of the proposed flag, seem a logical choice since they represent Canada. Many pages of our literature, in both French and English, are devoted to the maple leaf. They contain many references to the maple tree which is quite representative of our country not because it is exclusive to Canada but because, due to its profusion and beauty, its praises have been sung by Canadian poets and lyrics writers.

Hon. members should not prolong this debate unnecessarily by lengthy discussions of details. That is why I prefer to stick with a distinctive flag containing three maple leaves rather than risk embroiling matters and putting off the selection of a distinctive flag indefinitely.

The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra said in the house, on June 30 last:

> I believe Canada needs not only a distinctive flag but a distinctive Canadian spirit.

That distinctive spirit should be embodied in a flag whose judicial status is well established. It should represent all Canadians and, in my opinion, the three maple leaves flag should be the national flag of Canada and should prevail over all those which we had in the past.

The point here is not to please French Canadians any more than others, as suggested in certain narrow-minded political quarters. But if we take a look at history, we must admit that French Canadians have special reasons to favour the maple leaf flag, having been pioneers in the development of the west as well as the east, through their daring explorers and missionaries, laymen and clerics as well.

English speaking people of good will could not, any more than French Canadians, repudiate the distinctive flag proposed. Canada is the common country of the descendants of French and English pioneers. It has become gradually the country of immigrants of all nationalities who chose to come here to start a new life that had become impossible for them in their country of origin and gave Canada the best of their talents and industry. No one among those three groups should stand against the adoption of a flag which is long overdue. On the contrary, everyone should look forward with enthusiasm to the day when it will fly on high in the Canadian sky.

[*Text*]

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Albert): Mr. Speaker, this is my first intervention in the debate. I have had my name on the list of speakers for some time, but the list is long and it takes quite a while before one's name is reached. It is a pleasure to follow my hon. friend, the hon. member for St. James (Mr. Rinfret), and I hope that the remarks I have to make although somewhat different, will be along the same lines of Canadianism that he has envisaged.

I have noticed that many members who have spoken in beginning their remarks have made personal references to their own backgrounds and the backgrounds of their constituencies, and I want to do the same. Many hon. members have referred to service in the first and second world wars and their association with the red ensign. I think I am one of the few, if not the only one in the house, who can say that my entire career at sea during the second world war, a very inauspicious career I might add, was spent serving under the red ensign. Those of us in the merchant navy, however, grew to honour and appreciate the old red duster.

For the record, I think hon. members will find that the red ensign was first officially used on British mercantile ships in 1707 and has been used ever since. The first instance in Canada of the use of the red ensign with the dominion badge or seal added was in 1892.

May I also refer to Saint John and make some brief remarks about this historic city. Many hon. members will, of course, associate Saint John with the Loyalists. We are very proud of our Loyalist tradition and it is becoming a greater source of pride every day. I think I should point out that for a considerable period of its history Saint John was under the French flag, a similar period to that when Annapolis Royal was under French rule, as referred to by the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis-Kings (Mr. Nowlan) the other day. Many people do not know this.

I recall that when a measure was introduced in the house in 1954 concerning historic sites the then minister of northern affairs, now premier of Quebec, did not realize this fact

and promised consideration when I mentioned that here was a very good example of two eras of colonial control in a city. The Fort LaTour period to which I am referring extended from 1631 to 1645 and it was the first major French outpost in New Brunswick. Prior to that time there were two earlier phases of Indian life. The story of the first English settlement on the Saint John river more than a century after the LaTour-D'Aulnay struggle between two rival French traders is recalled by the well known trading posts associated with the Simonds, Hazen and White period. Thus, at Portland point in Saint John are significant historical phases in the lives of three racial strains, Indians, French and English. Each has played an important role in the history of our province. When to these are added the famous Loyalist settlement one has a good idea of the different strains in our city and province.

I think it is important to understand why the Loyalists came to New Brunswick. They were a unique group comprising many well educated men and certainly men of great principle. Not nearly enough credit has been given in our history books to these gallant exiles. Some have suggested that had they found in their midst in the United States a true leader such as George Washington they might have remained there and brought about a different course of history. But they did not hesitate. They brought with them their valuable possessions, their education and culture, but above all else their love of a monarchical form of government. They were not interested in republicanism in any form. That is why in New Brunswick and Saint John we have such a pleasant mixture of culture from which many can take a lesson. We have a pleasant blend of American heritage with a true love for the crown, not a blind obedience but an appreciation of the monarchy as a better form of government than a republic.

It is important to define what one means by "imperialism" and I go to the work, "Canadians In The Making", by Professor A. R. M. Lower. On page 349 he states:

> Canadian imperialism has never been simple; it can at one and the same time be bitterly contemptuous of Englishmen and warmly welcome the British connection. A newspaper in that most loyal of all Canadian cities, Saint John, could write, apropos of a book by an English traveller: "Canadians might never suspect how coarse, ignorant, conceited and, withal, amusing they are if talented Englishmen did not come out occasionally and write books about them." Imperialism was in its own way a kind of Canadian nationalism.

In supporting the subamendment put forward by the hon. member for Regina City [Mr. Bell.] (Mr. More) I want to say at the beginning that I feel a subject such as the flag should not have been brought up for debate in the house. I liken it to capital punishment. It is a very emotional subject. People take positions for different reasons and it is extremely difficult to get a truly free vote on such a subject. In addition, of course, bitter controversy enters the picture.

However, we are involved in a historic debate to which many good contributions have been made. I do not wish to single out any but I think that speeches both inside and outside the house have been worthy of commendation on all sides. I noticed that last night the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. McLean), a good friend of mine, made a contribution to the debate, and I give him credit for doing so. I do not agree with his thoughts. I think it must have been extremely difficult for him to make that speech. He is a member of the Royal Canadian Legion, active in the boy scouts, a veteran of the first world war and is of Scottish ancestry. His riding is almost completely associated with the British tradition. Yet he came out in favour of the new flag which, of course, means scrapping the red ensign.

I have always been interested in the remarks of the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette) about a republic. I find it difficult to believe there is support for a republic in his riding and I can only say he is either foolhardy or he knows what his people are thinking. It strikes me that in a historic place like Lotbinière the people would certainly have great respect for the monarchical form of government.

I was also interested in the speech of the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) the other day. Everybody in the house knows he is a very active Anglican layman, and I say more power to him. But in his speech he disowned completely the red ensign and its historic traditions and connections with the Anglican church. He made absolutely no reference to it. I am not criticizing his stand but I think he should have tried to explain this change in his thinking.

We have also had, of course, the famous speech of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp) which has been given so much attention. I can only say that it represented a walking of the plank such as we have not seen since the days of Captain Bligh. Hon. members may ask when I think the flag crisis became serious, and I should like to go back to the 1940's for a moment. I lay the entire blame on the Liberal party

and their failure to provide proper, enlightened national leadership, particularly during the so-called Mackenzie King era. I say that they have failed even to grasp the essentials of nationhood and I intend to prove this point.

In his speech the other day the Minister of Trade and Commerce showed great solicitude for the future and fortunes of the Conservative party. I intend to demonstrate it is his type of membership in the so-called Ottawa establishment of liberal, with a small "l", civil servants, English speaking and British educated in most cases, which is more to blame than anything else for the division that has crept into the country. I intend to show that this group who typify this pseudo-Canadianism, and I include in it the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson), the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp), the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) and any other members of this Ottawa hierarchy, willy-nilly accepted the Mackenzie King philosophy of the day, this misguided Liberalism of the first water that played with the constitution and turned our national life into the volcano of power politics to sustain at all costs the life of the Liberal party. These individuals were the henchmen, knowingly or otherwise who perpetuated the legacy of William Lyon Mackenzie King. The victims, Mr. Speaker, are you and I, the Canadian people, and we are paying for it dearly today in many ways, particularly in the departure of many of our symbols and traditions that go to the very root of our way of life?

Mr. Ryan: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Bell: Yes.

Mr. Ryan: How do you reconcile your words this afternoon with your party's slogan in the 1957-58 election campaign, "Canada first"? Is there an apple gone bad over there?

Mr. Bell: Well, I intend to demonstrate that the Conservative party has put Canada first, but not at all costs like the Liberals under Mackenzie King.

The flag, while it may give the foundation of our traditions is only an outward symbol. This deliberate policy of tampering with the distinctive emblems of our past history can only result in the weakening of the monarchy and, of course, our nationhood. The creeping republicanism that has been challenged so forcefully by Dr. Eugene Forsey can only result in turning this nation to republicanism. I wish to quote for a moment from Dr. Eugene Forsey's remarks which were made in 1955 in a radio broadcast on January 14. They show his foresightedness and they demonstrate the beginnings of the problems that you and I have to face. I quote his remarks:

> But why do I call all this "creeping republicanism?" Well, "creeping" it most certainly is; sly, slithering, serpentine. And I just wish I had time to recite to you the bad history, bad law, bad logic, the insults, the crass ignorance, the distortions of the dictionary, with which the government and its hangers-on have tried to defend the indefensible. They are almost beyond belief.
>
> It's creeping and it's "republicanism." It just doesn't make sense on any other basis. If it was all innocent, why the long years of stealth and secrecy? Why the flouting of law and constitution? Somebody has had some serious purpose in all this. It may not have been the government itself. Ministers may have just yielded to pressure. But, inside the government or outside, or both, the pressure has been there, steady, insistent, relentless. The people who applied it knew what they wanted: to root out familiar and distinctive terms which bind us to our institutions, so that they could remould them nearer to their hearts' desire. They would never have got as far as they have if more of us realized what the monarchy meant, and why it was worth preserving. But, that's another story: the melancholy story of how, for nearly 30 years, our people have been steadily and systematically miseducated about our constitution, and particularly about the role of the crown as the guardian of that constitution, the protector of parliament and the people against cabinet dictatorship. Fortunately, however, there have been many thousands who have never bowed the knee unto Baal; and there are signs now that many thousands more are beginning to understand what has been happening, and to resist. That resistance will spell the end of "creeping republicanism."

I mention that to show that the policy of Mackenzie King has been continued by his successors in the Liberal party. The Liberals, at times in our history, played an important part, but not as great a part as the party of which I am a member. They have played their share in our formative years, but someone forgot to tell them to stop.

Having blamed this creeping republicanism on Mackenzie King, it is only fair to ask why these changes were allowed to take place. Why is it that everything connected with our English background has to be removed? I refer not only to the designation of "dominion" which was removed from our telephone books, but even the word "royal" has been removed from the phrase "royal mail" on post office boxes. Even the word "British" itself now brings hatred and anger in some quarters. In my opinion, it is all the fault of incorrect premises, the assumptions centred around Quebec and our French traditions. In

order to obtain Canadian unity we must accept French Canada as the basic, positive form of Canadianism, and English speaking Canadians must work to become identified with this type of true Canada. In other words, it seems to have become an established fact that no Canadian virtues are to be found in our Anglo-Saxon traditions.

As a witness, I call a book entitled "Freedom Wears a Crown" by John Farthing. This was an outstanding young Canadian who died at an early age. Like Dr. Forsey, he foresaw what was happening. I predict that as the years go by this will become a very famous book. This is what he said on page 87 of this book:

> It is of the essence of the Kingsian conception of Canadian unity, not only that such unity is to involve an harmonious relationship between the French and the English communities in this country, but that harmony is possible only by destroying all real sense of community among the English speaking people of Canada. They must find themselves as a people by ceasing to mean or to stand for anything in and of themselves, save what is compatible with a unity the terms of which are dictated by others. The English speaking people of Canada are to find unity and hence their soul by standing ready to relinquish every shred of their heritage and tradition, and to abandon everything that has hitherto given them a distinctive character and made them the not wholly contemptible people that they are.

Although I have made a great many references to Quebec, I feel it is English Canada and many of the leaders mentioned who bear a greater responsibility. If there have been meaningful contributions by English Canada, then they have been obscured. The leaders have failed and I charge the Liberal party with this neglect because, after all, they have governed this country certainly for a majority of years in recent times. It is not the fault of Quebec, let there be no mistake about it—it is not the fault of Quebec that no one knows what English Canada is doing. We do not know our own achievements, our goals and our frontiers. While I do not pretend to know what French Canadians want or where they are going, I am certain we English Canadians have lost sight of our objectives, of our culture and nationalism.

It may be also that Anglo-Saxon Canadianism has been too apologetic and too negative. It may be that we have advanced economically, but other movements have been stifled. This is why I am attempting to lay the cards on the table. We may not need a silent revolution, as is the case in Quebec now, but we do need a different type of Canada, one that espouses certain basic terms, not of one Canada or the other but in the traditions of each. I want to say that the leader of my party consistently, throughout the years, has stood for one Canada.

Having said this, Mr. Speaker, I quote once more from this book "Freedom Wears a Crown". Mr. Farthing has expressed this in a much better way than I could:

> —the people of French Canada are faced with the same basic issue as are their English speaking compatriots. We have to decide whether we are to become again a democracy functioning according to our constitutional idea and ideal of government, or whether we are to become a dependant republic. That is the basic issue of Canadian unity and those are the terms in which the question has valid meaning. It is also the first and all important question facing Canada, since the answer to almost every other question will depend upon the answer we give to it. The question belongs outside partisan power-plays. It is a matter far too serious to be subjected to appeals to popular prejudice on either side. It ought to be treated in a manner befitting an adult people mature in their political thinking.

Having said that about certain matters of French and English Canadian nationalism, I now deal briefly with what has been referred to as republicanism. I do not know what degree of republicanism there is in this country today. The hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette) stood up in this house in answer to a question and said flatly he was a republican. He also said he was not a separatist. I find it very difficult to assess how a person could be a republican and not a separatist, but he has stated, as a member of parliament sitting in this house, that he is in favour of a republic. Evidently there must be some feeling for this in his constituency.

I call as my first witness a very distinguished French Canadian. I refer of course to Premier Jean Lesage of Quebec who, in the triumphant tour which we all recall he made of France in 1963, said in London, according to a dispatch in the *Chronicle-Herald* by Mr. Eric Dennis:

> Premier Jean Lesage of Quebec said here yesterday that the flames of nationalism in his province, fired by "a feeling of resentment over not getting a square deal" in the Canadian partnership were now on the wane.
>
> And at the same time he assured the British that "French Canadians as a whole looked to London and the crown as their great protector."
>
> "The French Canadian would be the last to join the United States if there was any move for Canada to be absorbed by the Americans," he added. "He wants to stay in the commonwealth. The French Canadian is a royalist. Never forget that."

I place this on the record with pleasure. It shows the division between the federal and Quebec Liberals on this matter of a republic,

and it is also comforting to know that at least someone in Quebec is in favour of the monarchy.

As my last witness I recall the words of Lord Elgin who, in 1847, referring to the proper respect being shown at that time for French nationalism, asked:

> Who will not venture to say the last hand which waves the British flag on American ground may not be that of a French Canadian?

The main criticism that has been made in this debate has been in reference to the timing, and this is still the unanswered question as the days roll on. Why was the flag issue introduced in the middle of a busy legislative program, a program that was slowly showing some success? Why was it that the Prime Minister all of a sudden interrupted the daily business of the house and introduced the flag debate? Was it that the Queen's visit had something to do with the Prime Minister's decision suddenly to stop the government's business that was, after all, making some progress?

One thing is certain, and I say this to the senior minister presently in the house, the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Martin), we cannot be debating a flag in this house when the Queen is inspecting troops outside on the lawn of parliament hill. This is my argument; it is difficult to separate the flag from the crown because exactly the same arguments apply.

We hear a great deal these days about being broadminded. I may be old fashioned but I think there is too much broadmindedness in the modern world. This may be one of the reasons why we parents are failing, as evidenced by the many problems of our juveniles. Perhaps we have failed in our responsibilities to the youth of this nation in not bringing forth a proper nationalism with the necessary symbols that demonstrate the great strength of our system of government which is, as I say, in monarchical form.

While we fear the extremism that is showing itself across the border, and has been particularly in evidence in recent days, it is surely not wrong to stand for something which demonstrates the essential character of this country and protects, constitutionally at least, all that is French Canadian. I refer of course to the main theme in my remarks today, the symbol of the crown.

Let us remember that we chose in Canada as our political system the monarchical form of government. For one, I would like to see the crown on our flag if the red ensign is not to be. I think this would be a protection for our commonwealth link and it would demonstrate to all in this nation, particularly the youth, the system of government under which we live, and it would put the lie to all those who have false ideas of a republic.

We made our decision freely, both elements, the French and the English, that the crown, the cabinet and the Commons would be our constitutional form of government. We cannot abrogate any one of these three elements; and that is why I am extremely worried that any inroads on the crown, be it merely symbols or designations, or some serious change in the constitution itself, will drastically weaken our whole form of government.

To get back to my own position, I have stated at home and I repeat now that I strongly believe in the red ensign, or red ensign with modifications, and have for some time pledged my support to the Canadian Legion, the I.O.D.E. and the many other organizations that have argued for the retention of the red ensign as Canada's national flag. I do not know the thoughts of all those in the maritimes but I am certain that the majority favour the retention of the red ensign, but I put this qualification on the record that if in some way it could be proven that the new flag of the Prime Minister is a final act of Canadian unity then we might have different thoughts. But as I have said, to me this suggests other steps and I feel it has caused serious misgivings, and that is the reason why many are digging in.

However, if the majority of the Canadian people indicate by plebiscite or otherwise a preference for the Prime Minister's design, unhandsome as this design may be, or any other design, I would accept it and I am sure this would be the wish of my constituency. I would also support any reasonable compromise that would come forward—and I notice today many of the newspapers, such as the Montreal *Gazette*, are calling for such a compromise. This could give us an opportunity to return home and obtain a better assessment of the views of our electors.

If a committee of this house were set up, as was suggested by the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) and later taken up by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Hamilton) it would of course meet with my approval. We would be certain that by doing this an election would be avoided, and each of us could get down to the serious business of our country and make our long term plans for real unity in 1967 and the great future of Canada. There has been some criticism made of the type of debate. I took part in the pipe line debate a few years ago and at that time

we did not apologize for any of the parliamentary tactics which were used. I think the same holds true today, even though the issue has not at this stage reached the same proportions.

I again call as a witness in connection with this matter of parliamentary tactics Dr. Forsey who, in the course of an address to the men's and women's Canadian clubs on June 19, 1956, in Edmonton—the home city of the hon. member who preceded me and who made such an excellent speech in this debate—had this to say:

> Construction is neither new nor vicious. It is, of course, "not by any to be taken in hand unadvisedly, lightly or wantonly, but reverently, discreetly, advisedly, soberly," and from a deep conviction that it is indispensable in the public interest. Obstruction is a legitimate, recognized, time-honoured and essential part of the parliamentary system; in the last resort, with the government's power of dissolution, the only way of keeping parliament responsible to the people.

In closing, I merely wish to say that we in the official opposition are taking our action in this flag matter "reverently, discreetly, advisedly and soberly".

Mrs. Eloise Jones (Saskatoon): Mr. Speaker, a flag is, and always has been, a symbol raised high, a focal point for those intense feelings of joy and grief, fear and faith, aspiration and courage felt both individually and shared simultaneously in a common and uniting experience.

The flag as a symbol has enfolded in memory for many people all the vivid colour of past deeply rooted experiences of national life. Sometimes it waves proudly on the stage of memory as an emblem of triumph and achievement; again, it may conceal crucial and painful events which some, understandably do not wish to relive. But whatever it means or does not mean to each of us in this place, we must all recognize the fact that for many it is deeply rooted in a sense of identity.

As a student, years ago, I remember a teacher suddenly directing a question to a fellow student: "How do you know who you are?" And the answer came: "Because I am the one who has had a certain set of experiences". We began to consider memory as a key to identity. The chain of experiences that contribute to identity are emotionally coloured and achieve importance in our lives depending on the intensity of their emotional content. The flag is bound by ties of emotion to some very important events in the lives of people.

In the course of our national history, this allegiance to a known and honoured flag has been—and especially has this been true in time of war—strongly encouraged by leaders and those who influence the lives of men.

If such a flag is suddenly lowered, emotions may flood forth whose intensity may well surprise both the individual and the nation. This is what we have seen happening before our very eyes during the past few weeks. More and more people have been realizing their close identification with a flag that is being torn aside, and feeling a sense of shock and loss of identity in the process. We must speak for these people. And the government must offer them something more than the assurance of its respect for their flag as a memory.

Some have said: "What is a flag? A flag is only what we make of it". This is true. This is what has happened down through the years with the red ensign. People have attached to it very deep emotional significance, the intensity of which was not always consciously realized. But when that symbol is threatened, the area of threat widens and deepens to arouse emotions that might well have slumbered, and we discover that it is no light thing to tamper with what lies deep within the hearts and minds of people.

One cannot sit in judgment, for who of us can judge? There is not one who does not have deep emotional and idealistic ties which involve objects and associated beliefs and circumstances; the flag is a prime example of this kind of attachment.

I am going to read some extensive comments from one letter I received from a constituent on this subject—a veteran of world war two. These are very interesting and thoughtful comments from an individual who plays a responsible role in the community, and who says:

> I am against the new flag. I am not violently against it at the moment, and yet my feelings are strange—it does not necessarily mean I am easy about it, nor that anybody can do anything they want. It is unsettling to feel that somebody can come along and interfere with it, pass a resolution and give us a new one. I wouldn't want to fight over it. And yet I don't want anybody else doing anything to change it. I think many people out here feel the same way.

Then the writer goes on:

> I feel they weighed this flag business on votes, not on the roots of the country or the sensibilities and deep loyalties of the people. When I see the red ensign, I don't think of Britain, I think of Canada. When somebody suggests getting rid of it I also see St. Andrew's cross in that flag, and I'm sure others see St. Patrick's cross and the cross of St. George. People say "Of course, your support of the red ensign is an emotional thing". If support for the flag we have is an emotional argument, then is it not also an emotional argument to attack it or suggest removal of it? If

emotion is to be ruled out, then the emotions of the other side must be ruled out also.

Certainly it is an emotional thing. Canadians are not too demonstrative. We make use of our flag as much as we do, I think, because Americans are such flag wavers they forced us into it.

We are embarrassed when we sing O Canada or The Queen, but let nobody for a moment think we do not feel emotions about such things.

The flag does not determine the nation; the nation determines the flag. If Canada had used another symbol at Vimy Ridge, if another symbol had flown from her ships, airports and army depots during the second world war; if it had fluttered over our men in Hong Kong, Dieppe, Sicily, Ortona, on D-day; if our soldiers, sailors and airmen had been buried under it during the second world war, then we could all be proud of that flag.

No. Canada made the red ensign what it is today. Must we pitch over many years of work and sacrifice now?

He goes on:

Is a flag something that from time to time we invite an interior decorator in to have changed, to be brought up to date? No, it's not. Canada has many years of tradition invested in the red ensign and this must not be lightly discarded as we would an old sofa.

Is a commercial artist to choose our flag? Or is it not proper to let those who have sacrificed most keep the one they served under and would serve again?

He goes on:

Parliament must tread with care. There is still ample reason for feeling that men are moved today by certain honoured symbols just as they were moved in the days of the pipes and the claymore and the battle cry.

The idea boys would have nothing to do with this sort of factor; it's not scientific; it's not logical. But they are not dealing with chemicals, computers or statistics; they are dealing with human beings.

That is why our flag should not be controversial. It is above that; just as it is above our heads as it flies from thousands of slender poles throughout the country today.

Mr. Speaker, many members have very seriously and ably presented arguments to justify retention of the red ensign either as it is or in modified form. May I say, with all respect, I believe these arguments are not essential to the present situation, because the central fact remains that millions of Canadian people are not yet ready to give it up. That fact in itself, in a democratic country, should be sufficient reason to give the government pause and inspire it to pursue a different course.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mrs. Jones: We are not really concerned with justification for allegiance so much as we are concerned with our clear duty to recognize and respect the reality of a continuing loyalty to a flag that signifies so much to so many.

Surely this capacity to accept and deal with a situation as it develops is one that is not foreign to politicians and governments. It is an important aspect of political life. One cannot say, "This should not be". The fact is, it is; this is the situation—and from the point of view of democracy it has to be dealt with in the light of what course is best for the Canadian people. And the voice of the people must be heard. I hope that even before consideration is given, for example, in the form of a plebiscite as outlined by the hon. member for Regina City (Mr. More) there would be a decision made by the Prime Minister to refer this far reaching and troublesome question to a committee not subject to a time limit; for to invite speed here is to summon discord.

This place is not a show, and those who impatiently watch the deliberations in this chamber must not expect a glib and arbitrary disposal of problems which would slur over the rights and expressed desires of millions of Canadian people.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mrs. Jones: On this important question of a flag for Canada, the onus is on the government to adopt a different course, a course in the direction of mutual respect and harmony; and on this path may discretion be the better part of valour.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Clément Vincent (Nicolet-Yamaska): Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in rising, as the spokesman of the people in my riding of Nicolet-Yamaska on the matter of a distinctive national flag.

As far as I am concerned, I am exerting the privilege loaned by the people of Nicolet-Yamaska—and I say loaned because the people of my constituency can at any time take away this privilege I have the right of exerting today—that is to be able to rise in the house as often as I want to express my views in all due freedom of speech and action.

At this time, the opposition is blamed without rhyme or reason for staging a filibuster on the question of a distinctive national flag. For the time being, the people, more particularly in the province of Quebec, believe that this discussion has already lasted four months. No, Mr. Speaker, this debate has not lasted so long as that, for we have hardly had 15 days of discussion.

I believe that I expressed my views on various occasions on the flag, and I have still not changed my mind, when I state that I am in favour of a distinctive national flag for Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Vincent: On November 21, 1962, I mentioned in the house what I believed to be the five points we should consider before choosing a distinctive design which could be flown throughout Canada, in every province, and would also represent Canada in every country in the world.

The policy of the Conservative party is well known in this respect, and last Thursday, I was proud to hear the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Hamilton), whom I have always admired—perhaps because I am particularly devoted to the cause of our farmers —tell the house which principles the Conservative party wants to see preserved when a distinctive national flag is chosen. First of all, he said that the flag should be acceptable to the majority of Canadians. Second, it should recognize our dual culture and be a symbol of our history. Third, the flag should have a religious significance. Fourth, Canada's political evolution should be accepted without revolution.

In 1962, I said first that I wanted this debate, which holds the attention of the Canadian nation, to be carried on with dignity and not to be made into a matter of political partisanship.

By the way, I would like to tell my colleagues who sit in this house that we must now discuss this matter and that when it has been decided, those who have not spoken should not range all over Canada and pit one race against the other, as has often been done in the past, and more especially in our province, when for 30 or 40 years we have heard about conscription and heard charges to the effect that a political party was in favour of conscription or war. If we do not want to play one race against the other, we must say immediately what we have to say, listen to the viewpoints of others and then walk hand in hand towards the ideal that we have set up.

If this first point is to be efficient, all political partisanship must be eliminated, so that the flag design which the nation will choose will be selected not by a single man but by a group representing all political parties, a group which has no reason to indulge in political partisanship by suggesting such and such a choice. That was the first point I mentioned in November 1962.

The second point I raised was the following: if all Canadians recognize the necessity of having a flag of their own, on the other hand they do not all agree on the flag design. All members are aware of that and they have received through the mails hundreds of designs for a distinctive national flag. But all do not agree on the design and that is why the leader of the official opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) moved an amendment to the resolution and the hon. member for Regina City (Mr. More) introduced a subamendment. By the amendment and subamendment, they ask the government to let the people decide the flag design. I shall revert to this question in a few moments.

The third point was the following: I am not one of those who want to ram a flag design down the throat of the rest of the nation. I agree that each group should try and have the rest of the nation understand that such and such design should be chosen.

At the present time we are discussing a design proposed by one man and consisting of three red maple leaves on a white field with two blue bands at each end. That design was chosen, as I said, by one man or by a small group without any previous discussion, not even at the caucus of the party involved or in the cabinet.

That design was chosen and they want to give it to the Canadian people. But when someone objects or gives his views on the design chosen, he is charged with being against a distinctive national flag. As far as I am concerned I do not like the design with the three red maple leaves, but I am for a distinctive national flag. I do not like this design, like several of my compatriots in the province of Quebec.

At this stage, Mr. Speaker, I should like to report a fact that happened in my home. When I arrived with copies of the flag with three maple leaves on a white shield and blue bands, my ten year old son asked me: "What is this?" I said: "This is the flag proposed by the government in the House of Commons." Then, he asked me: "What are those three things in the centre?" I told him: "Those are maple leaves." He answered: "Dad, we have maples on our farm. We have some in the yard and the leaves do not look like these. They are not the maple leaves we see here, in our yard, on our farm."

Honestly, Mr. Speaker, I admit that the remarks of that young boy saying they were not maple leaves made me think twice.

And they would like to adopt a flag, telling the Canadian people that those are maple leaves.

Mr. Dupuis: May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Vincent: Certainly.

Mr. Dupuis: Does the hon. member think that the fleur-de-lis represented on the flag of the province of Quebec look like those he sees in his garden?

Mr. Vincent: Mr. Speaker, to answer the minister, I shall say that, before I was elected as a member of the House of Commons, I did not think that a minister could be like the hon. member for St. Jean-Iberville-Napierville.

Mr. Dupuis: Answer my question—

Mr. Vincent: I thought a minister was quite different.

Mr. Dupuis: I asked you a very simple question. Answer it.

[*Text*]

Mr. Smallwood: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, surely the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Dupuis) had no right to get up in the house without recognition from you and interfere with the speech of the hon. member.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Perhaps I should mention to the hon. member that I have recognized the minister. I think the Chair can recognize an hon. member otherwise than by standing and calling on him by naming his constituency or his cabinet position. The minister got up and asked permission to ask a question, and this was granted by the hon. member who has the floor. I suggest that that was tantamount to recognition.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Vincent: Mr. Speaker, my fourth point is this. A Canadian flag is a symbol of unity; it should not divide a nation. Now, when we have reached a compromise enabling us to choose a really distinctive Canadian flag, we can rest assured that it will be flown with pride in every Canadian province, including the province of Quebec, and honoured by the whole Canadian nation.

That is what I said in 1962 and what I am saying again today.

We must select a design which will unite and not divide the nation. We must choose a design which will be a rallying sign.

If we could decide upon such a choice, I, for one, think that it would be to the greatest advantage of all Canadians in every province of Canada.

My fifth point is this. I should like to point out once again that our flag should be a symbol of unity. Bearing that in mind, our flag should be so designed that it takes into account the aspirations of the two main groups in the country. It should reflect our sovereignty, our accession to the rank of independent state and show that we are free from any political link of subservience.

There is now in Canada a nation-wide group which cannot conceive a Canadian flag without the union jack being an integral part of it. There is another group on the government side which cannot conceive that Canada can have a distinctive flag without retaining the union jack as a second flag.

Therefore, as far as I am concerned, I feel that exactly the same question is now being discussed. Several, maybe all of my English speaking friends, attach prime importance to the union jack. A few want it on the new flag and others want it as second flag.

Would it not be possible to have, maybe not the union jack, but something that would represent it, for our English speaking fellow citizens?

When the Leader of the Opposition proposed some amendments to the flag Canada recognized by order in council in 1945, by including a fleur-de-lis, he did not want to appease French Canadians as suggested unadvisedly, in my opinion, by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, when he stated:

> A clumsy and gratuitous piece of appeasement; it must have appeared to my French Canadian friends as a bone thrown out to a troublesome minority to keep them quiet.

Frankly, I do not believe that in proposing that a fleur-de-lis be added to a flag design, the right hon. Leader of the Opposition ever wanted to appease thereby the French speaking Canadians. He wanted to find a compromise, so that the two great founding races of this country could be represented on the same flag. He was looking for some common ground where, together, we could unite under the same flag.

Personally, I object to the union jack, in its present form, being shown on the distinctive flag. I want what the people of my riding want. I object also—and I speak honestly—to the fleur-de-lis being shown on the distinctive flag. But I might accept on the flag what the union jack means for my English-speaking friends and what the fleur-de-lis means for my French speaking friends. I would also accept on the distinctive flag symbols of our ties with our mother countries. Mr. Speaker, because of this proposal, I would not like my friends in the Liberal party to say or claim that I am throwing a bone to my English speaking friends.

For instance, if we could go back to the origin of our two races, we would find that

in 1497 John Cabot came to Canada, more exactly to Newfoundland, under a royal mandate, flying the white banner with St. George's cross. Later on, when Jacques Cartier came and discovered Canada in 1534, he flew a blue pennant with a white cross. Each having a royal warrant, those two men came to discover this country, and this was the starting point of a great nation.

If we were able to take those two crosses representing the English and French flags, and place them on a white field symbolizing the vast snowfields of this country, the Indians and Eskimos, in short, if we could arrange those two crosses without giving either of them priority, to show that this is a union of two great races which we formed in this country, and that we propose to go on working for its prosperity, we should certainly obtain the support of all our people.

The union of those two races would form a circle, which is the sign of unity, and we would, because of those two crosses, obtain the colours of Canada: blue, white and red.

On this flag, we would have a cross, which is the sign of a Christian nation. As 97 or perhaps 98 per cent of Canadian citizens are Christians, I do not think that a cross on a flag could be dishonourable; on the contrary, I think that a cross on the flag would certainly honour the Canadian nation. In the central circle, there could be a green maple leaf, which would indicate a growing Canada. That maple leaf might have 10 points, because an ordinary maple leaf can have 9, 10, 11 and even 12 points. Those 10 points would represent the ten Canadian provinces, and if, later on, another province happened to join the big Canadian family, another point might simply be added, to identify the new province.

Such a flag would have neither union jack nor fleur-de-lis, but it would indicate what the union jack means to a great number of our English speaking friends.

We would have the white cross on a field of azure to remind us of our past and we would have a circle in the middle to indicate that we are a united people in a country represented by a green maple leaf.

We could then visit our schools and meet the students. We could explain to them the meaning of the flag by recalling the whole Canadian history. We could start with 1497, mention 1534 and go on to confederation in 1867. We could tell them about the confederation pact and finally we would say: We are a united people.

[Mr. Vincent.]

In my opinion, this flag would be first and foremost a flag accepted by the majority of Canadians. Moreover, it would recognize our dual culture and would symbolize our history. It would also have a religious significance and would acknowledge the political evolution of Canada, without being revolutionary.

Mr. Drouin: Will the hon. member allow a question?

Mr. Vincent: Certainly.

Mr. Drouin: Could the hon. member tell us whether he has rallied to his cause his colleagues of the Tory party and the leader of his party? Do they support his flag proposal?

Mr. Vincent: To answer my hon. friend's question, I must tell him this: If the leader of his party, the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson), had consulted even a group of members, such as the member for Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes—

An hon. Member: He did.

Mr. Vincent: It is not what the hon. member—

Mr. Drouin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. As far as I am concerned, notwithstanding the statement made by the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) I was consulted, and so were all my colleagues of the Liberal party, before the Prime Minister submitted his three maple leaf flag design to the house.

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: That is not a question of privilege.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Vincent: I admit that the hon. member for Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes was perhaps consulted before the leader of the government brought in his resolution, but he did not say that he and his friends were consulted before the leader of the government introduced his proposal in Winnipeg to the newspapermen, or what he did before he submitted it to the cabinet. On that point, he may have consulted the hon. members of the Liberal party before introducing it to the house, but when he consulted his colleagues or his friends or the members of his party, everything was decided. In that, I feel that the hon. member for Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes approves me and that even if he had put forward objections as we

did, there was no change to make; that was the one, and they had to support it.

I want to repeat once more, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Boulanger: Answer my question.

Mr. Vincent: Does the hon. member for Mercier have a question to ask?

Mr. Boulanger: I asked a question a while ago and you have not yet answered.

Mr. Vincent: Mr. Speaker, having not heard the question I cannot answer it.

Once more, I wish to repeat this: at the present time, there are in the Liberal party members who will not speak on this flag issue. They will not speak on the second part of the resolution either.

I wish to tell them this: it would be much preferable that you say what you have to say here, in the house, instead of making all kinds of statements in the province of Quebec during the next federal election, in order to set one part of the population against the other.

I mention that, Mr. Speaker, because we meet at the present time organizers and members of that party who ask us, as the Minister of Trade and Commerce did the other day: What are you going to do to get elected in the province of Quebec, if you are against the three maple leaf flag?

But that does not mean that we are against a distinctive flag. And I would tell them this: It is not by flying a flag that all the problems we are confronted with at the present time in the province of Quebec will be settled. For 30 years, it paid dividends, for instance, to talk about conscription, but now, the farmers and the labourers want the country to look towards economy and not only towards emotion.

I even invited a group of members to spend a week in my constituency during the next election and to speak about the flag. Meanwhile, since my electors know my opinion on this matter, I shall speak about other things of greater importance.

What is happening in the province of Quebec is precisely that people realize that for too long, in the federal parliament, we discussed emotional matters only to do window-dressing and we forgot to discharge our responsibilities concerning economic matters.

I should like to quote from memory a speech made by Hon. Arthur Sauvé, former federal minister, father of the late Paul Sauvé, premier of the province of Quebec. Speaking at the college of L'Assomption, in 1931 or 1932, he said: "If we want to discuss politics in the province of Quebec, we must appeal to emotions—that is what the Liberals were doing at that time—while in other provinces, we must discuss politics and bring forth arguments."

Well, I believe that is a thing of the past in the province of Quebec as in other provinces. If we wish to discuss politics, let us use arguments and stop appealing to emotions and tell an hon. member: "Because you are against the three-leaved flag, even if you are in favour of a distinctive flag, you shall go down to defeat at the next election."

As far as I am concerned, I am and will always remain in favour of a distinctive national flag. I would be glad if, at last, the right hon. Prime Minister of this country would decide to convene a committee of the house. We would discuss the matter for a few weeks and I am sure we would be able to choose a design acceptable to all Canadians, or at least to the great majority of them.

If the committee is convened, I personally will propose the design I mentioned earlier, in order that all the members of the house may realize that by retaining what symbolizes the past of each race, we will have a flag which will unify the two groups and bring them closer together, in short, which will not divide them.

Moreover, if, as a last resort, I have to fight to have the three maple leaves replaced by one, as seen on this flag, especially of a colour which stands for a growing Canada, a united Canada, perhaps made up of two races—not only perhaps, but actually composed of two distinct races forming a great Canada, a complete whole—well, I shall fight to have those three maple leaves replaced by one maple leaf only.

If it is impossible for us, in this house, to make the Prime Minister understand that his three red maple leaf flag will not be readily accepted among the Canadian people, we should be able to make him realize that it is not enough to come and tell the people: "Here is a distinctive flag, do not bother about the design", because, once the people have the flag accepted and raised it, it will be too late to say, after a year or two: "Well, we should have had this or that on the flag instead of those three maple leaves". We must then accept it as is and never change it.

That is why we are exerting so much pressure and making these requests. We beg our colleagues of the Liberal party to exert pressure on the Prime Minister to set up a committee to choose a design which, as I said, would unite and not divide the country,

in short, knit together into one unit all the elements of our country.

I am sure that my English speaking friends are prepared to make major concessions and that they are prepared, as I said earlier, while retaining what, for them, symbolizes their past and their origin, to find a design that will satisfy both groups and still be accepted by the majority of Canadians.

If this committee is established—

Mr. Choquette: Allow me to rise on a very brief point of order, Mr. Speaker.

I listened with great interest to the remarks of my hon. friend. I understand that much latitude has been allowed during the discussion on the subamendment. But I wonder whether it would not be in order to ask the hon. member if he is in favour or not of a referendum. Would it be in order to ask? Since he is proposing a design, it means he is against a referendum. If such is the case, let him say so.

Mr. Vincent: Mr. Speaker, for the information of the hon. member for Lotbinière, in the proposals relating to a plebiscite, mention is made of the red ensign, of a modified red ensign, of the three-leaved flag and of a one-leafed flag.

The hon. member asked me to give my opinion. If he had been present in the house when I began my remarks, he would have noticed that I expressed myself clearly on this matter. Therefore, I do not intend to repeat my remarks.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, when he said that I should limit my remarks to the amendment and the subamendment—

Mr. Choquette: Yes or no, are you in favour of a plebiscite?

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Vincent: On that, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Choquette: I asked, Mr. Speaker, whether the hon. member was in favour of a plebiscite, yes or no.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Nicolet-Yamaska.

Mr. Vincent: I would ask the hon. member for Lotbinière to read his speech tomorrow—

Mr. Choquette: I do not have time.

Mr. Vincent: —and when he has read it, I will ask him if he is for or against the union jack as a second flag for Canada.

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to raise a point of order and after that, I will rise on a question of privilege.

[Mr. Vincent.]

First, with regard to the point of order, the union jack is not the subject matter of the debate right now.

With regard to the question of privilege, the hon. member asked me a question about the union jack. That is completely out of order and against the rules of the house. This is my question of privilege. The hon. member for Nicolet-Yamaska has no right to ask me such a question, as we are not discussing the union jack at the present time.

Mr. Vincent: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Lotbinière reminds me of a card player who prepares a bluff. He says: Do not look at my cards but I would like to know what there is in yours.

At all events, I would ask the hon. member for Lotbinière—it is very easy to answer—to tell us whether or not he will vote for the union jack as a second flag?

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: May I suggest to the hon. member that he make his own remarks. I think it is not conducive to good order and debate in the house for an hon. member who has the floor to ask another member to make a speech. I have the impression that if the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette) got up to reply to this question and went on for a few minutes, perhaps the hon. member for St. Mary might feel at that point that he had lost the floor. I suggest therefore that he complete his remarks.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Vincent: Mr. Speaker, I immediately come back to the referendum and the four proposals in the subamendment. In my opinion, this is an excellent suggestion and it should be carefully considered. We must not forget the fact that we are going to adopt two flags for Canada and when the time comes—

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Lotbinière is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, in all fairness, I rise on a point of order and it is unfortunate that it has not been done more often during this debate. When one of our friends opposite accuses us of trying to give Canada two flags, I maintain that it is false, absolutely false. There is no question of giving the country two flags but only one.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. There is no point of order and I would suggest that the

hon. member for Nicolet-Yamaska continue his remarks.

Mr. Vincent: Mr. Speaker, before I conclude, I should like to say that when the time comes to vote either on the flag issue, the referendum or any of the proposals contained in the amendment to the amendment, I will take my responsibilities. I will not run out as my Liberal friends did when the student loans legislation was put to a vote. Neither will I act as a rubber stamp as they did on the nuclear arms issue. I will take my responsibilities, thus setting an example for the Liberal members from Quebec.

Mr. Dupuis: Mr. Speaker, may I call it six o'clock?

[*Text*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Churchill: It being six o'clock I would like to ask the house leader what departments of the main estimates we will be taking tomorrow and Friday?

Mr. Favreau: On Friday we will be considering first the estimates of the Department of Industry, then the Department of Labour and then the Department of Public Works, but I should like to add that the Department of Industry estimates include defence production, atomic energy, national research, medical councils and the emergency measures organization.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, August 27, 1964

The house met at 2 p.m.

EDUCATION

STUDENT LOANS—STATEMENT RESPECTING ARRANGEMENTS WITH PROVINCES

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, in response to a number of questions from hon. members I would like to make a progress report on arrangements under the Canada Student Loans Act. I have delayed doing so pending receipt of information from the provinces on whether they are participating in the plan and on the arrangements they are making to get the plan under way.

All provinces, the Yukon and Northwest Territories have now decided to participate in this plan, except the province of Quebec. As all hon. members knew at the time the legislation was before the house, the province of Quebec was intending to continue to rely entirely on its own comprehensive plan of student loans, bursaries and scholarships.

Appropriate authorities, as provided under the act, are designated by the provinces as the authority in the province for the purposes of the Canada students loans plan. Nine provinces and the two territories have provided us informally with the following names and addresses of the appropriate authorities which they are designating for this purpose. I will not read the addresses, but in most cases the address is in care of the department of education:

Newfoundland	Canada student loans authority
Prince Edward Island	Minister of education
Nova Scotia	Canada student loans committee
New Brunswick	Deputy minister of youth and welfare
Ontario	Department of university affairs
Manitoba	Department of education
Saskatchewan	Department of education
Alberta	Students assistance board
British Columbia	The British Columbia student aid loan committee
Yukon Territory	The students financial assistance awards committee
Northwest Territories	Superintendent of education for the Northwest Territories

Except in the case of Ontario, these appropriate authorities will be the only agencies in the province to which students should apply for certificates of eligibility. These certificates may be issued to students who meet the provincial standards on academic qualifications and financial need.

In Ontario, all universities and other specified educational institutions will be entitled to issue certificates of eligibility to students. These institutions are listed in the appendix to this statement. By leave of the house I should like to suggest that this statement be printed as an appendix to *Hansard*, but if hon. members feel this would not be appropriate it could be done in some other way. However, I think it would be convenient to have the whole matter dealt with in the same document.

Mr. Speaker: Does the house agree?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Editor's note: For list of institutions mentioned above see appendix.*]

Mr. Gordon: Ontario students applying for a certificate in connection with studies abroad must apply to the Ontario department of university affairs.

All the forms which we must provide in order that the plan may get under way will be sent out next Monday, August 31, to all appropriate authorities of the provinces and to the banks across the country. Regulations under the Canada Student Loans Act will be published in the Canada Gazette during the first week of September.

A brochure is being prepared which will tell students about the qualifications necessary to apply for certificates of eligibility and loans, how much they can borrow, how long they can take to repay, what the cost is likely to be and, most important, where they should apply in each province. This brochure will be printed and available next week for distribution in large numbers to the banks and,

through the provincial authorities, to universities and other educational institutions. Copies of this brochure will be distributed to members of parliament.

Thanks to the wholehearted co-operation of all concerned, the Canada student loans plan will be launched, as promised, before the beginning of the academic year 1964-65. In this connection I should like to express the appreciation of the government to all the provinces, without exception, for their ready and helpful participation in our discussions, sometimes at short notice and at no small personal inconvenience to those involved.

Officials of the chartered banks have also co-operated in this endeavour and the government is grateful to them. May I also express a special word of thanks to the officials of several federal departments, including my own, who have worked under very heavy pressure to put this plan into effect at the earliest possible date.

[*Later:*]

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance arising out of the statement he made at the opening of today's sitting, which is some little time ago now. I should like to ask the minister whether there have been any applications received by him from credit unions for certification under the students loans act, and if so, how many credit unions have made such applications and what action has been taken.

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, when I last inquired, which was either yesterday or the day before, I think there were somewhere between half a dozen and ten credit unions which had written in to inquire about this matter. They are all being investigated by the department at the present time.

CANADIAN FLAG

LETTER OF MINISTER WITHOUT PORTFOLIO RESPECTING BUMPER STRIPS

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 whether he authorized any member of the government to solicit orders for bumper strips on which appear the three-leaf flag, and whether his attention has been drawn to a broadcast last evening over CHCH-TV by Mr. Geoff. Scott regarding a letter

forwarded to various colleagues of the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Dupuis) in which it was suggested that members might sell at least 1,000 of these stickers to—

Mr. Dupuis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Yvon Dupuis (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

[*Text*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: —to service stations—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dupuis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think it would be advisable to let the right hon. gentleman finish his statement, so I may decide.

Mr. Diefenbaker: —to sell at least 1,000 of these stickers to the most important service stations in the riding; the result would be better and would look less political than if the member undertook the publicity himself. I would like the Prime Minister to say whether he has any knowledge of this, and whether it is approved.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge of it. I will discuss the matter with my colleague the Minister without Portfolio, and if there is any statement that should be made I will be glad to make it.

Mr. Monteith: You want to find out what the cabinet is doing.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dupuis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. At no time have I used public funds to distribute or urge members of parliament to do anything with regard to the emblems of the new flag. I understand that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) is greatly interested in the new flag and in my activities, but I should like to make it clear, by rising on a question of privilege, that the question raised yesterday on television is unfounded. It was asked whether it is right for a minister to use public funds in order to advertise an emblem not yet adopted. My answer is no, it is not right, and I have not done anything of the kind. I would never use public funds for such a purpose.

[*Text*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: Possibly now, Mr. Speaker, a further question might be directed to the hon. gentleman. Did he send out the letter asking his colleagues to purchase, at $25 per thousand, these particularly attractive bumper stickers, and did he suggest therein "For information or orders call Mr. George Marshall, 992-2377", which is the telephone number of the minister in whose office Mr. Marshall occupies a position?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dupuis: My hon. friends asked me questions. Do they want an answer?

If you give me time to answer I will do so, and with great pleasure.

Mr. Speaker, the letter to which the Leader of the Opposition just referred is confidential. How did he obtain it?

[*Text*]

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Monteith: You admit it, then.

Mr. Dupuis: No. You had better listen.

[*Translation*]

How did he get it? I do not know. But at any rate he fell into a trap, because I was sure his intelligence service would cause him to rise today in order to cause a sensation as he usually likes to do, by saying:

[*Text*]

State the facts.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the Leader of the Opposition. Since he asked me questions in regard to the flag stickers, I have placed personally 50,000 of them. He is making the best publicity for the new flag he could ever hope to do in his life.

[*Text*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: I was reading from the broadcast of last evening. I ask the hon. gentleman how many of these confidential letters did he send out, and did he have much success with his colleagues?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dupuis: To answer the questions put by the Leader of the Opposition, I could quote many statements in order to prove to him that I had much success since he put his question. I will quote only one, to answer his question. It comes from a doctor, whom I have never seen, from Brantford, Ontario. Here is what he writes:

[*Text*]

Dear Sir:

If possible, I would appreciate receiving some bumper stickers of the new flag for which I enclose $5.

Be assured, sir, that there are many residents of Ontario who regardless of their ancestors' origins wish to see Canada truly united under a new distinctively Canadian flag.

[*Translation*]

And that doctor concludes as follows:

[*Text*]

I feel that we should be looking to the future and not to the past and that the proposed new flag is an expression of this feeling.

[*Translation*]

I sent him back his $5 cheque because I am not a merchant and I was glad to give him free of charge, as I always do, fine copies of this nice flag which the Leader of the Opposition likes so much.

[*Text*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, evidently the Prime Minister has information which he did not have before. Is it proper and fitting that a minister in his cabinet should be sending out messages to provide for the sale of bumper stickers, and make his office the place to which the returns are to be made? The Prime Minister is laughing, but does he regard it as proper for the office of a minister to be used for that purpose?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, if it is proper for a senator and a member of the previous government to send out messages soliciting campaign funds from members of this government, I do not think it is too serious when a member of the government supports and advocates a resolution which is before the house and in which he believes.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Certainly I do not know anything about the letter which the hon. gentleman received—

Mr. Hellyer: Was it not on behalf of your party?

Mr. Diefenbaker: —but I can think of no more appropriate place to get money, if you need money, than right over there.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Simpson: What's a hundred million?

Mr. Diefenbaker: However, I ask the Prime Minister this. Does he regard it as proper for a minister to use the services of his office for such distribution at a price, and under a plan whereby the people would be fooled? Because I am informed that the letter says,

in effect, "If you could get it distributed by a garage man the result would be better and would be less political".

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I have already stated that I will look at the letter and make a statement in the house if one is required. I am sorry my right hon. friend has not seen the letter to which I refer, but I will be glad to send him a copy. It is signed by Senator McCutcheon.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, since the right hon. Leader of the Opposition has referred to the letter which is in my possession I should like permission of the house to table this letter.

Mr. Speaker: Does the house give permission to table this letter?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I should now like to ask the Prime Minister and all his associates whether they will table the letter in question that was sent to each and every one of them?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I understand my right hon. friend has a copy of the letter.

Mr. Diefenbaker: No, no.

Mr. Pearson: We have tabled the letter that we have. I think it would be quite appropriate, as I have not got a copy of that letter, if he were given permission to table it right now.

Hon. J. W. Monteith (Perth): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a supplementary question of the Prime Minister. Does the Prime Minister not think it is completely disgraceful that the offices of a minister of the crown should be used for the distribution of literature concerning a flag which is not even the flag of Canada?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I am inclined to think that it is disgraceful to waste the time of parliament in this way.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am having a little difficulty hearing.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dupuis: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

I cannot let the Leader of the Opposition state that I used public funds to write that letter. I would say to him that, if he had taken the trouble to look at the confidential letter he has in his hands, he could have seen it was not written on government paper, but on personal paper which does not bear the government seal.

It is important to point this out, because it shows how the Leader of the Opposition can twist the facts around to suit his purpose.

[*Text*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, now that we have verification that what Mr. Scott said was correct, could I ask the hon. gentleman to table the letter in question, to which he has referred?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dupuis: Since this incident began on television and in the press gallery, I should like to submit personally, after the orders of the day, a complete summary of the situation that will show the people how the Leader of the Opposition tries to find scandals where there are absolutely none.

[*Text*]

Mr. Georges Valade (St. Mary): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege affecting all the members of this house, and I refer to the remark by the Prime Minister that it was not a serious matter. I should like to bring this very serious matter to the attention of the house. When the Minister without Portfolio stood up and said he had sent a confidential letter, I think he made a false statement; because I have a photostat of the letter he sent and there is no mention of it being confidential. I should like the Minister without Portfolio to retract or make a correct statement.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dupuis: Mr. Speaker, I am going to advise my office right now to send me one of those letters and I will put it under the very nose of the hon. member for St. Mary (Mr. Valade).

[*Text*]

On a question of privilege—

[*Translation*]

The hon. member for St. Mary just said that I should withdraw my statement. I think he should withdraw his instead, because I have here a copy of the letter I sent to all Liberal members which bears at the top the word "confidential".

Of course it may be that his friends in the official opposition hid that word when they took a photostat of that letter because

they were ashamed to use a document bearing the word "confidential". In any case, since the hon. member for St. Mary just said to the house that I lied, I would ask him to withdraw his statement, and I table herewith the document as the leader of the official opposition asked me to do.

I would ask the hon. member for St. Mary to withdraw his statement.

[*Text*]

Mr. Valade: I have nothing to retract, but the Minister without Portfolio should retract the imputations in his statement. He has accused the representatives of this house of taking out the word "confidential". I have mentioned in the house that I have a photostat of the letter the minister sent. I think the minister himself could have the word "confidential" on some letters which originally did not carry the word "confidential".

Mr. Monteith: I wonder if the Prime Minister—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dupuis: Mr. Speaker, I tabled a document. I do not accept the point raised by the hon. member for St. Mary (Mr. Valade). I am asking him to retract his words, as he said that I was not telling the truth to the house.

[*Text*]

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): May I ask a supplementary question of the Minister without Portfolio with regard to this letter he has just tabled. Has it gone to any persons other than members of parliament; because I understood him to refer to a letter which he got from some person sending in $5 for these stickers. Is the minister in business now, not only serving members of parliament—

An hon. Member: That is right; he is in business.

Mr. Douglas: —but the general public? If so, I suggest to the Prime Minister that instead of keeping him as Minister without Portfolio he might create a department of notions and gimmicks over which he could put the minister.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dupuis: Mr. Speaker, if I need a partner in "notions and gimmicks", I will ask the leader of the New Democratic party to assist me in my duties.

Now, to answer his question, this letter was only sent to Liberal members. Of course my messenger delivered them; I would certainly not use the messenger of the Leader of the Opposition for this purpose, lest he should enclose some red ensigns.

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order. Before this letter is tabled we will need the consent of the house. Does the house give consent to the tabling of the letter?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): May I ask a supplementary question of the Minister without Portfolio. There seems to be a question as to whether the minister is operating legally, and I am wondering whether he has obtained the necessary peddler's licence to conduct this business.

Mr. C. S. Smallwood (Rosetown-Biggar): May I ask a supplementary question of the Prime Minister. Has the hon. member for Carleton approved of this action, and how large an order for stickers has he placed?

Mr. Pearson: I am impressed, Mr. Speaker, by the fact that there are various forms of filibusters.

[*Later:*]

Mr. John Loney (Bruce): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister without Portfolio. Is the minister remitting Ontario sales tax on the orders for bumper stickers which are being filled from his office?

Mr. Dupuis: I always pay my taxes.

Mr. F. J. W. Fane (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. I would like to ask him whether he is aware that the bumper stickers being peddled by the Minister without Portfolio are very similar to the merchant navy flag of the Soviet union, with the red star of Russia and the hammer and sickle replaced by three red maple leaves?

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Mr. Terry Nugent (Edmonton-Strathcona): A supplementary question to the Prime Minister—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Surely that last question should not be taken too seriously.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask the Prime Minister then, and now is an appropriate time, whether the Minister without Portfolio has any duties other than chief huckster of Liberal propaganda on the flag.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, perhaps we could get on with the public business.

Mr. Monteith: Embarrassing, isn't it?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister a question. Would he have with him some statistics concerning the number of speeches made on the flag issue to date and also a breakdown indicating those who spoke the most and the participation of each political party, so that the Canadian public will know where the responsibility lies for all this delay in adopting a distinctive national flag?

[*Text*]

PUBLIC SERVICE

PROTESTS RESPECTING RECENT SALARY INCREASES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister. According to a statement issued by the national unemployment insurance commission employees association they are protesting to the Prime Minister about the salary increases which have been granted. They state that the salaries which have been approved by treasury board and cabinet are just half what was recommended by the civil service commission. I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether this statement has been drawn to his attention, and can he tell the house whether it is correct that the salary increases granted for group B are in fact half the amount that was recommended by the federal civil service commission?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I cannot comment in detail on that, or indeed answer the specific question, but I shall be glad to look into it. I may say that the President of the Privy Council and I are receiving delegations on this matter tomorrow morning.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

CYPRUS—REPORTED INTENTION TO WITHDRAW UN FORCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs, and I may tell him in advance that it is not about Indonesia. In view of the fact that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, on its national television news last night, announced that the secretary general of the United Nations had decided to recall the entire United Nations force from Cyprus this month because of a lack of funds, can the minister tell us just what is the situation in regard to the UN force on Cyprus?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): The hon. member for Greenwood had given me notice of his intention to ask the same question. The situation is precisely as stated in the house yesterday by the Prime Minister. The secretary general, it is true, was reported to have said that he would withdraw the force. However, the secretary general has said he did not make that statement. What he had said, at an earlier press conference, was that unless the financial situation, involving a deficit of $2 million, improved, he would have to give consideration to the matter.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): I wonder if the Secretary of State for External Affairs could tell us whether this government or he himself are making any efforts to encourage other nations to contribute the $2 million, which seems a very small sum for the whole of the peace keeping effort on Cyprus to depend upon. Is there anything being done to make sure that money is available?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): The answer to the question is yes. We have made every effort, alongside other countries, to see that the deficit is met. I have hopes that this will be the case. I will be disappointed if it is not.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): I have a further supplementary question. The Associated Press report is much more specific than the minister's answer indicates, unless this has been denied by someone. It states that secretary general U Thant said Wednesday night he will hand his recommendation on discontinuing a UN peace keeping force in Cyprus to the security council early next month. What I wanted to ask the minister was will this apply only to those participants who are being financed by the United Nations? Will countries like Canada, who are paying the cost themselves, continue to maintain forces in Cyprus? It seems to me that this would be quite practicable. Has Canada offered to continue the force there at her own expense?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): We will have to look at this matter in the light of the recommendations made to the security council by the secretary general.

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary North): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the minister has been reported in this morning's *Globe and Mail* as

indicating that the Canadian government is planning to withdraw part or all of the Canadian forces now in Cyprus on September 26, will the minister comment on that?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): That is a decision, of course, that will depend upon the recommendation that will be made by the secretary general to the security council. At that time the Canadian government and other governments will give consideration to those recommendations.

Mr. Harkness: My question was whether the Canadian government is actually planning to withdraw troops, because the account in the *Globe and Mail* this morning certainly indicates this is the government's intention, if the minister was correctly reported.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): The answer is no.

NATO—AGREEMENT RESPECTING EXCHANGE OF ATOMIC INFORMATION

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs which someone on the government side might take as notice for him because I did not have time to give him notice. My question concerns a document which was tabled in this house on June 30 dealing with the exchange of atomic information between the United States and her NATO allies. I questioned the minister about it on July 8 and again on July 16. I would like to ask the minister whether he would later give to the house a more accurate statement than he gave on July 16, when he told me, as reported at page 5546 of *Hansard*:

> This agreement concerns the exchange of atomic information for the use of members in scientific purposes.

I had been asking whether the exchange had reference to defence operations. My additional question is this. Will the minister of external affairs refer to the message from the President of the United States to congress concerning this transfer of nuclear information, and apprise the house of the exact terms of that message, which deals with extending information to NATO allies in order that they may make more effective use of nuclear delivery systems?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I will be glad to bring this to the minister's attention, Mr. Speaker.

Inquiries of the Ministry

LABOUR RELATIONS

GREAT LAKES—CONDITIONS IMPOSED FOR REINSTATEMENT FROM "DO NOT SHIP" LIST

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): Will the Minister of Labour carry a question to the maritime union trustees and bring back a reply as to whether Mr. Charles Turner, temporary president of the S.I.U., who was installed in this position by the trustees, is imposing, with full consent and knowledge of the trustees, arbitrary and unjustified conditions in writing upon seamen on the "do not ship list" as a condition to their re-employment in the industry?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Starr: May I ask a supplementary question. Will the Minister of Labour express his view as to whether this arbitrary and high-handed method of exercising dictatorial control over the employment of seamen is in accordance with the task which has been given to the trustees by parliament for the restoration of democracy in the S.I.U.?

Mr. MacEachen: No, Mr. Speaker, because I do not accept at face value the allegations contained in my hon. friend's question.

Mr. Starr: Then I ask the minister how he could accept this when he said he would ask the trustees whether they are directing such actions by the president.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I agreed to ascertain the facts, not to accept the hon. member's version of the facts.

Mr. Starr: As a further supplementary question, and in order to help the minister and the trustees in bringing down an effectual report, I might say they could refer to a letter dated May 6, 1964, over the signature of Mr. Charles Turner and addressed to Mr. John Wood, Sr. of Verdun, Quebec.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

QUEBEC—PAYMENT OF FEDERAL SHARE OF WINTER WORKS PROGRAM

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Chapleau): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour.

Could he tell the house whether his department has paid its share for all the works completed under the winter works program

for 1963-64 by the municipalities of the state of Quebec?

[*Text*]

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

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Speaker, with your permission I should like to take up this matter at half past ten, at the next opportunity.

[*Text*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SOFTBALL GAME FOR DAN MCIVOR TROPHY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Temple (Hastings South): Mr. Speaker, may I address a question to the Prime Minister. Is he aware that last evening a team of members of parliament from all sides of the house succeeded in recovering the Dan McIvor trophy from the security staff softball team, by a score of 6 to 5, for the first time in 14 years? As a supplementary question, would the Prime Minister be good enough to agree to keep this trophy for all members of parliament?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I was not aware of this important information, Mr. Speaker, and I thank my hon. friend for bringing it to my attention. I only hope the morale of the protective staff will not be so shattered by this defeat that we will not be given sufficient protection from the galleries.

FINANCE

APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL ADVISOR ON TAXATION MATTERS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. Has the minister appointed a special outside advisor on taxation matters and, if so, will he state what are the functions of this new outside advisor?

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, some months ago I received a letter from Mr. Arthur S. Pattillo, Q.C., chairman of the Canadian tax foundation, suggesting that with the work the Department of Finance will be faced with following receipt of the report of the royal commission on taxation, it would be desirable for the department to acquire some additional assistance on a temporary basis.

After considering this very helpful proposal the department decided this would be a good idea. We are grateful to Mr. Pattillo and the other members of the foundation for making the suggestion, and we propose to take on three tax experts for a period of a year or two to help with the implementation of the reports as they are received. I think the first appointment is the one to which my hon. friend referred.

Mr. Martineau: As a supplementary question, will the minister state whether there was no one among the permanent officials of the department who could carry on the functions of this new outside advisor, and will he also tell us from what line of work this advisor has been drawn?

Mr. Gordon: This proposal was discussed with the officials of my department, who felt it was a very good one. The additional assistance will be attached to the department and will work with the permanent staff. The gentleman in question is a tax expert and a chartered accountant by profession.

Mr. Martineau: As a further supplementary question, will he still be drawing his pay from his regular employers?

Mr. Gordon: No, Mr. Speaker.

REMOVAL OF TAX ON BUILDING MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. William Skoreyko (Edmonton East): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance whether, in view of the alarming increase in bankruptcies across Canada as reported in the press yesterday, he will now consider removing the sales tax on building materials and production machinery.

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I find it difficult to relate the two subjects to which my hon. friend refers.

Mr. Monteith: Get the experts in quickly.

Mr. Gordon: If there are any changes to be made in taxation they will be announced at the time of the next budget.

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): As a supplementary question, will the special advisers or assistants the minister has just mentioned be commissioned to advise him on that special tax?

Mr. Gordon: The assistants to whom my hon. friend referred will assist the minister

and the department in translating into legislation such portions of the recommendations of the royal commission as the government may approve of.

Mr. Skoreyko: Does the minister not know that the number of bankruptcies across Canada, alarming as they are, have all happened in the retail business, of which small lumber yards constitute the greatest number?

Mr. Gordon: I would think that a highly exaggerated conclusion, Mr. Speaker.

QUEBEC—ESTABLISHMENT OF BANK BY CREDIT INSTITUTIONS

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Maurice Côté (Chicoutimi): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Would the government be prepared to consider a bill authorizing Quebec caisses populaires and other similar organizations to become shareholders in a co-operative chartered bank having an authorized capital of $10 million?

[*Text*]

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): I think I shall have to take this question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANCE TO TEXTILE INDUSTRY TO OFFSET JAPANESE IMPORTS

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Finance.

Do the Minister of Finance and his department intend to take the necessary steps to assist the Canadian textile industries, which are seriously affected in their business by some imports from Japan which have increased by 100 per cent in the last two years?

[*Text*]

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to say that the Canadian textile industry as a whole has not been in as healthy a state for many years. On the particular question that I referred to yesterday, dealing with the production of worsted cloth, I said that at the Japanese-Canadian ministerial meeting to be held in Tokyo next week this would be one of the subjects we would be looking into.

Inquiries of the Ministry

AGRICULTURE

AMENDMENT OF SUBSIDIES ON FEED GRAINS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (Queens-Lunenburg): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Forestry. In view of the deep concern of maritime farmers, will the minister inform the house whether the revision in subsidies on feed grains, recently announced as an interim measure, will be amended so that Atlantic provinces' farmers can maintain their competitive position with livestock owners in central Canada?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): Mr. Speaker, the interim assistance measures that were announced at the end of July will be amended, but no final decision has yet been reached.

DEFENCE PRODUCTION

USE OF NUCLEAR MATERIALS BY PRIVATE INDUSTRY FOR PEACEFUL PURPOSES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Defence Production. Is the government taking any action to release nuclear materials to private industry for peaceful purposes, similar to the action approved yesterday by the President of the United States?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): As hon. members all know, Mr. Speaker, Atomic Energy of Canada Limited has over the years, as a major constituent part of its policy, been endeavouring to develop products of nuclear fission for peaceful purposes, particularly medical uses. This program has been highly successful and will be continued.

Mr. Aiken: I have a supplementary question. Do I take it from the minister's answer that no consideration is being given to a change in the nuclear power set-up in Canada?

Mr. Drury: Well, Mr. Speaker, no consideration is being given to any substantial change in the relationships of the Canadian government to other governments in the matter of nuclear power. If the hon. gentleman would be a little more specific as to what change he has in mind, perhaps I could answer him more specifically.

Inquiries of the Ministry

DOMINION-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

CONSIDERATION OF IMPROVEMENT IN CONSULTATIVE ARRANGEMENTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address this question to the right hon. Prime Minister in his capacity as reporting to parliament on federal-provincial affairs. Is it the intention of the Prime Minister at the forthcoming federal-provincial meeting to initiate discussions relating to the improvement of permanent consultative machinery between Ottawa and the provinces, and could the Prime Minister relate to the house the nature of suggestions he might be making?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to my hon. friend for giving me notice of this question, which concerns a matter of importance in which I know he has a particular interest. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that in addition to its purely commemorative session on September 1 next week, the Charlottetown conference will meet in regular session for only half a day, or at most a full day on September 2. The only item of substance on the agenda is the question of the amendment of the constitution in Canada. However, the conference will probably review also the calendar of federal-provincial conference meetings in 1964, and reference may be made in that review to any improvements which various governments might have been making in their internal machinery and procedures to facilitate federal-provincial consultation and co-ordination, in accordance with the recommendation of the federal-provincial conference in Quebec city last spring.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS

HULL, QUE.—INQUIRY AS TO CONSTRUCTION

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alexis Caron (Parliamentary Secretary to Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, the construction and rental of buildings in Ottawa is being announced but nothing is being said about Hull. Could the minister tell the house whether he will have at least one building put up in Hull this year?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to reply to the hon. member that it has been decided in principle to erect one federal building in the city of Hull. However, I am not in a position to say today what type of building it will be and which department will occupy it. As soon as I can, I shall communicate that information to the house.

Mr. Caron: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can we expect a decision this year?

Mr. Deschatelets: Mr. Speaker, I hope to be in a position to give further information regarding that building, in Hull, within a month or so.

[*Text*]

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

CONSIDERATION OF REPORTED CLAIM OF FORMER AGENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): I wish to address a question to the Minister of Justice. The question relates to a tape recording of a radio interview between Ed Murphy and Cowlishaw and Macdonald in which Macdonald said that unless some action is taken by three o'clock today he intends to go across the country and "blow the lid off" the R.C.M.P. security system. Yesterday the minister said he would investigate this case. Has he done so, and is he in a position to make a statement?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): My answer was given in reply to a question asking whether I was investigating the case. It is obvious that in my capacity as Minister of Justice it is my obligation to do so. But the question whether the facts as alleged by either Mr. Cowlishaw or Mr. Macdonald are accurate is a totally different one, and I think I can only answer it in the words of a previous minister of justice in a former administration, words which I think are absolutely right and which I want to make my own. These are the words of Hon. Davie Fulton in answer to a question asked in the House of Commons on April 29, 1959, as reported in *Hansard* of that year at page 3152. I will take full responsibility for them today:

> I can only answer the question by saying that the government has consistently followed a policy of complete reticence concerning security work, which in such a case means that it must refuse either to acknowledge or deny allegations about the employment of secret sources for intelligence work.

I repeat that under my own responsibility I make those words of Mr. Fulton my own.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): A supplementary question, following the answer given to my hon. friend from Danforth. I should like to ask the Minister of Justice

whether he would not agree that if it is true that a man is being discriminated against because of an association with the communist party which he undertook on behalf of the R.C.M.P., the government and in particular the Minister of Justice has a responsibility to clear this man's name in the circumstances?

Can I ask the minister if he accepts this principle and whether he is prepared to look into the matter on this basis? It seems to me it is not sufficient to tell us that a previous minister of justice said he must be reticent on this subject. If this man's statement is true, his good name is at stake. Surely the minister has the responsibility to clear his good name if the facts he gave to the public are correct.

Mr. Favreau: Evidently the question is predicated on an assumption. Therefore it is hypothetical. Second, it purports to ask for a personal opinion on my part. I must tell the house that the answer which was given by a previous minister of justice and which I adopted as my own is the same as was given by ministers of justice in still earlier administrations. This represents an attitude which in certain cases, I must admit, makes for certain apparent hardships. However, it is important and essential to the security of the whole of Canada that as far as these matters are concerned the same line of conduct be followed by this government as was followed by previous governments.

Mr. Douglas: Would not the minister be as interested in the security of this individual, whose livelihood is affected, as he would be in the security of the R.C.M.P.? Surely the individual has some rights; this is not a police state. If he has had an unfortunate association at the request of the R.C.M.P., and paid for by the R.C.M.P., surely his name should be cleared.

Mr. Favreau: Of course I never did refer, and I never would, to the security of the R.C.M.P. as such. This is a gallant body, each of whose members will always place his personal safety and security at the disposal of Canada. I was referring to the security of the whole of Canada, the country as a whole.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): If I may make an observation on the last statement made by the minister, there is certainly no problem more difficult than that of security. Anyone who has occupied a position of responsibility, either as minister of justice or as prime minister, realizes how difficult is that responsibility in this particular field.

However, is it not possible to get around the principle enunciated by the minister, if the facts are as stated, by a declaration by the minister that this man is, in fact, not a communist? Such a declaration, if it is the case, would remove any peril or difficulty in which this gentleman finds himself, and could not by any stretch of the imagination impinge or infringe on national security.

Mr. Favreau: This is a matter which would be difficult to determine, but I agree that a delicate situation is involved. I am, to an extent, comforted to learn from the newspapers and from press conferences that, in the words of the person concerned, Mr. Macdonald, he has in fact been expelled from the ranks of the communist party. At least that is what I read in the paper.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Can the minister tell us what steps he intends to take to prevent Mr. Macdonald making public the security provisions which are now in effect in relation to the communist party? As I understand it, Mr. Macdonald intends to make these arrangements public right across the country, and individuals concerned would be named. What steps does the minister intend to take to prevent this breakdown of security?

Mr. Favreau: Of course what is done, or what might be done, by any individual citizen is done, or would be done, on his own responsibility. As to what steps are being taken or will be taken to further the security of Canada, this is something which of course I am not free to divulge at any time, nor is any minister free to divulge this type of information.

Mr. Douglas: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The minister has just said Mr. Macdonald has stated publicly that he was expelled from the communist party. Would the minister tell the house and the country whether he became a member of the communist party in the first place under instructions from the R.C.M. Police?

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, I think this is covered exactly and completely by my first answer to the original question.

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): I have a further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Am I to take it from the minister's previous statement, when he referred to the responsibility of an individual in revealing R.C.M.P. security measures, and so on, that Macdonald is aware of their security regulations and their security operations to the

extent that he can go out and make them known publicly?

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, this question would not have been asked if my answer had been completely understood. Perhaps it was somewhat imprecise. I never said Mr. Macdonald was in possession of any such secrets or otherwise. What I said was that whatever any individual citizen purports to say in respect of what he purports to have done in the past or in the present will always be said under his own responsibility, and personally I could hardly prevent it.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

HAL BANKS—INQUIRY AS TO WHEREABOUTS

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): I would ask the Minister of Justice whether he is now in a position to give us a report on the peregrinations of Hal Banks. Has he any information from United States immigration authorities whether in the course of his departure from justice in Canada Mr. Banks entered the United States and, if so, on what date?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): I have no information as to that although I must repeat what I said in the house previously, namely that the Canadian authorities are presently in touch with United States authorities to obtain whatever information may be supplied to us in this respect.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That was the answer the minister gave a week ago, as I recall it. Surely in the time which has elapsed since that question was asked the minister has been able to place himself in a position to advise us whether the United States immigration authorities have given any information respecting this man.

Mr. Favreau: None has been reported to me, Mr. Speaker.

[*Later:*]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Georges Valade (St. Mary): My question is directed to the Minister of Justice and concerns the whereabouts of Mr. Hal Banks.

Is the minister aware of the fact that Mr. Banks' property in Dorval, Quebec, is offered for sale for the amount of $110,000?

If so, could he not seek information from the real estate agent looking after the sale of that property as to the present whereabouts of Mr. Banks. I submit that this would be a way to find out where Mr. Banks is.

Mr. Favreau: I shall make a note of the question asked by the hon. member, Mr. Speaker.

[*Text*]

VETERANS AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR INCREASE IN BURNT OUT PENSION

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Robert Beaulé (Quebec West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Veterans Affairs. Does he propose at this session to introduce a bill in order to increase the veterans' pensions?

Hon. Roger Teillet (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I answered that question two days ago. I believe and hope I will have a recommendation to make before the fall, that is during this session, if possible.

[*Text*]

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Auguste Choquette (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Public Works. In order to expedite the business of the house, would it be possible to turn out the lights in the house during the flag debate so that filibustering Conservatives may be prevented from reading their speeches?

[*Text*]

SHIPPING

SINKING OF SHIP IN HUDSON STRAITS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. The minister is quite ready to assist the Minister of Justice in answering some of his questions, and I wonder why he does not answer some of his own mail. For the last couple of months I have directed letters to him regarding the sinking of the S. S. *Costello* in Hudson straits. Could the minister tell the house what steps the department has taken to correct the wrong impression which is left abroad because of the sinking of the S. S. *Costello*?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman

did not receive the letter I wrote to him about this matter some days ago, I will send him another copy of it, because it sets the matter out fully.

COMMONWEALTH RELATIONS

PLAN FOR PROVISION OF SCHOLARSHIPS AND FELLOWSHIPS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Arnold Webster (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Will the minister tell the house what proposals he intends to present to the commonwealth education conference this afternoon regarding Canada's part in the commonwealth scholarship and fellowship plan?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. friend for giving me notice of this question. Later today I will be saying something at the conference about a program of senior fellowships and visiting educationalists' awards to be financed out of the appropriation provided in the estimates for the commonwealth scholarship and fellowship plan; also about the assistance, in the form of transportation to be provided to the African students' foundation, a Canadian organization which is bringing students to Canada from Africa.

BROADCASTING

INQUIRY AS TO REPORT OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State. Could the Secretary of State advise the house whether the government have received any report from the advisory committee on broadcasting; and if not, when they might anticipate receiving one?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, we have received no report, and as I said when I announced the setting up of the committee at the end of May, we are still hoping to get a report of the committee early in 1965.

FISHERIES

MARITIME PROVINCES—LOBSTER LICENSING PROCEDURE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries. Is any action contemplated by the minister in relation to the licensing procedure in the lobster industry in the maritime provinces, in view of the stand taken by the Shediac young Liberal association condemning the present procedure?

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, my department is well aware of this situation, which has existed for a number of years, and I must say that it is presently under very active consideration.

PRIVILEGE

MR. KNOWLES—CORRECTION OF RADIO SPEECH BY LEADER OF OPPOSITION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I am rising on a question of privilege which I would have raised at the start of today's proceedings but the Leader of the Opposition, who is involved in it, was a few seconds late in getting into the house. That is quite understandable, but I did not want to raise it until he was in his place. I might also have raised it yesterday when the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg raised his point of privilege about a statement which appeared in *Time*, but as far as my question of privilege is concerned, it was not until this morning that I obtained the necessary transcript so as to be sure of the words used which I feel need correction.

I happened to hear the voice of the Leader of the Opposition over radio station CKPM here in Ottawa the night before last and again yesterday morning, when he made a statement in which there were two errors which should be corrected. I have obtained a transcript from Mr. Paul Taylor of CKPM, and I should like to read the words which I think should be corrected. At one point, referring to my open letter of August 12 to the party leaders, the Leader of the Opposition said:

> When I received his open letter, which was first given to the press—

—and so on. I wish to make it clear, so that all hon. members may know the facts, that I delivered copies of my open letter by hand—not through a messenger; I delivered them myself—to the office of each leader between nine o'clock and five minutes after nine o'clock on Wednesday morning, August 12. I personally delivered copies to the press later for release at eleven o'clock that morning. That is the first correction.

Canadian Flag

The other statement in the transcript I have in my hand arises out of the reference made by the Leader of the Opposition to the occasion when he offered to place my name before the house in nomination for the speakership of this house. He used these words:

For some reason known to him he refused to allow his name to go before the house—

The implication there is that I did not give my reasons. The Leader of the Opposition knows that I wrote him on August 24, 1957, setting out the reasons for my refusal. My letter was in reply to his letter of August 19, 1957, in which he made the offer; and he, the Leader of the Opposition, who was then prime minister, tabled both these letters in the House of Commons on October 17, 1957. They comprise sessional paper No. 178 of that session.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that nothing tremendous turns on these two misstatements, but it is my view that statements made in public by public men should be in accord with the facts.

HARBOURS

VANCOUVER—INQUIRY AS TO LEASES OF WATERFRONT PROPERTIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I just want to ask the Minister of Transport whether he is prepared to reply to the question asked him a few days ago regarding the leasing of some property on the Vancouver waterfront to Coal Harbour Investments Limited. At that time he said he would make a reply shortly. I do not want to take up the minister's time now, but can he give us any information on this matter?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I did make a reply, either yesterday or the day before, at the very end of orders of the day. I do not blame the hon. gentleman for not noticing it because it was one of three replies which were made at the same time. My reply was to the effect that there would be no lease of this property to anyone without the approval of the city of Vancouver.

CANADIAN FLAG

OFFICIAL ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW DESIGN

The house resumed, from Wednesday, August 26, consideration of the motion of Mr. Pearson:

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.

[Mr. Knowles.]

And the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Diefenbaker, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. More.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Battle River-Camrose (Mr. Smallwood).

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would call attention to the fact that the debate was adjourned last night by the Minister without Portfolio, and we should hear from him now.

Mr. Mandziuk: If he has anything to say.

Mr. Speaker: I understand that the Chair did not recognize him last night, although I notice that according to *Hansard* he did ask that it be declared six o'clock.

An hon. Member: He must be out selling stickers.

Mr. C. S. Smallwood (Battle River-Camrose): Mr. Speaker, last night the Minister without Portfolio called it six o'clock, but evidently the hon. member's business has now become so important that he has not even time to stay in this house and complete his speech. We have always been looking for a label for the hon. gentleman, and I suggest we now call him the "minister of bumper stickers".

This letter which he sent to his colleagues is quite interesting and should be brought to the attention of this house. I have a photostat of the letter, which I should like to put on record. It says:

My dear Colleague:
If you are interested, I can procure—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I do not like interrupting the hon. member, but a copy of this letter has been tabled today and is available to any hon. member who wishes to see it. We have had considerable discussion about it. Perhaps the hon. member would confine himself to the subamendment.

Mr. Smallwood: On a point of order, this letter is referring to the subamendment because it deals with the three maple leaves flag which the hon. member is trying to advertise across this country. It is time some of this propaganda was brought to the attention of the Canadian people. This letter has to do with the three maple leaves flag and goes on to say:

—I can procure at a very special price: $25 per thousand stickers...of the proposed flag.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Smallwood:

I believe that every member should sell at least 1,000 to the most important service stations in his riding. The garage manager could then distribute them to each client who buys at his station.

Thus, the result would be better (and would look less political) than if the member undertook this publicity himself.

In my riding I have already placed 12 orders of 1,000 in the gas stations of 12 different localities.

For information or orders call Mr. Gordon Marshall 992-2237. (Only those orders of 1,000 decals or more will be accepted).

The hon. member told his colleagues that he had a special price of $25 per thousand for the proposed maple leaf bumper stickers. I became very interested in this subject this morning and made a number of phone calls. I found one place where I could buy them for $21 per thousand. Where is the extra money going? Is that extra money going to be put in the Liberal campaign fund? Is that party going to benefit in this way by pushing a proposed flag down our throats? These are questions the Prime Minister should consider.

I think the situation is disgraceful. I suggest the Prime Minister and his cabinet are engaging in a propaganda campaign in respect of this flag. If the Prime Minister walked into this chamber now and withdrew his motion and placed the flag issue before a committee I would be glad to take my seat. If he does not do so I shall continue to speak on this resolution at this time, and perhaps speak again on four or five other occasions.

Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate the second time I feel I am doing so with great responsibility. I am supporting the retention of the red ensign or a slightly modified red ensign. Canada has prospered for 96 years under the red ensign. The people of Canada have lived together happily, and we have witnessed intermarriage among the French, English, Ukrainians and many other nationalities. I suggest there is no excuse for the Prime Minister or anyone else at this time to cause the dissension across this country that is now being caused.

Mr. Speaker, I have a resolution before me which I should like to read. This resolution states:

Whereas the red ensign as the flag of Canada, is the symbol of:

(1) democracy,
(2) parliamentary government,
(3) justice and tolerance,
(4) freedom of the individual,
(5) freedom of worship,
(6) educational opportunity for all,
(7) initiative and industry,

and whereas, under this flag and these principles Canada has been developed,

and whereas, the red ensign was chosen as the flag of Canada by authority of an order in council September 5, 1945, by the government of Canada,

and whereas, it was the flag used by the Canadian forces in the last two wars, and now in Cyprus and also carried by the Canadian teams in the Olympic games,

Mr. Speaker, I am expressing the feelings of millions of people in this country when I speak in support of the red ensign. Statistics indicate that nine of the ten provinces in this great country of ours support the red ensign as Canada's national flag. I am sure the people in that other province would also accept the red ensign were it not for the brainwashing which has been done by extremists and university professors, such as we see sitting in the cabinet across from us today.

Mr. Speaker, we in the Conservative party are being accused of filibustering. Let me say that we are not filibustering but fighting on behalf of the people in Canada who support the retention of the red ensign. The members of this party seem to stand alone in this house on this flag issue. We do not have the support of the members of the party to our left. I have a great deal of respect for the leader of the New Democratic party. I know he comes from a part of this country which is in support of the red ensign. That part of the country is not receiving much support from the N.D.P. members in this house.

What has happened to that great parliamentarian, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, who likes to hear himself, even though he must resort to phony points of privilege in order to put his remarks on record? I am sure his constituents are going to be unhappy about his position in this matter.

What has happened to that great Social Credit party next to us? I give the hon. member for Fraser Valley and the hon. member for Cariboo credit for at least rising in their places in this house and taking a stand. What have the rest of the members of that party done?

What has that great parliamentarian, the hon. member for Red Deer, had to say about the flag issue? Mr. Speaker, I have a *Time* magazine bearing the date August 28, 1964 before me. I suggest that it is in *Time* magazine that that hon. gentleman takes a position. He makes his position known outside this house. According to that article Bob Thompson, for one, is fed up. I have received a letter from a Social Credit supporter in

British Columbia who indicates that supporters there are fed up with Bob Thompson. The article in *Time* in part states that according to Bob Thompson:

"The Prime Minister and each of the minority party leaders were willing to come together on any reasonable compromise," he snapped. "Mr. Diefenbaker refused to consult with his own party—"

Mr. Speaker, that is a downright lie. I belong to that party, and we discussed this issue at each and every one of our caucuses. The hon. member for Red Deer should not make statements of that type across this country which are, as I repeat, downright lies. That hon. gentleman has contributed nothing to this debate. I know he comes from a red ensign supporting part of this country, yet he sits in his seat, when he is here, and contributes nothing to the debate except to hand out passes to a couple of undesirables to go in the gallery and throw blood on the floor at a time when our members were speaking in support of the red ensign.

Mr. Patterson: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether it is in order for the hon. member to make such a vicious attack upon the leader of a party at a time when he is unable to be present.

An hon. Member: Why is he not here?

Mr. Patterson: My remarks would apply in respect of any hon. member, for that matter.

Mr. Smallwood: Mr. Speaker I submit that is not a point of order. I am referring to that which appeared in a newspaper, sir. If an hon. member is not here it is not my responsibility. Perhaps I will not be here tomorrow. That hon. gentleman can read what is happening here as reported in *Hansard,* while out in his own constituency, and that is his decision.

The only sensible remark that has been made by a member of that party during this flag debate was made the night before last by the hon. member for Portneuf, who suggested that before individuals be allowed to stand for election they should be given I.Q. tests. I doubt very much that the hon. members over there would stand up to the I.Q. test.

An hon. Member: You would never get back.

Mr. Smallwood: If you want to make a speech go across the river and make it.

Mr. Speaker, let us hear from those members on the Liberal side of this house. We would like to hear from the Ontario members. We have heard from the hon. member for York-Humber and the hon. member for York East, who at least got up on their feet and expressed their opinions. The rest of those hon. members have sat quiet.

The Prime Minister, as a result of poor advice, has placed before this parliament the three maple leaves design flag, as mentioned in the subamendment and the resolution. This flag is not acceptable across this country. Why was the Prime Minister in such a hurry to place this flag resolution before this parliament? Surely there is a great deal more important business that should be dealt with by this house. The hon. member for York-Humber told us that this design was not placed before them in that party, or mentioned in their caucus, but was brought in in a hurry shortly after the Minister of Forestry attended the Quebec conference. Does this flag resolution have something to do with the government's proposed pension plan?

Mr. Speaker, I suggest the flag issue represents one of the biggest blunders that any prime minister has made. He now finds himself with little support for his flag across this country. I suggest he should now give further consideration to this whole matter. He has suggested that the design proposed could not be mistaken for the flag of any other country.

He stated that our present flag is too much like the British merchant flag, and we should get away from that. On several occasions I have mentioned that I have looked through the flag book. I am not allowed to display this, but if anyone cares to come to my desk and look at this flag he will find that the Russian naval flag closely resembles the one proposed by the Prime Minister. It has a white fly, the hammer, sickle and star in red, and a blue band on the bottom. Are we going to throw out our red ensign because it looks like the British merchant flag and accept a flag with the colours of the Russian naval flag? No; we are going to put up a big fight before we have to accept this.

I wonder why the Prime Minister fell for these colours. When we asked for the tabling of the correspondence referring to the flag we found this letter, which says that the communist party supports the proposal for a new Canadian flag. I will not read all this letter but it also says "We urge you to reject the proposal for a plebiscite." I am going to leave this thought with you today, fellow members in this chamber and fellow Canadians across

this country. Think about these statements that have been put on the record today. If you doubt my word, get a flag book and take a look at that Russian naval flag. Then there is that communication. I am going to tell you today that if something is not done about this flag, if we are going to have this flag forced down our throats, then the next speech I make will be one in which I will put a lot more documents on the record and there will be some people with red faces before we are through.

Mr. Godin: After?

Mr. Smallwood: You did enough yapping yesterday. If you just sit on your seat and keep your brains warm you will be a lot better off. Nothing has split this country more than this flag issue. This process was started under the B and B commission, and now we have the flag issue to add to it. As stated by the hon. member for York-Humber earlier, there was no mention of the flag anywhere but in the province of Quebec. Out west we were offered $2 wheat, and I suppose in the maritimes they were offered a larger amount for fish or lumber. The people of Quebec resent the fact that they are being used as tools for political purposes. I have talked to many people from the province of Quebec. The French Canadians are fine people, and I have a great many friends amongst them. I have been through the province of Quebec, and when you get to the rural areas you find the farming people very friendly. They would like to see this government do something for them. They cannot eat a flag, but they could do with some assistance to agriculture. The Minister of Agriculture has not the legislation prepared yet, so we have to fight over this flag.

Only the other night several good French Canadians told me they were being embarrassed by the actions of these intellectuals, these Creditistes and the people who are speaking about the desire for this new flag. Quebec has a fleur-de-lis flag. Premier Lesage says this new flag will be their second flag.

An hon. Member: What about the third one?

Mr. Smallwood: Well, the Prime Minister will give them a third one, too.

Mr. Godin: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Could the hon. member tell the house where verification can be found for his statement about Premier Lesage? Was the statement made to him?

Mr. Smallwood: That is no question of privilege.

Mr. Skoreyko: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: We already have one question of privilege.

Mr. Smallwood: That is a phony point of order; he is usually yapping on these points of order.

Mr. Godin: This is a point of order. A member of this house is required to substantiate any declaration he has made by giving the source of that declaration.

Mr. Smallwood: If you had to substantiate your thoughts or declarations you would have a hard time, because you do not have any thoughts. I said I wanted to speak in support of the red ensign. I should like to place on record a portion of an open letter to the Prime Minister from Winnipeg:

Dear Sir:

Mr. Pearson, in his latest speech on the "Nation's Business", stressed two points: 1, the need for Canadian unity—2, the need for a "distinctive" Canadian flag.

Regarding the first point, i.e. the need for Canadian unity, everybody knows that the public controversy aroused to date by the introduction of Mr. Pearson's flag has reduced Canadian unity to the lowest ebb in our history.

Regarding the second point, i.e. the need for a "distinctive" Canadian flag, only Mr. Pearson seems to be unaware of the fact that we have in the red ensign one of the most distinctive flags in the world. Where it flies on Canadian embassies, no one fails to recognize it as Canadian. Only Mr. Pearson seems to doubt this. Yet Mr. Pearson's flag possesses no distinctiveness whatsoever, and can in no way be compared with our nation's flag, the Canadian red ensign.

I would say to hon. members here today that if they consider we do not have a distinctive flag they should go over to the front of the west block, walk up and down and look at the flags displayed there. They will see that the Canadian flag stands out from all the others that are there.

Here is a letter now to Right Hon. John Diefenbaker:

Dear Mr. Diefenbaker:

We have been greatly encouraged by your last pronouncement on the "Nation's Business" on television regarding the flag issue, and also by the news report that your party is continuing the fight for the red ensign.

The loss of the red ensign would cause a split in our nation such as we have never known before. This split added to the Pearson bicultural rift could spell the ruination of our future as a nation.

We believe that if the people of Canada fully understood the traditions represented by the symbols on the red ensign, they would overwhelmingly endorse its retention as our flag.

You and your party are our last hope for preserving unity. We, therefore, thank you for your continuing efforts on behalf of the great majority of Canadians.

These are the reasons, Mr. Speaker, for our support of this flag. There are more letters that I could read, but I see my time is nearly exhausted. I say, sir, this matter is becoming serious. Something must be done. The government got itself into this problem by trying to force the maple leaf flag on the Canadian people when they are not prepared to accept it. The next move is up to the Prime Minister. I am reminded of the old proverb which says he who is on the wrong track and will not turn back is a fool. I say to the government, you are on the wrong track and it is time you turned back and withdrew this resolution. You should accept the recommendation for a committee or a plebiscite or some means of letting the Canadian people choose the distinctive flag they want.

We hear a lot about our flag not being distinctive and not being known throughout the world, but I have a picture here of our soldiers over in France and the red ensign is flying as they march by. The time has come for the government to give very serious consideration to withdrawing the flag resolution. The Prime Minister will be looked upon across Canada with a great deal more respect than he is today if he does that, because people will know he has realized he made a mistake and is man enough to acknowledge it.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: I wonder if the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre would stand aside for the hon. member for Greenwood, who spoke to me about his wish to make reference to a sentence in somebody else's speech, which in my opinion he has the right to do under standing order 37, which says:

> No member may speak twice to a question except in explanation of a material part of his speech which may have been misquoted or misunderstood—

I understand he will be very brief, and that it is in the nature of a correction.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. That is what I desire to do, to take brief advantage of the opportunity presented by standing order 37. Yesterday during the debate on this matter the hon. member for Saint John-Albert, as recorded at page 7304 of *Hansard,* made the following statement:

> I was also interested in the speech of the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) the other day. Everybody in the house knows he is a very active Anglican layman, and I say more power to him. But in his speech he disowned completely the red ensign and its historic traditions and connections with the Anglican church. He made absolutely no reference to it. I am not criticizing his stand but I think he should have tried to explain this change in his thinking.

[Mr. Smallwood.]

In the very brief contribution I did make to this debate a few days ago I did not disown the red ensign. In fact, on the contrary I specifically proposed that the red ensign be officially recognized as a symbol in Canada of the commonwealth. But what is a lot more important is the statement by the hon. member that I disowned the historic connection of the Anglican church with the red ensign.

So far as I know the Anglican church at no time has taken any stand whatsoever on what would be a suitable flag for Canada, and has no historic connection with the red ensign. There is no such thing as Anglican orthodoxy on this issue and the hon. member, as an Anglican, has just as much right to his view as I, another Anglican, have to disagree with him. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have only one or two more sentences. I would like to remind hon. members in this house—

Mr. Churchill: I rise on a point of order. This, I understand, is a point of privilege which the hon. member is raising?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, it is. Both the hon. member and I did not think it was important enough to raise right at the opening of the sitting, and I suggested to him that inasmuch as it concerned the flag debate he could ask the indulgence of the house for two or three minutes to correct what he believed was a misinterpretation of his statements.

Mr. Churchill: It seems a bit odd to me that rebuttal of statements made in the course of debate should be done by way of privilege on this occasion. Surely the hon. member can participate again and deal with any remarks made in the course of debate here by way of rebuttal. All he is doing now is smuggling in a rebuttal by way of a question of privilege. I think this is quite wrong. If it is to be the established practice of the house, then it is open to all members to do the same on any occasion when something is said with which they disagree. The hon. member should take his opportunity in the debate, and there will be other opportunities for him to make a rebuttal.

Mr. Speaker: The last part of standing order 37(1) says:

> —but then he is not to introduce any new matter, and no debate shall be allowed upon such explanation.

I was interrupted for a moment, but I understood the hon. member was trying to explain a material part of his speech which may have been misconstrued or misunderstood, and I am sure if the hon. member would stick to that we would have no more trouble.

Mr. Brewin: I just have one or two more things to say, and that is what I was trying to do, to say I was misunderstood by the hon. member who said I had somehow or other abandoned Anglican tradition. I was about to finish my remarks by pointing out that the Anglican church of Canada itself, when it adopted its own flag or emblem, which I believe was approved by statute in this house, had incorporated in its emblem not one, not three, but in fact four maple leaves, coloured green, not red, and they were not conjoined. But there is no Anglican tradition that requires people of loyalty to the Anglican church to adopt any particular flag, and I deplore my hon. friend interjecting into this debate the reference to some supposed religious orthodoxy on the matter before the house.

The particular church we are both discussing has broadened out so that the old jibe is no longer true, that the Anglican church was the Tory party at prayer. I do not think we should have that suggestion.

Mr. Diefenbaker: With great respect, Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of order. The hon. gentleman knows very well that type of statement has no place whatsoever after he has participated in debate. While interested, as one of Baptist persuasion always is in questions of ecclesiastical orthodoxy, I do not think even that fact justifies what the hon. gentleman has done.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I enter this debate because I believe the concern I feel is shared literally by millions of Canadians. My concern is for something more than the various flags we are discussing; my concern is for parliament itself.

I dearly wish it were possible for some kind of mirror to be installed so that all of us in this parliament could see what it looks like during the course of this debate. If we cannot do that at least I feel we should pay some attention to the reports we are getting from our people back home, the pleadings that are reaching us that we discipline ourselves to the point of reaching a decision on the matters that are now before us.

Canadian Flag

Last Saturday I had the privilege of spending the day in a lovely rural town in my own province of Manitoba. On that day I was not in my own constituency; I was in the constituency of my friend the hon. member for Portage-Neepawa (Mr. Enns). It is an area that is Conservative. There was not any question amongst the people whom I met—and I met a good many at a social function—as to which flag they wanted. They wanted the red ensign.

But, Mr. Speaker, there was not a person present at the function I attended last Saturday in this Conservative red ensign area who did any flag waving or pressed upon me any ideas so far as the flag was concerned. Every person who spoke to me asked "What's wrong with parliament? What's wrong with you people down there that you talk on and on and on? Are you crazy? Have you got no sense, no discipline, no concern for what the people of the country think about parliament?"

My purpose in rising is to urge all of us in this house to take a very close look at ourselves and at what we are doing by this protracted debate, and by the character of the debate at times—people can read *Hansard* for this afternoon—to the institution of parliament itself. I plead with all my friends in the house in all parties, whatever may be their views on the flag, to realize that there is something more important than winning this debate, winning an issue, or seeing that one leader triumphs over the other. That more important goal is to maintain the dignity and the integrity and the importance of parliament itself. Hon. members know that I am a strong advocate of—

Mr. Bigg: Hairsplitting.

Mr. Knowles: —finding ways and means of disciplining ourselves so that we do not have protracted debates. That is so well known that I do not need to expand upon proposals I have made for the allocation of time by agreement. But hon. members also know it is my firm view that once a debate has started the rules cannot be changed in the middle of it; you cannot even use standing order 33, the rule for closure, without doing irreparable damage to parliament. And I say to hon. members, even to those who by continuing this debate are taking a course which I deplore, that if closure is imposed I will oppose it, because I think closure does damage to the institution of parliament. But I ask hon. members not to shelter behind the knowledge that closure will not be imposed, or behind the knowledge

that enough of us will be opposed to the application of closure. I ask them not to continue with the kind of protracted debate which can do nothing but bring parliament into discredit and disgrace in the eyes of the Canadian people.

This is supposed to be the most important institution in Canada. This is where 19 million Canadians govern themselves.

Mr. Bigg: On a point of order, the hon. member is simply preaching at us.

Mr. Skoreyko: On a point of order, I understand that this house is engaged in a debate on a flag design. We are now being given just another superfluous lecture on the rules. We are well acquainted with the rules which govern this house. Let the hon. member tell us where he stands on the flag issue. That is the question before us.

Mr. Knowles: I ask anybody to read the speeches which have been made in this debate during the last few days and tell me what can possibly be out of order. Everything has been discussed. But the fact is that I am discussing this debate itself and I am asking hon. members to recognize that, important though they feel the subject is, there is something even more important, namely parliament itself.

Mr. Bigg: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is giving us what amounts to a lecture. We are supposed to be considering the flag issue, and here we have a lecture from this would-be schoolteacher who talks about a filibuster yet forgets that his own party filibustered for two years on the divorce issue.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The Chair has been generous in allowing a wide range of introductory remarks, and that applies to all members of the house in all parties. I do not see where the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is out of order at the present time.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles: I do not resent the suggestion by the hon. member for Athabasca that I may be indulging in a little preaching. But if I am doing so, I am preaching to all of us in this house, no matter to what parties we belong or what stand we take on the flag issue. I am pleading that we recognize the importance of the institution as well as of the subject we are debating.

Mr. Bigg: Let the tailor tailor the cloth.

Mr. Knowles: I have done a little arithmetic to ascertain just what has been taking place in this debate. If my counting is accurate, and I believe it is, this is the sixteenth day of debate on the flag. During the 15 sitting days of debate which ended last night we had a total of 125 speakers. The breakdown—and the Prime Minister was asked a question about this on the orders of the day but he did not have the answers—is as follows: 3 from the Ralliement Créditiste; 7 from the Social Credit party; 5 from the New Democratic party; 28 from the Liberal party and 82 from the Conservative party.

Mr. Bigg: Just what part of the subamendment are you speaking on?

Mr. Knowles: Since the subamendment was moved by the hon. member for Regina City there have been 64 speeches. Until last night —I have not counted speeches made today— the breakdown is as follows: Social Credit, 4; New Democratic party, 2; Liberals, 7; Progressive Conservatives, 51.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Knowles: This represents a fair amount of discussion on this issue; a total of 125 speakers, 82 in one party and 43 in all the others. But this is not all the time we have spent on this flag issue. On a total of 31 different days questions on orders of the day have been asked about the flag, and on a minimal basis the number of those questions is 145. In this figure I have not included second or third questions asked by any one member on the same day. In other words, all I have counted is the number of individuals who have stood on orders of the day to ask questions about the flag, whether one, two, three or whatever may have been the case.

Mr. Simpson: What was the breakdown there?

Mr. Knowles: I am sorry; I do not have the breakdown, but I will work that out as well. In addition, we have spent three private members' hours between five and six o'clock on matters relating to the flag. The flag question was also discussed in four of the overtime periods after ten o'clock or 10.30 p.m. Added to that, there were several points of order and questions of privilege involving the flag issue.

I suggest the evidence is overwhelming that we have thoroughly discussed this flag question from all its various angles, and that it ought to be possible for reasonable, grown people, after so much discussion, after so many days of deliberation, after all these attacks on the problem, to reach a decision.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles: It seems to me we should consider the amount of time we are spending on this item in the light of our responsibility to the other measures which have to come before us. There is a long list of things on the order paper—

Mr. Churchill: May I ask a question of the hon. member?

Mr. Knowles: Gladly.

Mr. Churchill: The hon. member talks about other matters which should come before us. Why are they not before us? The government refuses to bring its legislation forward. It refuses to deal with the main estimates. It says "The flag issue, and nothing else".

Mr. Knowles: That is a good question to put to the government. I shall have something to say on that in a moment if the hon. gentleman will possess himself in patience. But I suggest that all of us have to take some responsibility. If we spend so much time on one issue, we are not able to get on to the others.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles: There is something else that is happening because we are spending so much time on this issue—and we spend time on all issues, apparently, in this parliament —and that is that we are abdicating our responsibilities as the elected parliament of Canada. There was an article about the establishment in the current issue of *Maclean's* magazine, by Peter Newman, that everybody is reading with interest. We are turning the government of Canada over to the establishment; we are getting rid of democracy by making parliament a sideshow that deals with things which are less important than the major issues that are before this country.

I plead with hon. members of this house to realize what we are doing, by the way in which we are carrying on this debate. I say again, Mr. Speaker, that any effort to impose any kind of closure on this debate will meet with my opposition. The rules for debate as they were when this debate started must remain until this debate is over. I ask hon. members not to confuse that with the efforts I am making regarding future debates; but I say that so far as this debate is concerned closure must not be applied to it. I plead with hon. members of the official opposition if they are not concerned about the image of the government, if they are not concerned about the fortunes of the party on the other side, to be concerned about the image of parliament itself.

Mr. Dinsdale: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Knowles: I should be very glad to.

Mr. Dinsdale: Would the hon. member not agree that when the government or the executive pursues an arbitrary and a divisive course in its policy, the only recourse of the legislature is a continuation of discussion; and is this not the course that his party pursued in connection with divorce matters?

Mr. Knowles: Some members of my party pursued that course with respect to that matter.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Knowles: Just a minute. Don't get so excited; I didn't come to parliament yesterday. This whole party took that position with respect to the pipe line debate in 1956. As my hon. friend knows, what he has said is right in principle, and I will assert it; that if a government is trying to do something that members feel is completely inimical to everything the nation stands for—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles: —yes, those who take that position should use what weapons they have at their disposal to try and prevent that happening. But I say two things to them. They must be sure they are right in the stand they take; and the other thing is that they must also remember there is such a thing as the right of a parliamentary body to make a decision.

My hon. friends of the Conservative opposition keep talking about the minority government ramming something down their throats. May I say to them that by their continuing this debate they are preventing a decision being taken; they are preventing our being given an opportunity to move an amendment for a single maple leaf, as they know we wish to do; they are preventing proper parliamentary procedures; they are preventing parliament from making a decision; they are preventing us from getting at other business; they are preventing us from running the country; they are turning things over to the establishment.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

An hon. Member: Now we see the plot.

Mr. Skoreyko: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who has just taken his seat—

Mr. Knowles: I am sorry; I have not taken my seat.

Mr. Skoreyko: Well, I am on a point of order.

Mr. Knowles: All right.

Mr. Skoreyko: The hon. member said that because this debate is being prolonged the government is being prevented from dealing with other business. It is my understanding, as it is his, that the Prime Minister of this country said that as soon as this debate was over we were going to take a recess. If the Conservative party prefers to put responsibility before recess, then we will stand the consequences.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, may I remind my hon. friend from Edmonton that the time for the recess has just about gone. May I also remind him that one day a week or so ago the Prime Minister, in response to questions we asked him, did agree that if we got this debate over during the time a recess was still supposed to come, he would bring on the pension legislation and let it go through the first stages so it could go to a committee before any recess. I submit that the argument that we are merely depriving ourselves of a recess no longer holds water; the recess time has gone and we all know there is not going to be any recess. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, since we are here to do the business of the country, I think it is up to us to discipline ourselves so that we pay some attention to the business that really deserves our attention.

I want to say some things about this debate to the two main groups in this House of Commons. I am going to address myself first to the Progressive Conservative party and then I am going to address myself to the government.

Mr. Choquette: What about the Speaker?

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette) has made a very important objection.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order, I think it might result in better progress in the house if we were to listen to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) without continued interruption.

Mr. Choquette: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. gentleman is obliged to address himself to the Speaker and not to the Liberals or the Conservatives.

[Mr. Skoreyko.]

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, I quite enjoyed the interruption made by the hon. member for Lotbinière, who is technically correct. I was speaking in a rhetorical sense. Through you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make certain suggestions to the members of the official opposition and then to the government and to its supporters. I trust the hon. member for Lotbinière will agree with my putting it that way.

Mr. Fane: That was his first lucid remark.

Mr. Knowles: First of all, Mr. Speaker—and I hope my Conservative friends will take this seriously, even if they do not like its coming from me—I believe they owe us in the house and they owe the country an honest, straightforward statement as to what their purposes and their intentions are in this debate.

Mr. Churchill: Well, Mr. Speaker, "honest" has an unfortunate imputation.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) does not like my use of the word "honest", so I will take it out. I ask for a straightforward statement by the Conservatives of their intentions and purposes in this debate. Maybe there is some other intention than the two that occur to me, but it seems to me it is one or the other.

Mr. Bigg: What are yours?

Mr. Knowles: I am trying to get parliament back on the rails.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles: One intention of the Conservative party in carrying on the debate at length—and the statistics I gave can hardly be denied—may be to discuss the matter thoroughly and fully, to bring up all the angles, to go into the matter from every possible aspect. That is a legitimate purpose. But if that is the purpose of the Conservatives, let them say so. If that is their purpose, they should be willing to agree to extended hours of sitting so there can be time for that full debate they feel to be necessary.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles: If that is their purpose, Mr. Speaker, I call upon them to say so and to take a position consistent with that purpose. On the other hand, if their purpose is to prolong the debate so as to prevent a decision being taken, I think they should say so, not only to us out in the halls—where they do say it to us—but here on the floor of the house.

If it is their intention to keep this debate going through all of September and into October; if it is their intention to keep it going until we get to the next interim supply time and thus force the government either to suspend the flag debate or to ditch it, I think they should say so.

If they have a purpose other than these two, then that is for them to say. But for us to go on from day to day and for parliament and the country not to know what this chamber is being used for is not fair to parliament, is not fair to the country and is not fair to the great history of this nation. I call upon them to tell us which of these purposes they are pursuing.

Mr. Alkenbrack: The ensign is part of that history.

Mr. Knowles: Is their purpose full and free debate? If so, we will co-operate in providing the extra hours to make this possible. But if it is to prevent a decision, let them say so, in order that the house may know where it is and what it has to cope with.

Now through you, Mr. Speaker, I want to say something to the government. If it is declared to be the purpose of the official opposition to have full and free debate, and if that is straightforwardly their position, I think the government should co-operate by providing the extra hours so that we can take a full decision. The government should make the declaration, in addition, that there will be no closure or any attempt to foreclose this debate.

Mr. Forbes: We have already seen through that.

Mr. Knowles: There is nothing to be seen through. I am speaking frankly and openly, and it is plain to be seen if hon. members will look at it.

Mr. Churchill: We are on extended hours now.

Mr. Knowles: The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) says we have extended hours now, and that is right. But if the purpose is simply to have a free debate in order for us at some point to get to other matters, I suggest that we should be willing to extend the hours still further. We in this party are prepared to do that and I hope there might be the necessary consent to make it possible.

If the other reason for continuing this debate is the true purpose—if the aim is to prevent the making of a decision and that is made clear by the Conservatives—then I suggest it is up to the government to face that situation and to try to decide what to do about it.

I have three suggestions to make to the government. I have already made the first one but let me put it in different language. I suggest that the government should be prepared to sit it out. By that I mean that the government must eschew—I was accused of being a preacher so perhaps I can use that word—any thought of closure in any form. It must sit this debate out.

The second suggestion I make to the government is that it must keep the door open for any kind of conference which will resolve the issue. The last time the Prime Minister made a statement on the meetings of the party leaders he did say something to that effect at the end of his remarks—that the door would still be open. I plead that that door be kept wide open and that at any time when it is possible a conference should be held, either on the debate itself or on the design of a flag. It seems to me that referring the matter to a committee—unless all five men get together and agree on it—is just delaying the issue. If there is any chance of the five leaders getting together on some kind of compromise on the design, I hope that such a conference might be held at any time.

The hon. member for Battle River-Camrose (Mr. Smallwood) who spoke earlier this afternoon asked me whether I was having any correspondence with the Legion in Winnipeg with regard to my position on this flag. Yes, I have had correspondence with the Legion officials in Winnipeg. It is the kind of correspondence which goes back and forth between people who, if they have different views, still respect each other. If I had known that that reference was going to be made I would have brought down with me the last letter I had from the Legion. There was one sentence in the last letter which I had from the Legion in Winnipeg which struck me rather forcibly. The writer of the letter, who was one of the officials of the Legion in Winnipeg, said to me—this was when he thought the issue was just about over—"It is too bad there could not have been some kind of compromise". I congratulate the Legion wholeheartedly for that position. I think it is wrong to suggest that the Legion is an uncompromising organization. In the Legion's own language is the comment that it is too bad there has not been a compromise. I urge the government to keep the door open for a conference at any

time, either between the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition or among the five party leaders, so as to achieve some kind of compromise which will produce a design. Toward that end, despite what has been said here, I am not concerning myself in these remarks with the design of the flag, because I do not think that is as important as finding a way to resolve the issue and thus save the good name of parliament.

There is one other suggestion I would make to the government, and I make it in as pleading terms as I possibly can. All of this is based on the second premise that the Conservative party will tell us that its purpose is to prevent action being taken. If that is the case then I urge the government not only to sit it out with no thought of closure, keeping the door open for conferences to take place, but also to arrange that from now on the flag debate take place on only three days a week. I should like to point out that I am trying to be reasonable and I am suggesting a practical proposition. I therefore propose that from now on we have one day a week on estimates, as is now the case, three days a week on the flag, and the other day, which I suggest be Monday, on other legislation. There is the Canada pension plan.

Mr. Forbes: It is not ready.

Mr. Knowles: There is redistribution. There is the railway legislation and there is the Bank Act. There is all kinds of other legislation. My hon. friend says it is not ready, but I urge the government to get it ready. The government did say a week or so ago that if this debate is over before the proposed recess we might have the pension plan. Let us get at that, and also at the national labour code. These matters have been promised since the start of the session and the list is a long one.

I believe that if there is no option but to sit out a long debate on this issue, with the resultant damage which I feel is being done to parliament in the eyes of the people, we could correct that image considerably and improve our position a great deal if each week while this debate continues we spend one day on estimates and one day on these other important items of legislation. Then if hon. members knew that the session was being planned in that way there would be no temptation to protract the debate on other legislation on Mondays or to protract the debate on the estimates on Fridays. In this way we could start to redeem ourselves and get some business through and make things look a lot better than they do now.

I do not mind the interjections and the points of order which have been raised during the course of my speech; a speech like this is bound to invite the kind of comments I have heard because I have been treading on toes. But I hope I have been treading on toes of members on both sides of the house. I understand the position of a government faced with a protracted debate—and I am not using that awful word that people do not like to hear—which is spelled out by the statistics I have given. Even if the government feels this is wrong and that it is being dealt with unfairly by the opposition, it is still the government. It is still responsible for parliament and it is still responsible to the people of the country for this institution, and it should lean over backwards to take the kind of steps which will make this parliament look much better than it has looked over these past three or four months when discussing this issue. The best way to do that is for everyone to agree to let the debate end and get on with other business. If we cannot do that, then I call on the government to accept the proposal which I have made and to limit the flag debate to three days a week, with one day on other legislation and one day on estimates. If we do this kind of thing and hold conferences among the house leaders regarding business, conferences on redistribution and on the Canada pension plan, and leaders' conferences on the flag, because we are reasonable and grown up people, I believe can do something to save this institution and make this present parliament, not one which will look bad in Canadian history but one which might yet be regarded as one of the better parliaments in the history of this country.

Mr. Churchill: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Knowles: I would be delighted.

Mr. Churchill: Does the hon. member not see that there is a principle involved in the flag debate, the principle being the preservation of our history and traditions, as exemplified in the Canadian flag which some people are anxious to discard?

Mr. Knowles: I think a much greater principle is involved. I do not find fault with those who feel as they do about certain designs for a flag, but I feel that the institution of parliamentary democracy is far more important, and it is that which we should primarily aim to save.

Mr. Moreau: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre also agree that there is a further principle involved? We have heard a great deal from the official opposition in respect of a free vote. Would the hon. member not agree that hon. members should be allowed a free vote, and that this issue should be allowed to come to a vote?

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, I believe I answered that question earlier in my remarks. I think that parliament should, after a reasonable amount of discussion, have the opportunity of making a decision. I also think that some of the rest of us should have an opportunity to put our proposals before this house. Technically speaking, although the debate has wandered all over the place, we have been debating since June 15 a Conservative amendment and a Conservative subamendment. We would like a chance to debate a New Democratic party amendment to the main motion.

Mr. Churchill: At what length?

Mr. Knowles: For a reasonable length of time. I think one or two days would be sufficient.

Mr. Hales: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the hon. member would permit one more question? Does he not realize that the proceedings of this house, as well as the legislation that is brought before it, is the responsibility of the Prime Minister, and that when such legislation bogs down it could be completed almost immediately if the Prime Minister would allow this matter to be referred to a committee?

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, I accept the point made by the hon. member for Wellington South, that the responsibility for organizing the business of the house and for what happens in the house rests with the government. That is why I made my appeal to the government, that being faced with these difficulties in respect of this subject it ought not require parliament to spend all week on it. I think the committee idea is a possible one, but apparently the five leaders cannot agree on the terms of reference and the various arrangements. That is why I called upon the Prime Minister and the government to keep the door open for conferences of this kind.

If my hon. friend feels I have directed most of my fire against those who have kept this debate going, perhaps he is right; but I have also called upon the government, in spite of the feeling it may have that it is facing difficulties, and facing the kind of position it ought not to have to face, to realize that it is still the government's responsibility to find a way out of this mess. I believe if the government accepted my proposal, that one day a week be used for legislation, one day a week for estimates and three days a week for the flag debate, with the absolute understanding that there would be no closure of any kind, we would get along much better. Perhaps it would not be long under those circumstances before we could reach an agreement on a proper *modus operandi.*

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. gentleman permit me to ask a question?

Mr. Knowles: Yes.

Mr. Pickersgill: Does the hon. gentleman not think in fairness to the Prime Minister he should have reminded the hon. member for Wellington South that the Prime Minister indicated he and the leaders of the three smaller parties were agreeable to forming a committee; if there was a reasonable time limit on its deliberations?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Pickersgill: I asked that question of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles).

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am speaking to a question of privilege.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. Has the right hon. gentleman not already spoken?

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am rising on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I have not already spoken.

Mr. Pickersgill: I hope these remarks will be counted as his speech.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I advise the hon. gentleman that his summary is entirely incorrect. As far as the suggestion made by the other hon. gentleman, that his plan would be one that could be acceptable, I rise also to say that we will fall in line with that 100 per cent.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, before the hon. gentleman replies, and since this discussion is being treated as a question of privilege, and my accuracy has been contested, I point out that when the Prime Minister gave his report, the leaders of the three smaller parties spoke, and the right hon. gentleman

spoke. At the end of that statement the Prime Minister indicated that he had accepted the principle of establishing a committee, if there was a reasonable time limit placed on its deliberation. The right hon. gentleman himself confirmed what the Prime Minister had said.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that *Hansard* will reveal the situation more clearly. There were two points made. I took the stand with respect to such a committee, that in view of the fact that the Liberal party has its major ally in the Creditistes, who are 100 per cent in support of removing the union jack, and that with two or three exceptions the general view held by the members of each of the other parties was that the union jack should be removed, while this party stands in favour of preservation of that part of our heritage and the heritage as well of the French, if the majority of that committee was to make a decision, the decision would be made before the committee started, on the basis of the representation on such a committee. If the decision was to be based on an 80 or 90 per cent basis, and that is the only way in which a flag should be imposed on the people, we would gladly accept that suggestion. That is our stand now. However, to say that whatever report the committee brought in and if it was only a majority decision, the debate should be limited, would mean that we are beaten in advance in respect of the stand we are taking.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, since my veracity has been questioned I feel I should put on record again the words used by the Prime Minister on August 21, which will be found at page 7113 of *Hansard*. The Prime Minister said:

> Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether I am in order, but I did not make any statement except on the facts of what occurred at the meetings. The right hon. Leader of the Opposition—and I am not complaining at all about it—referred to the suggestion that a committee should be established to look into this question. I think I ought to put on record that we on this side are not opposed to such a committee, but we do not think such a committee should meet for an indefinite period of time and thereby unduly delay this matter. In addition, we believe that the report of this committee should be subject to a time limitation of debate when it is received by the house.

In other words it is perfectly clear that the government as well as the leaders of the other three parties—quite a substantial majority of this house—were in favour of having a committee with a time limit, and a time limit on the debate afterwards. The right hon. gentleman uses words seeking to distort what was said, but he will not be able to distort the facts.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to engage in an argument with the hon. gentleman, but when it comes to distortion, he is the past grand master.

Mr. Pickersgill: I am not even in the same league.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is right, you are in the bush league.

Mr. Speaker, the point I am making is this. There were two principles advanced in respect of the establishment of a committee. We believe that a committee could meet and consider this matter. I said three months should be the period beyond which a committee should not meet. The Prime Minister, as I recall, and I am speaking from memory, said that he thought three weeks, or thereabouts, would be sufficient. I said they should have a free vote, and then if the recommendation made by that committee was substantially unanimous there could be no question as to whether we would agree to a limitation on debate in respect of that committee's report. The view of the other leaders generally was that the usual rule should apply and that a majority should be sufficient. If we accept that and allow the 15 members of that committee to decide the issue we might just as well not have a committee at all, because it would consist of seven Liberals and one representative of each of the other parties. If only one of those members, perhaps the Creditiste member whose party is entirely united, were to decide in favour of removing the union jack and having no vestige of the union jack in the flag, then the committee would simply end there and then. When the matter came back to the house under those circumstances, we would not accept this recommendation. However, if it were substantially unanimous, there would certainly be a limitation and we would be glad to accept a limitation on the basis of a decision of a committee like that.

Mr. Knowles: I rise simply to refer to the question the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) asked me, and which started this last bit of demonstration. He asked me if I would make certain remarks about the position of the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson). I thought I had implied that in what I said, and if I did not imply it, then it has now been put on the record.

There is nothing more for me to put on the record with regard to that, but I should like to say that we have had a demonstration

in the last few minutes of what we all know to be a fact, namely that we are at an impasse; horns are locked and we are in a difficult situation. In the name of all that is right in terms of parliamentary procedure, in the name of the people of Canada, I plead that we find a way out of this. Others have made suggestions, and I made some this afternoon which I hope will be taken seriously by the Prime Minister and by others, despite what has been said.

If I might summarize them quickly, I ask the members of the official opposition to state clearly their intentions; then I ask the government to take these intentions into consideration. If it is the second intention, namely to go on at length, then I urge the government to do three things: One, sit it out without any resort to closure of any kind; two, keep the door open for conferences and compromises; three, plan the week's business in the way I suggested, one day on other legislation, three days on the flag and a day on estimates. I believe if we did this we might start to make some progress.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Accepted here and now; it is up to the government.

Mr. George Muir (Lisgar): I listened with amazement, as I am sure many other members did, to the lecture we just received from the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). Of all the people who should be lecturing the house about taking up the time of parliament, he should be the last. I should like to draw attention to the fact that in the 1952-53 session he took up one third of *Hansard*. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that when an hon. member gets up to speak in this fashion he should practise what he preaches. I should like also to draw your attention to the index from February 18 to July 31 in which you will find there are three full pages given to headings under the name of Mr. Stanley Knowles. The hon. member said that when he was referring to members taking a long time he might be stepping on people's toes, but I suggest instead of that he is stumbling over his own toes. In other words, he is asking for a double standard, one for himself and one for the other members of the house.

Now, Mr. Speaker, had I been given the opportunity to conclude my remarks the last time I spoke on this issue it would not have been necessary for me to take part in the debate at this stage. However, since no one on the treasury benches has replied to the questions I put to them concerning the new flag, and since no satisfactory explanation has been given to the country as to why we should be seeking to scrap our present proud flag, I feel these questions should be placed on the record again. I feel this very strongly, particularly since there has been little or no attempt on the part of government members to justify their stand on the flag. They show no great concern for the effect that the proposed political flag is having on our national unity. I should like also to look into the matter of the so-called free vote that the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) now says will be taken on any division on the flag issue. I think one of his supporters, the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) expressed it very well when he said a resolution proposed by the Prime Minister and seconded by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau) could not be considered other than a government measure, that it would be regarded as such during any vote that would be taken by his colleagues on the government side. The only way in which a free vote could have been achieved would have been for the Prime Minister to ask one of his private members to introduce the resolution. Had this procedure been followed, I am quite sure the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson), who is a co-designer of the Prime Minister's pennant, would have welcomed the opportunity. He may have had some reservations because he is reported to have expressed some doubts as to its proper heraldry. I am sorry the hon. member is not in the house this afternoon—he was earlier—but I am equally sure the hon. member for Kootenay East (Mr. Byrne) would have been glad to act as seconder. His great contribution to the flag debate has been recorded in *Hansard* by a series of, "Oh, oh's".

Now, the little matter of heraldry does not seem to bother the designer commissioned by the Prime Minister to design a flag for him. He is reported also in the press as saying that anyone who did not like the blue edges could cut them off. It does not seem to bother the Prime Minister because, in answer to a question he said Canadians could fly any flag they like. Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, it probably would be much more appropriate if the government were to give to each Canadian a new flagpole rather than a new flag.

While the matter of the flag that Canadians may fly is not too important to some people, I find that the majority of the people with whom I have talked or corresponded have a deep regard for our present national

flag. This is particularly true of those who suffered the deprivations, illness, the humility and degradation of the prisoner of war camps. During a recent visit to my home constituency I talked to a Hong Kong veteran who had spent a long period in the prisoner of war compound on the island. He said he will never forget, nor will the Canadians with him ever forget, the day when the red ensign was once more raised on the flagpole over the prisoner of war compound. He said they knew on that day that freedom had come to them once again, and that peace and justice again walked hand in hand across the land once more.

I have with me a couple of typical telegrams which I have received from my local Legions. I think a lot of hon. members have received similar telegrams. One of these was sent to myself and the other is a copy of one sent to the Prime Minister. I believe that the Legions, their families and friends are, generally speaking, wholeheartedly in favour of retaining our present flag, and this is what the first telegram says:

> The Crystal City Legion have not changed their stand on regards red ensign and expect your full support.

The other telegram sent to the Prime Minister, with a copy to myself, says:

> It is the desire of the Canadian Legion branch No. 21 Manitou, Manitoba, that the red ensign be the national flag of Canada.

If a flag is to have any meaning it must symbolize first of all the people's pride in the nation's past achievements. It must symbolize their love of country at the present and their hopes and aspirations for its future. The part now so recklessly being played by the government with regard to our national unity will foster bitterness and division at the time harmony is so urgently required within the nation itself. Harmony is needed, not so much because we have to face any insurmountable problem but because we have lowered our eyes from the horizon of future greatness to quarrel and oppose each other over the picayune issues of the present.

In this regard I would like to read a news item from the Ottawa *Citizen*, reporting an interview with a visiting member of parliament from Britain, who discussed this very aspect of Canadian life. The article's heading is, "U.K. M.P. says petty issues hurt Canada," and it reads:

> Sir Edwin Leather, a Canadian born member of the British house of commons for 15 years, said Wednesday Canada faces a frightening domestic problem.
>
> [Mr. Muir (Lisgar).]
>
> The Conservative M.P., born in Hamilton, said the problem is that Canada has no really serious problems and petty issues thus are debated by government officials.
>
> "The most worrisome part of it is the contempt many Canadians are expressing against their government," he said in an interview.
>
> "And with the (French Canadian) separatist movement making itself heard, petty issues could tear the country apart because no one cares enough to do anything about it."

The Prime Minister by introducing the flag issue into the political affairs of the country at this time is contributing to that image of bitterness that the hon. gentleman mentioned, and is only adding fuel to the heat already engendered by other elements not too interested in national unity. His own members are taking little part in the debate, except to heckle as though it is of no consequence. They are accusing the opposition of a filibuster and in this way they hope to convince the Canadian people that we are wasting parliament's time. They also hope by these tactics to win the debate by default. Let me assure them here and now, and I am quite sure they will get this assurance from other members in this party, that they are not going to win anything this way. The Prime Minister has got them into the mess and he had better start looking for ways to get them out.

Now I have something to say in regard to a filibuster. The Winnipeg *Tribune* in an editorial in its issue of Friday, August 21, had this to say about the filibuster:

> Filibuster of Silence.
>
> The word "filibuster" may acquire a new political connotation before the flag issue is resolved. The Prime Minister used the word in the house August 4 to describe the tactics of the opposition, and it has been employed with increasing frequency by those in sympathy with his desperate plight in parliament.
>
> Oxford defines the word as meaning obstructionist. Mr. Pearson apparently intends it to mean "refusal to enter a debate." *Hansard* confirms this for there is no debate taking place.
>
> Some eloquent and profound speeches have been made by members of the opposition but the government benches remain silent except for occasional hoots.
>
> Nick Mandziuk (P.C.—Marquette) succinctly defined the parliamentary situation on August 12. In reply to an interjection he said:
>
> "A filibuster of silence."
>
> The opposition has offered the government many pertinent observations, has requested answers to perplexing questions, has invited participation in resolving sensitive problems, and has explored national unity, national history, and national purpose.
>
> But the government supporters refuse to discuss any of these subjects. As an historical episode it will make sad reading for the Canadians of tomorrow when they learn how a government attempted to convert parliament into a flag-making factory.
>
> The opposition's speeches at least will serve as a valuable record on what thoughtful politicians

had to say about the state of our country in 1964. There will scarcely be a word of what government supporters thought for all *Hansard* has to record about them is: "Some MEMBERS—Oh, oh. Some MEMBERS—Filibuster."

A chill stubborn phalanx of inarticulate politicians is rallied around their filibuster flag and that's how history is made.

Yet we are talking about a debate. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) described this as being a debate. Where are the members of his group who have entered this debate? Where are the members of the government who have entered this debate? Where are the members of the other little parties who have entered this debate? Have they no idea of what their constituents want in regard to a flag? Have they no thoughts about what the country needs to resolve our unity between the two great founding nations? They have no ideas at all, Mr. Speaker. At least, if they have they are not expressing them.

As a matter of interest I would like to mention one more thing in regard to the so-called filibuster. The Prime Minister, in the last revised version of items he wanted dealt with before calling a summer recess, listed six items. Five have been dealt with and we are now on the sixth, the flag issue. The official opposition feels it is important enough to forgo the holidays in order that this whole issue will be settled in a democratic manner.

It has even been suggested by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) that the government bring forward other important legislation so that we can deal with that also. Yesterday he suggested that the farm loans legislation be brought forward, but we found in answer to that question that it was not ready, and there is a growing suspicion among opposition members that the government's other legislation is not ready either, and that in order to play for time its members sit there twiddling their thumbs in a filibuster of silence.

The Prime Minister and some of his colleagues seems to feel that the election promise made with regard to the flag supersedes all their other promises made at that time, despite the fact that it was conspicuous by its absence from the Liberal campaign literature, as the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) has pointed out. It certainly does not appear in the literature which was sent me by the Liberal candidate in my riding. I have a copy here. As you can see, Mr. Speaker, it is about 2 feet long by 6 inches wide. There is fine print on both sides and it is full of promises to the Canadian people. In all this fine print there is no mention of a new flag. It is not my intention to put any of these unfulfilled promises on record because I dislike having my speech cluttered up with trash—and no other name can be used to describe what is apparently nothing but Liberal propaganda.

The Liberal candidate in my riding was really kind. He sent me another pamphlet called "Prosperity and the Farmer". These two pamphlets are published by the national Liberal federation. If any member wants to get copies, the address is 251 Cooper street, Ottawa. Just reading this pamphlet would make any farmer full of anticipation. His mouth would water. However the farmers are still waiting for these promises to be fulfilled. Do you know something: There is nothing about a flag here. It did not offer the farmers a new flag.

An hon. Member: Wrong part of the country.

Mr. Muir (Lisgar): Incidentally it might be interesting to recall an article which appeared in the *Globe and Mail* on August 13 under the name of Mr. Bruce West. This is what he had to say:

Have you noticed how well those new banners are holding up on the radio antennas of those brave souls who are leading the way in our trek out of the valley of colonial humiliation? What the Toronto soot and rain are doing to these pennants shouldn't happen to a proposed flag for Lower Slobovia. Even their most ardent supporters must be wondering a bit about these bedraggled banners which were recently rushed on to the market by some patriot with a fast eye for a buck. After only a few weeks in the breeze, they make a sorry comparison with the historic flag which has been flying in this country for the better part of a century. There's just something about a wet maple leaf on a tattle-tale grey background which fails to stir the pulse, and surely the designers of the proposed new flag must recognize this fact.

I see my time is running out and I must curtail what I had intended to say. The article goes on:

However, perhaps I and many other hundreds of thousands or millions of people in this country are wrong, as we have been told so often in rather rude and testy terms. If this is so, I would like to see it proved in a nation-wide referendum.

We are constantly being told that such a vote would cause widespread dissension in this country. What, pray, do we have now? It is hardly unity.

I am sure that many of us who now oppose the scrapping of our present proud flag now be willing to shut up and bow to the will of the majority if a referendum indicated that a new flag were desired by this country.

It might be painful, but not nearly so painful as the prospect of having this flag foisted upon us by a government which really gives its members no other choice but that of voting for the adoption of a new standard.

Now I should like to make a reasonable suggestion to the Prime Minister. I should like to suggest to him that he withdraw the flag resolution until such time as a Canadian government gets a clear mandate from the people on this issue either through a plebiscite or at the next general election. He himself has stated that the people would let him know the answer in no uncertain terms. Let the people give their answer first, before we start messing around with our flag. Unless the right hon. gentleman is prepared to do so he is destroying by a pressed vote what is in reality the very basis of our democratic process. We are not just an emerging nation which would expect a jungle leader to tell us just what flag we must have. We have many years of history behind us, and no flag chosen in such a manner could be considered acceptable to a highly developed, proud and civilized people. By pressing the flag issue to a conclusion, the Prime Minister is scuttling his own legislative program and, in the process, weakening the image of parliament. If our national symbols are to be chosen in this manner, without seeking majority opinion or without at least a willingness to compromise, a strain is being put on our national unity at a time when the utmost good will is needed on the part of every Canadian to ensure that we continue to develop as a nation under the pact created between the two great founding races and adhered to ever since confederation.

I have asked the Prime Minister to drop this issue in the interest of national unity until such time as the Canadian people have an opportunity to express their views either through a plebiscite or at the next general election. We all know where the Prime Minister stands on the flag question. He has made his views known, and he is adhering to them; otherwise the issue would have been withdrawn from the political arena long ago. But we have not heard much from the other hon. gentlemen on the front benches opposite. Mr. Charles Lynch says the Prime Minister's position is weakening in this regard. It would be interesting therefore if the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate (Mr. Pickersgill), for example, were to give us the benefit of his views on this matter. Is he to be the only one in Newfoundland who will be flying this new flag?

Mr. Pickersgill: Would the hon. member like an answer to that question now?

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Muir (Lisgar): No, after I have finished.

[Mr. Muir (Lisgar).]

Mr. Pickersgill: I would be delighted to give my views by voting if I were allowed to do so.

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Muir (Lisgar): Then there is the hon. member for Essex East (Mr. Martin)—

An hon. Member: That was a good long speech, Jack.

Mr. Moreau: Your members shouted him down.

Some hon. Members: Five o'clock.

Mr. Muir (Lisgar): —representing a constituency where a recent survey showed 80 per cent in favour of the red ensign.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): 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 private bills, notices of motions (papers) and public bills.

PRIVATE BILLS

Mr. Scott: On a point of order. Yesterday, the Prime Minister, discussing the importance of the flag debate, told us it was the most important matter for decision before parliament and that it should take priority over such things as the Canada pension plan and all the other items on the order paper. If it is so important—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Scott: —I suggest it should take precedence over private members' hour, which is concerned with nothing but bills for the Bell Telephone Company and things of that sort.

Mr. Peters: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Peters: Let Bill S-27 stand at the request of the opposition.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Unanimous consent must be given to the standing of this bill, this being an order of the house.

Mr. MacNaught: There is no agreement that Bill No. S-27 should stand.

BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY OF CANADA

The house resumed from Thursday, August 13, consideration in committee of Bill No. S-27, respecting the Bell Telephone Company of Canada—Mr. Brown—Mr. Batten in the chair.

On clause 1—*Number of directors.*

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Chairman, this special bill referring to the Bell Telephone Company of Canada has attracted my attention because of comments that I made in this house in December of 1962 and again in 1964 with regard to the contract between the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and the Bell Telephone Company of Canada. Before I make any comments on a matter affecting the Bell Telephone Company I would like to point out that there is no conflict of interest on my part. I am one of the 222 subscribers to the Tiny township municipal telephone system, and since it is a municipal telephone system the taxpayers of Tiny are the owners of the telephone system. We have no plans to sell the system to any other competitor, and as far as I know we have not been approached to make such a sale in order that they may affiliate their services with our very satisfactory arrangements in the township of Tiny.

This telephone system up on the shores of Georgian bay has approximately 200 French Canadian subscribers who are permanent residents of Lafontaine and the township of Tiny, and about 25 English speaking Canadians who are cottage owners in the district. I wish to declare my interest in a telephone company at this point so no one will accuse me of a conflict of interest.

I mentioned in 1962 that the president of the Canadian Pacific railroad and the president of the Canadian National railroad had written a joint letter to the minister of transport of the day, Hon. Léon Balcer, after they had lost a contract which they had held jointly for 30 years with the C.B.C. In the course of a letter to Hon. Léon Balcer it was pointed out that for three different ten year periods the C.P.R. and the C.N.R. together had rendered service in the transmission of sound to the 195 radio stations throughout Canada. In 1962 the C.B.C. called for tenders for this service and the C.N.R. and the C.P.R., two of the most efficiently operated organizations in the Dominion of Canada—and I would even go further and say two of the most efficiently operated organizations in the world—put in a normal tender based on their 30 years of experience.

You can well imagine, Mr. Speaker, their surprise when they were advised some time later that the contract had gone to a competitive system which was able to quote a price 25 per cent lower. It does seem to me that if there is an organization that can operate a business profitably at 25 per cent lower rates than the C.N.R. and the C.P.R. railroads, after their 30 years of experience in this particular field, we should turn the operations of the C.N.R. railroad over to that organization and probably they could cut the expenses of the C.N.R. by 25 per cent. However, the C.N.R. and the C.P.R. did not look at it in this manner. They wrote a letter to Hon. Léon Balcer pointing out that it was fair to the communications industry in Canada to have a competitor in the field who was able to put in a very low tender for this service and secure very high rates in other fields by representations to other boards or commissions throughout the dominion. The letter, signed jointly by Mr. Emerson on behalf of Mr. Crump, president of C.P.R., and by Mr. Donald Gordon, concluded by stating:

> 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.

I was appointed a member of the committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines this session and we had before us this original application for examination. Some very interesting news came out of the discussions we had.

The Chairman: Order, please. I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member but I wonder if he would indicate, for the benefit of the Chair, how the remarks he has made up to this time and which obviously he intends to make are related to clause 1 of the bill now before the committee. As the hon. member knows, discussion in committee should be strictly relevant to the subject matter before us, and it is not too clear to the Chair how these remarks relate to clause 1 of this bill.

Mr. Cowan: Sir, is clause 1 the title of the bill?

The Chairman: No. The committee is discussing clause 1.

Mr. Cowan: I thought we were on the title of the bill.

Mr. Peters: On the point of order, Mr. Chairman, if the Chair will look at Bill No. S-27, you will see it is an act respecting the Bell Telephone Company of Canada. However, it is not only an act respecting the Bell Telephone Company of Canada but is an amendment to a previous act which established by incorporation the Bell Telephone Company in the year 1880 by Bill No. C-67. I suggest that the hon. member is in order in making these remarks on clause 1. This bill is an amendment of a previous act that has been, as the chairman will note, amended on at least a dozen occasions over a period of

years. This bill is an amendment to the Bell Telephone act. The hon. member is speaking to the general matter of the Bell Telephone Company and is therefore speaking, in effect, to the act that is being amended by this particular bill. I suggest the hon. member is in order.

The Chairman: I am afraid I cannot agree with the suggestion made by the hon. member. As he knows, I am sure, an amending bill does not, automatically, necessarily reopen the discussion on the original act that is being amended by the new bill. The hon. member on this occasion and, if I remember correctly, on a previous occasion suggested that because there is a reference in the marginal note to previous legislation, all that previous legislation is being re-opened by the bill that we have before us. Certainly there is nothing in the standing orders of the House of Commons that says that when we are discussing in committee a specific clause of a specific bill, the discussion can include the principle or the details of the act which is being amended. There are, of course, precedents to support the position adopted by the Chair. We had a very general discussion of this matter when we were on second reading before we reached the committee stage. But certainly at this stage we should limit our discussion to what is before the committee. That is the requirement of our standing orders.

Mr. Cowan: I had read this Senate Bill S-27 several times, Mr. Chairman, and I was of the opinion, and still am—I did not have it before me when you questioned me—that there was only one clause in the bill. Clause 1 says, you will notice:

1. Section 8 of chapter 67 of the statutes of 1880 is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

Colon. Then there are these words:

8. The business of the company...

And so on. I take it, therefore, there is only one clause in this whole bill. Am I incorrect, Mr. Chairman?

The Chairman: Of course not; there is only one clause, but the clause deals with the increase in the maximum number of directors from 15 to 20. That is what this committee is asked to approve. As I said, on second reading there was very general discussion about the operations of the Bell Telephone Company. It was the feeling of the Chair at the time that we should allow a general discussion, but at this stage my suggestion to all hon. members is that the discussion should be limited to the specific matter before the committee.

[Mr. Peters.]

Mr. Cowan: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I remember that during the discussion of this bill before the house the hon. member for Timiskaming asked in rather forthright terms: What is the need for increasing the number of directors from 15 to 20? I hope to be able to show that they need to increase the number of directors from 15 to 20 in order to be able to divide the profits faster. It takes them a little longer with only 15 men dividing them than it would with 20 working at it. That is the reason I rise to make a few comments on this matter.

I was pointing out when I was interrupted, that the public long distance telephone rates in Canada are 50 per cent or more above comparable rates in the United States. That is the flat statement of the president of the C.P.R. and the president of the C.N.R. Before the railways, canals and telegraph lines committee of this house I made some inquiries of Marcel Vincent, president, P. C. Venne, Q.C., vice president and R. C. Scrivener, vice president, with regard to the operation of their organization. One of the things in which I was interested was a statement which was made under examination by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Regan) concerning the increased rates for local telephone service. We were told in the evidence given before the committee by the speakers on behalf of the Bell Telephone Company that when the number of telephones in a local service increases, the rate goes up. This was a rather surprising statement because many of us have had the idea that the rate is usually reduced for bulk purchases—that volume reduces the rate. Evidently the Bell Telephone Company does not work in that way, because as we were questioning their representatives it came out that the rate was raised locally as the number of telephones increased. Then I asked the question, reported at page 429 of the report:

The more telephones there are, the higher the rate?

Then the vice president of the Bell Telephone, Mr. Scrivener, gave this answer:

The higher the cost of providing the service and the greater value of the service.

That would show that as the number of telephones goes up the cost of the service also goes up.

A little further on in the proceedings I quoted this statement of Mr. Crump and Mr. Gordon to the representatives of the Bell Telephone Company, and I asked them whether they did not go before the board of

transport commissioners and argue that because of the relatively limited number of telephones in Canada they had to have higher rates for long distance calls. Then this answer was given by the president of the Bell Telephone as reported at page 430 of the report:

> Whether the percentage is correct or not, the fact is that the rates are higher in Canada than they are in the United States. The development is not comparable at all; we have a very scattered population from one ocean to another.

The Bell operates in Quebec and Ontario; but they refer to the scattered population from one ocean to another, even though the population they serve is more or less concentrated in Ontario and Quebec.

When questioned as to why the rates were 50 per cent higher Mr. Scrivener replied:

> Because of the development in Canada, sure.

You thus have it that the local rates are raised because of the increased number of telephones; the long distance rates are high because of the very small number of telephones. If you ever saw a monopoly operating to perfection, Mr. Chairman, I would say that this is the perfect example.

The Chairman: Order. I am afraid I must interrupt the hon. member again. I have been listening to him in the hope that he would relate his remarks to the clause before the committee at the moment, but I must remind him of standing order 59(2) which says:

> Speeches in committee of the whole house must be strictly relevant to the item or clause under consideration.

What the hon. member is doing now is referring to the operations of this company, which to my mind is quite far removed from the subject matter we are required to discuss, namely the increase from 15 to 20 in the number of directors in the Bell Telephone Company. I would ask the hon. member to relate his remarks to the specific point.

Mr. Clancy: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out that the hon. member is talking about something concerned with the expenditure of the taxpayers' money, which is always our concern in this house. Whether the company concerned be Bell or Saskatchewan Telephones does not matter; we are talking about spending the Canadian taxpayers' money and I think this is relevant.

Mr. Cowan: Perhaps I might develop my remarks and show the committee how busy the directors of the Bell Telephone Company are with all their multifarious activities, including the operation of Northern Electric Company. Perhaps it will then become apparent to the committee how vital it is that there be an increase in the number of directors in order to look after the multitude of duties they have imposed upon themselves—in the opinions of many, quite unnecessarily.

I thought when I mentioned that the rates are increased locally because the number of telephones increases, and that the long distance rates are increased because the number of telephones is limited that you would be interested in a statement accompanying the shareholders quarterly review of the Bell Telephone Company of Canada, summer 1964 issue, in which the subscribers are given comparative rates to show how the rates have dropped for three minute daytime station to station calls from Montreal to Vancouver. In 1949 it cost $7 for a three minute daytime station to station call Montreal to Vancouver, and in 1964 it costs $3. This is a tremendous reduction, from $7 to $3, in a matter of 25 years. I am not too sure whether this is because of the tremendous increase in the number of telephones in Montreal and Vancouver—because we are told that it is because of the increased number of telephones that the rates go up—or whether it is because of a decrease in the number of telephones. The Bell has already told us that where telephones are scattered the cost must be high to cover the costs. They have explained some of the reduction in cost by pointing out that technological advances are benefiting all long distance telephone users, but when a caller requires personal service to ensure locating a particular person he waives some of the advantages of automatic operation and faces the effects of rising labour costs. Improved long distance service and rate reductions have been accompanied by rapidly growing use of the company's long distance facilities. Microwave systems can transmit large quantities of information over great distances and difficult terrain more economically than is possible with wire and cable systems. These are technological advances well known to the public of Canada, and they believe that they should be taken into consideration in setting both local and long distance rates.

In connection with this application for an increase in the directorate I would draw your attention to part of the annual report of the Canadian National Railways for 1963. The hon. member for Three Rivers knew when the contract was given by the C.B.C., after 30 years in the hands of the C.N.R. and the C.P.R., that between them these

people would lose approximately $1 million a year in services. Mr. Donald Gordon, reporting for the C.N.R. in 1963 on telecommunications, stated that net income from all telecommunications services was $5.4 million in 1963, which was down $200,000 from 1962. Mr. Gordon points out that the C.N. telecommunications net income was down $200,000 from 1962. The C.B.C. contract, which the C.N.R. had lost was worth $500,000 a year to it.

The Chairman: I must again interrupt the hon. member and ask him to co-operate with the Chair. The Chair has brought his attention to standing order 59(2), which I will read again:

> Speeches in committee of the whole house must be strictly relevant to the item or clause under consideration.

Certainly the hon. member will admit that what he has been saying during the last few minutes is entirely irrelevant, as far as the Chair is concerned, to the clause before the committee. There are rules of procedure which must be respected by all hon. members and I ask the hon. member's co-operation in referring as expeditiously as possible to the clause of the bill now under consideration.

Mr. Nasserden: Mr. Chairman, I find the remarks of the hon. member most timely. I believe that those remarks have something to do with these operations and with the particular clause that is before us. In fact, I am eagerly awaiting his further remarks in this regard so that we may then know something about this before it is dealt with by the house.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Chairman, I point out that the bill now before us, respecting the Bell Telephone Company, provides directly for the addition of five members to the board of directors, an increase to 20. I think you, Mr. Chairman, should give some consideration as to why this board should be increased from 15 to 20 members. I suggest any increase in a board of directors is contemplated for one of several reasons. Surely a board of directors has a purpose and a relationship to the operations of the company. This company is asking for an increase of five in the number of directors. I think it is reasonable to our discussion to ascertain why the number should be increased by five, and the function to be performed by those additional members. I think we should be made aware of any situation that has developed in this country which would warrant such an increase.

It is my information that when a company requires an increase in its board of directors it is because of an expansion in the operations of the company or because the company is amalgamating with another company. Such a required increase might also be necessitated by a proposed increase in the capitalization or expansion of the company. I feel that members of parliament have a right and obligation to ask why a board of directors should be increased.

We have no indication as to who the additional five members might be. We do not have any information about their associations with other companies. I suggest the hon. member is not in a position to tell us who the members are or why they are being appointed. I think it is your responsibility, Mr. Chairman, to allow this discussion to be broad enough so that we may obtain answers to these questions. What purpose will these additional directors serve? What is wrong with the company at the present time, necessitating an increase in its board of directors? I suggest it is your responsibility, Mr. Chairman, to allow hon. members to find out, through the hon. member for York-Humber, whether or not the increase of five members to the board of directors of this company will be in the interests both of the company and the people of this country. I suggest, therefore, that the hon. member be asked to indicate why the officials of the Bell Telephone Company feel an increase in the number of directors on the board is necessary.

Mr. Clancy: Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman who has just spoken should direct his question to the Minister of Transport. The hon. member will recall that not long ago he voted some $86 million to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Canadian National Railways. Let us go back to where this whole thing started.

An hon. Member: The Minister of Transport is not here.

Mr. Clancy: He is not usually here, but that makes little difference.

The Chairman: Order.

Mr. Clancy: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking to a point of order. We were voting public money. The Bell Telephone Company is asking for an increase in its board of directors. It may well be that we are suspicious of its motives, but I should like to point out that the C.P.R. and C.N.R. set up a line across Canada at the expense—

The Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Clancy: Direct your question to the Minister of Transport.

The Chairman: Order. I have listened with interest to the remarks made by hon. members on the point of order. Some of the questions raised by the hon. member for Timiskaming are, in my mind, the type of questions that must have been raised and considered when this bill was before the standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines. I suggest that was the purpose of sending the bill to the committee. In view of the fact the bill has been before that committee and is now back for consideration by the committee of the whole house, we are bound by the rules of procedure. All I can do is read again for your guidance standing order 59(2), which states:

Speeches in committee of the whole house must be strictly relevant—

I expect all hon. members will keep that in mind during the course of their remarks.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Beaulé: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order, questions have been asked in committee concerning this bill, and in view of the hazy answers given, I agree with the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) that we are complying with the standing orders in discussing the reasons for this increase in the number of the company's directors.

Mr. Plourde: Mr. Chairman, to end the discussion on that point, would the unanimous consent of the house settle the issue?

[*Text*]

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Chairman, I thank you for your comments, and those members who have participated in this matter, in an attempt to show the relevancy of my remarks in respect of whether there should be five more directors added to the board of the Bell Telephone Company.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out that when the railways, canals and telegraph lines committee met I raised a question about the C.B.C. contract. I asked this question directly of the Bell Telephone representative although for some reason or other it was not caught by the official reporters. The question was asked at the end of that committee's meetings. I said, would one of the five new directors be a representative of the C.B.C.? The Bell Telephone Company representatives simply smiled and said, no, they had not given consideration to that idea. I thought such an appointment might have been a fitting reward for taking a contract from a crown corporation, such as the C.N.R., and giving it to a private organization, so that the crown corporation could show that it was down $200,000 next year in net revenue while at the same time it was down $500,000 in gross revenue. Perhaps that is beside the point.

Perhaps the increase by five in the number of directors of the company was necessitated by the company's great interest in the Northern Electric Company, which is considered by many as a subsidiary of Bell Telephone. During the meetings of the railways committee we made a number of inquiries relating to the connection between Bell Telephone and Northern Electric. The board of transport commissioners had made a report, shortly before the Bell Telephone Company made application for this increase, which indicated that Bell Telephone was entitled to own Northern Electric. In the evidence before the board of transport commissioners, a copy of which I have before me, appears repeatedly the statement that Bell Telephone Company owns 90 per cent of the stock of Northern Electric. By the time the parliamentary committee got around to sitting in respect of this application for an increase in the number of directors, as we were informed by those representatives who appeared, Bell Telephone Company owned 100 per cent of the shares of the Northern Electric Company. That statement is repeated two or three times in the evidence taken before that committee.

Mr. Chairman, several hon. members have commented favourably in respect of this application because there are manufacturing companies and offices of the applicant located in their constituencies. I should like to point out for the benefit of the members of this committee that there must be a riding in this Dominion of Canada in which there are employees of Industrial Wire and Cable Company. In respect of the reference to the board of transport commissioners in connection with Bell Telephone and Northern Electric, hon. members might be interested in knowing that most of the employees of Industrial Wire and Cable Company reside in the riding of York-Humber. I have good reason for participating in this debate, because of the interest of the employees of Industrial Wire and Cable. That company has an industrial factory located at the intersection of highway 27 and the Queen Elizabeth highway, in the township of Etobicoke part of which is in the riding of York-Humber. The Industrial

Wire and Cable Company acted as an intervenor in an application—

The Chairman: Order. I am sorry I must interrupt the hon. member. I feel his comments at this point are irrelevant but in any event his time has expired. I have taken into account the fact that there were several points of order. He has been given an additional seven minutes time to compensate for the time used in dealing with those points of order.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Chairman, when this matter came on before I had a chance to make a few remarks but I did not get an opportunity to make some remarks I intended to make. I do not wish to repeat myself, but I tried to point out then that I had read carefully the evidence before the committee of this house and was unable to find any sound reason for the request for the expansion of the number of directors. The answer was that they needed more leeway, they needed the vice presidents to get acquainted with the board of directors.

However, I want to deal with a broader aspect of the matter today. As the members of this committee are well aware the Bell Telephone Company is a privately owned monopoly in charge of a tremendously important service. Now, that fact is no reason for the refusal of any reasonable request when the company comes before this house. On the other hand, the fact that they come and ask for an increase in the number of directors enables parliament, and I think imposes upon parliament, an obligation to inquire as to necessity for the increase and to ask some other questions concerning the company's public responsibility.

It is well known to the members of this house that this is a private monopoly, but it is a monopoly with great public responsibility and public interest. This is partly served by making its rates structure subject to control and investigation by the Board of Transport Commissioners for Canada. I am quite sure that the members of this house and the members of the committee do not want to usurp the functions of the Board of Transport Commissioners for Canada. However, we have the right to inquire whether that degree of investigation is dealing adequately with the public responsibility of the Bell Telephone Company. I have a copy of the proceedings before the Board of Transport Commissioners for Canada. It is only, I think, about 600 or 700 pages, so I do not propose, in the time available, to bring all these matters before this committee.

This transcript concerns an application of Industrial Wire and Cable and deals with the matter raised by the hon. member for York-Humber, namely whether it was legal for the Bell Telephone Company of Canada, under its limited charter, to own shares of Northern Electric Company, a manufacturing company. Now, this question was dealt with by the board of transport commissioners and they held the Bell company legally entitled to hold these shares. What I think has not been called to the attention of the committee is that there was a further application made to the Board of Transport Commissioners for Canada and, so far as I know, this has never been dealt with. Certainly, the committee has never been told whether or not it was dealt with.

As I say, there was an additional phase to that application and that was to find out whether the board of transport commissioners, by reason of the fact that the Bell Telephone Company owned all the shares of Northern Electric, was entitled to review the financial affairs of Northern Electric. This question was adjourned until the question of the legality of the ownership of the shares of Northern by Bell Telephone could be determined. This first question was determined, namely the responsibility of Northern Electric to account to the board of transport commissioners; but so far as I know, and I have the records here but perhaps the sponsor of the bill could tell us some time, the second question never seems to have been looked into.

We have a situation wherein the Bell Telephone Company comes before this house seeking an expansion in the number of the board of directors. We are not in a position to know whether or not, by reason of this link between Northern Electric, the manufacturing company, and Bell Telephone, this large aspect of the work of manufacturing is under any review by anybody, including the board of transport commissioners. I am not the first member of the committee to raise this question. It was raised by the hon. member for Broadview quite early in this debate, on July 18. He said he was not just concerned with whether or not this ownership was legal, but that he was concerned about the question of whether or not this publicly owned monopoly which is under the jurisdiction of the house and which is so important to Canada was, by reason of its ownership of Northern Electric shares, really under the control of this committee and of this parliament or whether a device, as it

were, had been discovered whereby a substantial portion of its operations was not under any control at all. The hon. member for Broadview raised the question, but no answer was given.

It does seem to me that if this house is asked to increase the number of directors, with no reason given but the company's desire to have more leeway, then this house has a right to inquire whether or not, in fact, the application before the board of transport commissioners has ever been dealt with. The question remains open. I submit that before this bill is dealt with, that sort of question as to the responsibility of this company which affects the rights of so many people, should be answered.

Another question that I feel could be answered is the following: In many countries throughout the world they have not adopted either a complete system of private ownership or complete public ownership of a public monopoly. In Scandinavia they have adopted a system whereby there is partial ownership by a minority, and there are minority appointments to the board of directors. You have therefore a privately owned company with vast connections, but with representatives of the public on that board. I believe if the sponsor of this bill could assure us that some of the five directors would not be just people with business connections but rather that they would be people with responsibilities to the people of Canada, thus assuring to the public a greater degree of responsibility so that hon. members would have the right and opportunity to find out whether the rate structure was being adjusted in some way or other by arrangement with Northern Electric or other companies, he would find we were pleased to give our approval to the bill very quickly.

We have been told that the additional appointments may be vice presidents who are already serving the corporation. I would urge the sponsors of this bill, therefore, that they should seek to answer some of the questions I have asked and some of the questions aked earlier in the debate by the hon. member for Broadview. They should seek to assure this committee that this would be the result of the request. As I have said, I have read all the evidence in the committee and I could not find anything but the most vague statements that the company wanted more leeway. I believe the parliament of Canada is entitled to be treated with a little more respect by an organization with this wide, major public responsibility.

So far as I am concerned, I do not wish to obstruct the company's receiving any reasonable request that will add to its efficiency or to its responsibility to the public for the tremendously important service they give. However, until these questions are answered, and answered to the satisfaction of hon. members, I feel we should not pass this particular bill. Let them tell us why they need five directors. Let them tell us if the additional directors will add to the public responsibility of the board. Let them tell us whether Northern Electric, which is a wholly owned subsidiary, is to be subject to public regulation by the board of transport commissioners. If they answer these questions they might receive better co-operation from members of this committee, including myself.

Mr. Watson (Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie): Mr. Chairman, during the past few private members' hours I believe there have been attempts to talk out this bill, No. S-27. Members of the New Democratic party have suggested the appointment of five government directors, and there has been some suggestion of nationalizing the Bell Telephone Company.

In my opinion the Bell Telephone Company is one of the most efficient and well run companies in the country, and is better run privately than it would be as an arm of the government. It may be that at one time or another most subscribers to the company have felt they have not been fairly treated by persons answering their complaints. Generally speaking, however, the company is acutely aware of its public image and is sensitive to the quite frequent charge that it is a monopolistic giant and that it is callously indifferent to complaints from its subscribers.

I have a suggestion which might satisfy the objections of members of this committee and which would at the same time be of advantage to the company. I believe that eventually an ombudsman type of individual should be appointed within the Bell telephone organization, and possibly appointed on the recommendation of the federal government. Such an ombudsman individual would shift much of the burden of criticism which the company itself bears now, and such an appointment would meet the objective of the New Democratic party in their suggestion for the appointment of five directors by the federal government.

I have no desire to delay debate on this bill. I simply feel that if the company and this committee gave consideration to the appoint-

ment of an ombudsman within the Bell organization it would be a way out of the impasse that we seem to have reached on this bill.

Mr. Scott: As the hon. member for Greenwood has said, Mr. Chairman, we do not want to delay unduly the passage of this bill, but the questions we are raising are serious ones and we want to have answers to them from the sponsor of the bill. We are all impressed by the Bell company, the importance of the good work it does and the good public relations it enjoys throughout the country. We are not the slightest bit interested in holding the measure back, but the hon. member for Greenwood has raised a very serious point that I believe it is incumbent on the committee to discuss, and I do not see how we can do that until we have some information from the sponsor of the bill.

It is obvious that the bill is not going to pass this evening, and I hope between now and next week the sponsor of the bill will get in touch with whoever had him sponsor it, will raise with them the points we have raised, and that he will come back next week, or whenever we reach the bill again, and make a statement with regard to the matters we have raised.

To refresh his memory, our main objection is that this is a private corporation managing a very large section of the public business, and we are not convinced that it is proper for such a corporation wholly to own a subsidiary when that subsidiary's financial statements are not available for public scrutiny. It is widely suspected in the electric business in Canada that Northern Electric has a two-price list, one for the Bell company and one for everybody else, and there is a wide suspicion a lot of profits are being hidden in this wholly owned subsidiary.

Before passage of the bill we would like an undertaking from the Bell company and Northern Electric that their financial statements will be made available for scrutiny and examination by members of this committee. We do not think this is unreasonable. After all, the Bell Telephone Company has been granted a very important monopoly by this chamber and it has a very serious duty to the public in general, as indeed to the members of this committee. Therefore because of the fact that this wholly owned subsidiary's financial statements are not available we want to see them and satisfy ourselves that there is nothing wrong with the financial relationship between Northern Electric and the Bell company.

[Mr. Watson (Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie).]

The hon. member for Greenwood also indicated our view that we think it is a reasonable proposition that members of the public should have representation on the board of directors. Indeed, we intend to move an amendment that three of the directors be appointed on recommendation of the lieutenant governor in council. I think the public ought to have representation, rather than bank directors and presidents of other corporations. I would like to see educational institutions represented on the board of directors. In short we want to see—

Mr. Macdonald: Would the hon. member permit a question? Which lieutenant governor in council?

Mr. Scott: I am sorry, I meant the Governor General. We feel it would be in order for appointments to be made on the recommendation of the Governor General, and we hope the sponsor of the bill will go back, put these two propositions before his principals and let us know what their answers are. I want to emphasize as strongly as I can that we are not interested in holding up the bill just for the sake of holding it up, but we are thoroughly convinced both these propositions are sound and that they raise very serious questions with regard to the matter. We will not let the bill pass until we do get serious consideration of these two very important proposals.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bélanger: Mr. Chairman, I too should like to make my contribution to this debate on the bill now before us and which provides for the appointment of five additional members to the board of directors of the Bell Telephone Company of Canada.

I wonder whether such an increase in the number of directors would make for a more efficient administration of the affairs of this company.

Apparently, according to several members I have already heard, the manner in which the company is run leaves something to be desired.

For my part, if I were convinced that the addition of five directors would change in some way the administration as it is now, I would be willing to let the bill pass as quickly as possible.

On the other hand, I wonder whether this would improve the situation.

At any rate, in our districts, we take exception to the manner in which this company is administered and to the service it provides.

For instance, in the Beaupré district of my riding of Charlevoix businessmen and business concerns in small towns located ten, 12 or 15 miles from Quebec city have to pay long distance rates for their calls to Quebec city. This adds up to huge amounts and hinders the development of our area.

To prove my point let me read a resolution passed by the various councils of our municipalities. Here is the resolution introduced at the regular council meeting of the municipality of St. Féréol:

Whereas the residential and commercial development of the Beaupré coast is contingent upon free telephone communication between the municipalities concerned, on the one hand, and Quebec city on the other, it is moved and seconded... that the municipal council of St. Féréol support whatever action the telephone division of the Beaupré coast regional development committee sees fit to take, such as the sending of a petition to the Department of Transport in Ottawa."

That resolution was moved and passed by the municipal councils of Chateau Richer, St. Ann parish, St. Ann village, Beaupré—

The Chairman: Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but I must remind him, as I did for members of the committee who spoke before him, that comments made at the committee stage must be strictly relevant to the clause under consideration.

I would therefore, ask the hon. member for Charlevoix to refer to standing order 59 (2) of the House of Commons which stipulates that speeches in committee of the whole must be relevant to the item or clause under consideration.

The clause under study at this time is clause 1 of Bill No. S-27, providing for an increase from 15 to 20 in the number of directors of The Bell Telephone Company of Canada.

I therefore invite the hon. member to limit his remarks to that very thing.

Mr. Bélanger: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, but notwithstanding what you have just said, I think that it is possible to link my previous remarks to the bill under considersation. As a matter of fact, we are being asked to allow the Bell Telephone Company to have five more men on its board of directors.

To my mind, this is done for two reasons: Either because there are more profits to divide, or because the management has to be improved. That is why I am trying to show that the management of that company is inadequate, and that this condition should be remedied as soon as possible.

It is inconceivable, Mr. Chairman, that the people of the seven parishes in the county of Montmorency should suffer for two more years from the inertia of this company, which refuses to establish a free telephone exchange system between those communities and Quebec city. This hinders the economic development of that area by forcing businessmen and companies to pay exorbitant prices for their telephone calls.

The treatment we receive, over there, is truly remarkable, when everybody knows that communities 60 and 80 miles away from the city of Montreal have the advantage of a free telephone exchange. Now, on the Beaupré coast long distance charges must be paid for calls to Quebec city which is only 22 miles away.

That is why I should have been remiss, as representative of that area, if I had not risen in protest against such a situation when the bill was introduced.

Mr. Latulippe: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words on Bill No. S-27 concerning the Bell Telephone Company of Canada which wants to increase the number of its directors.

I must say that we are not, in principle, against the increase in the number of directors of this company. It is a private company and it is generally admitted that it has rendered great service to society. We want to respect as much as possible the principle of free enterprise; we want free enterprise to remain in Canada.

If free enterprise, as our friends were saying a moment ago, is too ambitious, if it goes too far, if it denies the rights of the community, the government must step in.

As long as this company does not go beyond its rights, that it is not prejudicial to the community, it must be protected, because free enterprise, or private enterprise, is still the best. Nobody can prove that state enterprises are better than private enterprises.

We are then in favour of private enterprise. But if, once again, this private enterprise is too ambitious it rests upon the government to intervene and see to it that it does not hinder the progress of the community in general.

If the rates of the Bell Telephone Company of Canada are too high, it is again up to the authorities concerned to intervene. If this company makes large profits, the government in turn, levies taxes. Speaking of taxes, I believe the purpose of taxes is to cut down the profits of any private company.

We are glad to share in such a project. We wish, in every respect, to maintain private enterprise in Canada. We are not against

any private enterprise or any monopoly so long as monopolies do not deny the rights under which they have secured privileges.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am saying again that I wish the Bell Telephone Company of Canada would understand the situation. I know we are doing this company a favour by examining its problems.

It was said, a while ago, that this company was a subsidiary of the Northern Electric Company, a subsidiary of the American company, and so on.

Although this company is a subsidiary of the American company, it nevertheless operates in Canada and all the income derived from this business goes back to its shareholders, and if the latter make large profits, they are in turn taxed all the more under the Income Tax Act.

In any event, I still think that, in spite of all, it is fair to protect this private enterprise.

May I call it six o'clock, Mr. Chairman?

[*Text*]

Progress reported.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED UNDER ADJOURNMENT MOTION

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to provisional standing order 39A, to inform the house that the question to be raised at 10.30 o'clock this evening is the following:

[*Translation*]

The hon. member for Chapleau (Mr. Laprise): Labour conditions and winter works—inquiry as to whether the federal government has paid its share.

[*Text*]

At six o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

CANADIAN FLAG

OFFICIAL ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW DESIGN

The house resumed consideration of the motion by Mr. Pearson:

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.

[Mr. Latulippe.]

And the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Diefenbaker, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. More.

Mr. Joseph Slogan (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, in this House of Commons I think I am better known as a listener than as a speaker, but I make no apologies whatsoever for rising to make a contribution on this flag question. Indeed, I had a very nice speech prepared, but after the lecture we received from the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) this afternoon I think that even before I make my introduction I should make some observations upon the contribution of that hon. member. It was not unusual for him to adopt the attitude of preaching to the House of Commons about the sins of other parties and other members. He said that we were wasting time, that we were lowering the standards of parliament, and so on. But indeed, Mr. Speaker, if we look at the index of *Hansard* I have no doubt that this hon. member occupies as much space in the index as I for one occupy in *Hansard* as a whole. I believe that neither the Liberal party nor the New Democratic party are in any position to lecture to the Conservative party about wasting time in the house. The Liberal party in the 1962-63 session proved themselves to be a more obstructionist party than perhaps we have ever witnessed in this house. Even at the time when the New Democratic party, or the old C.C.F. party, was just a minor group of eight members I think they took more than their share of space in *Hansard*. Certainly the party to my far left, the Creditistes, and the New Democratic party still, when we consider their numbers, take up much more time in this house and space in *Hansard* than any of the other parties.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me it is idle for a person to preach to us when he has only to look back on the sins of his own party in this house. I think especially of what has already been mentioned, the divorce blockade—not by a major party but by a minor group in this country, and particularly two members who saw fit to hold up divorce bills in this house, not for 15 or 16 days, but indeed I think it could be measured in terms of months and sessions, and perhaps even years, inflicting personal hardship upon the people who were affected and who had a right to come to this House of Commons to ask for relief.

I believe the hon. member really destroyed his own case, too, when he suggested that we should stop talking so we could vote on the subamendment and the amendment in order that his party could introduce their amendment; in other words, so we could start talking on their amendment. To me that did not sound as though he was wanting an end to the debate in order that we could get on with other legislation. It was not a very convincing case that the hon. member put forward, to my mind.

Mr. Skoreyko: Typical Knowles tactics.

Mr. Slogan: Then he talked about extending the hours of sitting of the House of Commons. Indeed, this has already been done, and already in the country we are receiving criticism because the attendance in the house is not as it should be when we sit through the noon hour on Fridays. When it comes to his argument that we should get on with other legislation, surely the hon. member realizes it was only at the insistence of the opposition parties that the government was finally forced to bring in their legislative program. We asked for and passed the legislative program which the government wished passed before a recess. If we are occupying the time of the house at a time when we could be on the beaches and in our cottages, there must be a principle behind what we are doing, because certainly we do not do this just because we want to talk.

Mr. Skoreyko: Stanley wouldn't understand the principle.

Mr. Slogan: The hon. member talked about the number of speeches that have been made in this house by the Conservative members, and so forth. Surely, Mr. Speaker, on a matter of principle such as the flag everyone in this house should feel obliged to speak. He should feel obliged to speak because of the fact that he represents people who I am sure would like to know how he is representing them in this house, and because he has a conscience of his own. Also may I remind the hon. member that there are still a large number of members of this party who have not contributed to this debate at all. These are some of the factors I wanted to raise regarding the speech of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, there was nothing in his speech suggesting the setting up of a committee of the House of Commons to which this question could be referred, which would clear the decks for action in this house on other legislation. In fact, we agree with many of his constructive suggestions, such as the idea that one day in the week should be left for legislation. I believe the house leader of our party has made suggestions, perhaps not identical but similar in their purport, and I know the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) has said he was prepared to accept here and now the suggestion made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre so far as the bringing in of legislation is concerned. Now it is up to the government to agree to that suggestion and to start bringing in that legislation for which we have continually asked. But where is it? Perhaps it would not be such a bad idea if the Prime Minister of this country sat in on this debate now and then in order to appreciate some of the feelings which are being generated and some of the suggestions being put forward by hon. members of this house, because certainly they could result in a solution of this problem.

Mr. Skoreyko: The member for Parkdale (Mr. Haidasz).

Mr. Slogan: I do not want to spend my whole time discussing the speech made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, Mr. Speaker. I have listened to many of the speeches made in the house in this debate and I must say that in my opinion they have been far above par. I believe this debate as a whole, considering its length, has been of a quality which we have not seen in this house for many years. Certainly the members of this party could roll out a lot more in the way of emotion and argument than they have. I believe they have been very moderate; I think they have put forward good suggestions; their speeches have been very sincere. I am pleased to note, also, that many of the members of this house who very seldom speak have been prompted to speak in the debate because of the way they feel on this question. I must say that those members have made a distinct contribution by the manner in which they spoke and they are a credit to their constituents.

I am sorry to see there have not been more members on the government side who have spoken. Some of them have been very facetious in their interjections. I would feel from their interjections that they think they have more brains in their seats when sitting than when on their feet. I can assure them that their interjections do not measure up to their expectations.

Mr. Godin: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I do not say this for myself but I trust the

hon. member can indicate to the house what change in the design his discourse will bring about.

Mr. Slogan: I am very happy the hon. member is listening so attentively to my speech; if he will contain himself I will get around to that question very shortly.

At the beginning of this debate we had a very broad participation on the part of the members of the Liberal party. Although they were saying that we were filibustering they were almost making speech for speech with us. Then apparently the Prime Minister lowered the guillotine and there was a wall of silence on that side of the house. This was brought to the attention of the public and we are now treated to the spectacle of one speaker per day, so that we cannot say that they are completely gagged. Although some members opposite are very facetious others are very attentive. I have watched their faces during some of the speeches which have been made on this side of the house. I think they have convictions of their own and I wish they would talk about them. I am wondering why they do not. Are they afraid to express their opinions or do they not have any convictions? Are they so divided on that side of the house and so lack conviction that they have nothing to say? I wonder whether they feel that they are representing the opinion of their constituents by their silence. Not all of them are silent. There is the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) who has courage indeed. He made one of the greatest indictments of a prime minister which I have heard in this house. Among other things he said that the caucus was not consulted about the flag, that it was a decision brought in from the top.

Mr. Skoreyko: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Godin) spent most of his time yesterday afternoon interjecting during the speech of myself and other members in this house. He is doing precisely the same tonight. I would ask you to restrain him or ask him to make a contribution in this flag debate, please.

Mr. Smallwood: Go and lick some stickers.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am sure the hon. member knows as do all hon. members, that an hon. member who has the floor is entitled to speak without interruption. I hope that is kept in mind.

Mr. Slogan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do not mind these interruptions because they reflect only upon those who make them.

[Mr. Godin.]

Mr. Watson (Assiniboia): You know where they come from.

Mr. Slogan: I have already dealt with the contention that we are delaying legislation. We are asking the government to bring forward legislation so that it can be dealt with expeditiously, as was the legislation which has already been passed.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp) is one of the few frontbenchers on the government side to participate in this debate. As reported at page 6956 of *Hansard* he said:

> No one with respect for our parliamentary institutions would wish to contribute to the filibuster now under way.

The word "parliament" itself derives from the verb "to speak". I am most surprised that the minister, who perhaps was used to exercising bureaucratic power before he became a minister, is now trying to gag his own members and withdraw them from this debate. If they did speak they could make contributions, and I think speech by speech we would inch toward some sort of conclusion which would be acceptable to this parliament as a whole and to the people of Canada.

I must mention the speech of the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Hamilton) because he made some very constructive suggestions. In our amendment to the motion we have asked for a referendum. Then in our subamendment we have made some specific proposals regarding the questions which could be asked relating to a design in such a referendum.

In this connection I should like to refer to a radio broadcast quoted many times here which the present Prime Minister made on December 29, 1961. He was asked: "How would you poll the people on this?"—that is, the flag question. The then leader of the opposition replied: "We would poll the people when we 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". I agree with this point of view which the leader of the Liberal party expressed at that time.

I also think the people of Canada agree with it because there have been a large number of letters and representations to the government asking for a referendum. I refer to the Ottawa *Citizen* of June 4 where in an article by Norman Campbell headed "10,000 send views to P.M." one of the categories the letters fell into was those calling for a

referendum on the flag question. So certainly the view of the then leader of the opposition was supported by the people.

Then in the Ottawa *Journal* for June 16 there is the headline over a Canadian Press dispatch: "350 ft. ensign petition to P.M.". I might just quote shortly from this article, which says:

> A petition bearing 17,873 names, mainly from Toronto and southern Ontario communities, was left at Prime Minister Pearson's office Monday urging a national plebiscite on the flag question.

I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that the geographical areas referred to are mostly represented by members on the other side of the house.

I am not an Orangeman but I have an article here from the Saskatchewan *Leader-Post* of June 18 which is headed: "Orangemen ask Pearson for flag referendum". I also have an editorial from the *Telegram* of August 22 under the caption "Ask the people". It goes on to say:

> The voice of the people can be heard on this issue only through a national plebiscite...
>
> Here is a matter which touches the hearts, the emotions, the loyalties of virtually all Canadians. A parliamentary vote that would destroy the country's flag would leave deep and festering scars for years to come.

So there is certainly the feeling among the people of the country that they want to have a voice in the selection of the flag which will fly over them.

Perhaps the reason they want to have a voice is the manner in which this flag resolution has been brought before the House of Commons. I want to return for a moment to the radio interview which I mentioned given by the then leader of the opposition on December 29, 1961. He was asked: "But you do think the country needs this symbol to hold us together?" and he replied: "Yes; I think it would be a good idea to have a distinctive Canadian flag in the interests of national unity". I emphasize the words "in the interests of national unity". We just have to look at what has happened in this country since the Liberal party took office to see that if there is anything which is needed in this country it is national unity. Unfortunately, everything which this government does tends to divide this country further and further. In another answer the Prime Minister went on to say: "We should try to solve these problems in a manner which will create the minimum of division and the maximum of unity". That is a good way of putting it, and I agree. I think that if we are going to bring in a new national flag it has to be done with a minimum of division in this country, and certainly the Prime Minister of today is not living up to his words of yesterday.

When the Prime Minister was asked: "What about Quebec; would they want the fleur-de-lis on it," Mr. Pearson said: "Well, we would have the Quebec members of our cabinet decide what the design would be". Perhaps it was the Quebec members of the government that designed this flag.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member permit me to ask him whether he is aware of the fact that the Prime Minister categorically denied ever having made that statement? I am sure he would not want to repeat something that was misreported and categorically denied by the Prime Minister.

Mr. Skoreyko: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Is it necessary that hon. members of this house must listen to the Minister of Transport, who is completely ignorant of the facts?

Mr. Slogan: Mr. Speaker, I do not mind the interjection made by the Minister of Transport. I think probably I am one of the more placid members of this house. I was not aware of the fact that the Prime Minister had denied this statement. I believe this report was taken from a tape recording, but if the Prime Minister did not make that statement, I will withdraw the remark, or at least indicate that I am sorry I ever mentioned it.

Mr. Pickersgill: I thank the hon. member.

Mr. Churchill: This was a tape recording.

An hon. Member: Good night Jack.

Mr. Slogan: Later in this interview the leader of the Liberal party was asked: "What is your conception of the new Canadian flag?" Mr. Pearson said, regarding the design: "Well, I am not going to tell you what the design should be." Mr. Pearson then went on to say: "The government will make up its mind. If I am going to be the head of the government I am not going to tell you what the design is." That does not make very much sense.

I would like to quote from an article which appeared in the Toronto *Star*, May 20, under the headline "P.M. Told Newsmen of Flag Decision". I suppose he must have changed his mind. Perhaps it would be more clear if I quote a few short lines from this article, because I think this has a bearing on the question. This quotation relates to that meeting of the Prime Minister and newsmen who were called to his home for the unfurling of

what was referred to as *"his choice"*, the three maple leaves design. He said—

—he was prepared to have the government stand or fall on the maple leaf flag.

The Prime Minister was careful, however, to make clear that the flag on the mantle was his personal choice.

When we now refer to the three maple leaves design as the Pearson pennant, or something of that nature, I certainly do not think he would now say it was not his personal choice. I am wondering whether it would not have been much more democratic for perhaps a caucus to make that choice, or a committee of this house.

Not only is the motion before the house in the name of the Prime Minister sponsoring a flag design of his own choice, but the Prime Minister said to this House of Commons that if we do not accept this flag then we are going to have an election. I have never heard anything more close to political blackmail than that statement.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to refer to a headline which appeared in the Toronto *Globe and Mail* on June 18. The headline states: "Regards Both Flag Votes as Confidence Tests: P.M.". Perhaps I might also refer to an article that appeared in the Toronto *Telegram* of July 20, written by Ronald Collister headed: "Accept My Flag or Else . . . Warns a Defiant Pearson". The article then states:

Mr. Pearson is laying down the law, with fire and fury, after the breakdown of all-party talks on a firm agenda for the next month.

In the Montreal *Gazette* of August 24 there appeared another article under the heading: "Free Flag Vote, Pearson Calls Off the Whips".

Mr. Speaker, perhaps there is a reason for this turn of events. I have before me an article written by Patrick Nicholson, which appeared in the Quebec *Chronicle-Telegram* on August 12, 1964. The heading is: "Election on Flag Could Kill Libs".

Perhaps all these headlines are really related one to the other. I think there must be a compromise in respect of this question. Although some might call these compromises retreats, I think the compromises are good. Perhaps one can properly come to the conclusion that if the compromises are necessary they are good. The Prime Minister did not give too much consideration to the whole situation in the beginning, or he would not have had to change his mind so many times. The fact that he is still openminded and willing to change his opinion I think represents good news for this parliament. I think more changes will have to be made.

[Mr. Slogan.]

Mr. Speaker, I should now like to refer to the amendment proposed by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) calling for a referendum. I think I have produced evidence showing that there is support among the people of Canada for this position. What might the result of such a referendum be? In my personal opinion I do not think a plebiscite should be held immediately. I agree with the original view of the leader of the Liberal party, that the time to call a referendum is at the next election. If the next election is held a year or two from now I think that would be an appropriate time to hold a referendum, because by then all the emotion that has now been created may well have subsided and we would be able to obtain a more accurate reflection of the views of the public than could be obtained today. I recall one politician who on many occasions said, when the sea is whipped up into fury and the waves are riding high, surveyors do not measure the height or depth of the land, but wait until the sea is calm. Perhaps that thought has some application to this present situation.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to refer now to the results of some polls which have been held. A Canadian Press dispatch in Winnipeg of June 29 appeared in the Ottawa *Citizen* and states:

A flag poll at the eight-day Red River exhibition here saw 41 per cent of 15,000 persons indicate a preference for the red ensign as Canada's national flag.

That poll was not conducted by the Conservative party, but was sponsored by the Manitoba New Democratic party. It showed 32 per cent of those polled in favour of a tri-maple leaf flag, 15 per cent in favour of a new flag with one maple leaf, and 12 per cent in favour of a new flag with some other design. Seventy four per cent of those polled favoured a national referendum on the flag. Certainly if one requires a sampling of public opinion, that is it, and it indicates that we should hold a referendum on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, in the *Evening Telegram* of June 10 appeared an article under the heading: "Flag Straw Vote Ends...Ensign 773; New Flag 332". I believe that poll was held in Newfoundland and should be of special interest to the Minister of Transport.

In the Montreal *Star* of July 21 appeared an article under the heading: "Red Ensign Advocated by 149,465". Perhaps I should read

a short part of this article, which states as follows:

> The office of the state secretary has received 149,465 signatures on letters and petitions since July, 1945, favouring retention of the red ensign as Canada's national flag, the Commons was informed yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, I think that article gives some idea of what the people of Canada are thinking, and would indicate why a referendum should be held on this flag issue. I do not think the Liberal party should be afraid of a referendum or plebiscite. The red ensign is leading in nine provinces.

On a national basis, as has been pointed out, the figures are, red ensign, 27.9 per cent, maple leaf flag, 39.6 and others, 15.4. Certainly, they have nothing to fear if they feel the people of Canada really want this three maple leaf flag. This is the way to get it, to have a referendum.

In this party we have generally supported the red ensign. I am not speaking here solely as a supporter of the red ensign. I think I can be a little broader in outlook, Mr. Speaker. Last December I conducted a survey in my own riding, and this was before all the emotions had been stirred up. The survey was quite a wide one but there were some flag questions included. At that time, 10 to 1, the people of my riding were in favour of a distinctive Canadian flag. The margin was something like 52 per cent to 48 per cent in favour of the red ensign. However, since that time, since the time the three maple leaf flag was unfurled, there has been a considerable change on the part of those who wanted a distinctive flag other than the red ensign. Many of them have now decided to support the red ensign because they feel it is a far superior design to the one proposed by the Prime Minister. I agree with them because, personally, I do not like the three maple leaves. I would prefer one maple leaf.

I believe we, in this party, are being very broadminded. I do not believe we have been such diehards, because not only are we suggesting a referendum but our subamendment provides a wide scope for the questions to be placed on the referendum. We have given four choices to the people of Canada. The first is the red ensign. The second is a modification of the red ensign. The third is the three maple leaf flag, and the fourth is a single maple leaf flag. Since this proposal has been made in the subamendment there have been a number of speeches made in this house in which the suggestion has been made this question should be referred to a committee. I am wholeheartedly behind this idea. I believe that this party would be prepared to accept a reasonable deliberation by such a committee. If the government insists on a time limit so far as the committee is concerned, certainly that would be no stumbling block.

I feel that one of the things the committee could consider would be a design that might have almost unanimous approval. If such unanimity were reached and such a flag were brought back to the house, I believe it could be adopted without too much debate and there would be no need for further reference to the people. If the small group of members comprising this committee were unable to agree, then perhaps they could clarify the questions that should be asked on this referendum. Of course the red ensign question is very clear. The question of modifications on the red ensign could be considered by this committee and perhaps they could suggest a modified red ensign that could be placed on the referendum. Then we have the three maple leaf flag. It could be considered as it is or perhaps suggestions may be made to modify it, such as those made by A. Y. Jackson. Perhaps his design could be considered, and a final recommendation brought forward. Then we come to the one maple leaf design. Of course, there are hundreds of one maple leaf designs. Perhaps if this committee could not agree on a design they could at least narrow down the number of one maple leaf designs. All these designs could be put on the ballot.

Then I believe the committee should report to the house and this question should be put to a referendum. This issue should be taken out of the House of Commons and referred to the people as a whole. If even a small group cannot decide amongst themselves, then we in this larger House of Commons have little hope of reaching agreement on a design. I feel that if this committee chose these four designs and then the people declared themselves on those designs, the design chosen by the people would automatically become the flag. I think the suggestions made from this side of the house are worthy of consideration. I believe the very fact that we are willing to give the people this scope, and are willing to accept the decision which the people may make, whatever it may be, certainly shows that we are not so stubborn or so rigid in connection with one design that if the people of Canada as a whole voiced their opinion, we would not be willing to accept it.

Surely that is the spirit of compromise. I do not believe we have to apologize for it. I think that is the spirit in which we must consider this question. I see my time is running out, Mr. Speaker. Incidentally, the Winnipeg *Free Press,* which is certainly one of the greatest supporters of the Liberal party, says in its editorial of August 21:

> Thus a national flag is being born in the worst possible circumstances—in political bitterness, party strife and parliamentary manoeuvring. The outcome could easily be a flag that would be looked on by many not as a symbol of national unity but as a political flag of divisiveness and controversy.

Farther down, the editorial reads:

> Why could not Mr. Pearson—in the hope of securing some harmony within parliament—ask to refer the flag motion to a parliamentary committee composed of representatives of all parties?

Then, it goes on:

> —it would give parliament a voice in choosing a national flag...

And farther down it says:

> —would make a start towards restoring public respect for parliament.

What we are asking, Mr. Speaker, is being asked in the spirit of compromise which has been accepted by the leader of the Liberal party and the Prime Minister, by shifting his position from time to time. I do not consider it is dishonourable to do that. I think he must shift his position once more if he is really interested in the unity of this country. I am not so old and so bound to tradition that I am unable to sense that I must exhibit a spirit of understanding and compromise, if this nation is to emerge united and strong after this debate. I am not so young that I do not feel a sense of loyalty or devotion to the symbols which have signified and represented something of the richness and uniqueness of my country. I recall the credo of the Progressive Conservative party which is contained in the phrase, "The vision to create, the courage to retain." I think if anyone searches within himself for a guideline to direct his thinking to contribute more to the interest of Canada and all Canadians, then that is a very worthy one to remember. I think if we directed our thoughts along the lines of that phrase, we could contribute more to the interest of Canada and of Canadians than if we were to apply any other philosophy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I must say that it is difficult, if not impossible, to achieve a unifying symbol in a country that is itself not unified. This was stated in one editorial. Perhaps it was the thought of the Prime Minister that at this time when the very threads of confederation seem to be bursting, that the various opposing elements in this country could unify behind a symbol of Canada such as a flag. This may be a legitimate desire on the part of the Prime Minister in introducing this resolution. However, just as the bicultural commission, instead of unifying the country has already tended to crystallize the English and French apart from one another, and at the same time has sent a wave of nationalism through the other ethnic groups which was not evident before, so the introduction of the flag resolution has tended to divide this country along Anglo-Saxon and French lines.

Because of this, like many speakers before me I deplore this debate taking place. I deplore that the Prime Minister has not seen fit to postpone the flag debate until there is more evidence of unity in the country and when the rallying around a flag would be more natural. The introduction of a flag should be at a time when jealousy and distrust and hatred are at their lowest ebb. That is not the case today.

Because I am neither of Anglo-Saxon nor of French origin, I deplore more than most the fruitless, the useless and the damaging forces that have been set forth in this flag debate. The hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Starr) has already expressed not the joy but the sadness of those of us who are considered the third element in Canada to see the two factions at loggerheads with one another, especially when these two factions, whether accurately or inaccurately, are considered the founding races in Canada.

Also, in making a contribution to this debate I would like to say that too many Anglo-Saxons and too many French people forget that they are not the only ones in Canada. Today, just as in this House of Commons, every group is a minority, with the Anglo-Saxons, the French, and the other groups combined forming almost equal factions. The fact that Canada is a country of minorities has often made me feel proud because I could see so much unity in the diversity about us, until lately. I grew up in the west where people settled in colonies of Ukrainians, Germans, Polish and French, and it may be interesting to note that in my own riding I have more Indians than I have people of French origin, although we do have a few communities of French people—and I may say they are very fine people.

I might digress for a moment, Mr. Speaker, to read a letter from one of our original citizens, the Indians. This letter is significant because it comes from one of the seven Indian chiefs I have in my riding, a man who

was a past chief of the Indian Brotherhood of Canada, and in his letter he says:

> I have just returned from a meeting in Winnipeg. We were shown the proposed new flag. None of the chiefs like it. They wanted to know where the union jack was. It is the flag of our Queen and should be part of the flag of Canada. All of the chiefs in Manitoba wanted the red ensign to be the official flag of Canada. Please speak for us on this point.
>
> I am enclosing a petition of the people on my reserve.

In the Toronto *Telegram* of June 13 there was a letter to the editor from a Peter Jackson, headed "Indian Treaties in Jeopardy." It read as follows:

> Apart from other aspects of the flag situation in Canada, as an Indian I am deeply concerned about the apparent determination of the government to impose a new national flag on the Canadian people.
>
> I am fully conscious of the significance of the union jack in some form to the majority of Indians in Canada. Most of the treaties which Indians signed included a reference to the "flag", then the full union jack, and the final approval of these treaties involved the presentation of a flag to the Indian tribes concerned as an earnest of good faith.
>
> The present proposal of a flag bearing only a few maple leaves is very disturbing as it appears to place in jeopardy the treaties signed in the past for "as long as the grass grows, the sun shines and the flag flows in the breeze."
>
> Certainly no Indians, nor Eskimos, have been consulted about a Canadian flag, and, for Indians at least, it has a greater significance than to any other people in the dominion.

Perhaps this again is a reason why we should have a referendum.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I regret I have to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

Mr. Churchill: Let him go on.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the hon. member have unanimous agreement?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I regret there were some noes, so the hon. member does not have unanimous consent.

Mr. Churchill: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, in view of the suggestions made this afternoon by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) that we be given an opportunity to express ourselves fully, would it not be wise to let those who are participating in this debate have extended time to do so, rather than being chopped off by those who are not participating at all?

Mr. Pickersgill: If I may make a suggestion—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the hon. member rising on the same point of order?

Mr. Pickersgill: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Clancy: Sit down.

Mr. Pickersgill: I would suggest that we do allow the hon. gentleman to continue his speech, and that we agree to sit for that many extra minutes after 10.30 so that no time will be lost.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Perron: Mr. Speaker, for at least 15 days now, we have had the opportunity on many occasions to listen to various speeches which are a continuous repetition. I think we are so used to the same things repeated by many hon. members that, in my opinion, the hon. member who now has the floor should have had plenty of time to express his views. Consequently, since his time period has now expired, I object once again to its extension.

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is obviously not unanimous agreement.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Georges Valade (St. Mary): Mr. Speaker, in my opening remarks, I should like to say that I do not approve, nor does my party, of the delaying tactics which were used, starting December 17, 1962, to prevent the then prime minister to complete the answers he had started to give to the then leader of the opposition.

Mr. Habel: Judgment has been passed on that.

Mr. Valade: We recall the incident very clearly. We are not going to resort to tactics which we did not approve then and which are not approved now by the people.

Those who think that we are filibustering by taking part in this important debate are unfair and are only showing their lack of interest or, worse still, trying to explain their silence to the house and the people.

Mr. Plourde: You are the ones who do not care.

Mr. Valade: After only 15 days of debate, nobody should speak of obstruction regarding a matter of such importance. We, of the opposition, are conscientiously doing our duty—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Valade: —as honestly as possible—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Valade: —and I would even go so far as to say, in reply to the Creditistes who have just uttered those sounds, that we have never contradicted ourselves on such a vital issue as the choice of a distinctive Canadian flag.

On the contrary, it is those who refuse to speak in this house—

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Valade: —it is those who refuse to take a stand according to their conscience—

Mr. Caouette: May I put a question to the hon. member?

An hon. Member: Certainly.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for St. Mary has the floor and, obviously, he does not wish to reply.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I should like, at this time, to ask a question—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for St. Mary has the floor.

Mr. Valade: Mr. Speaker, the reason I do not wish to reply now to the hon. member for Villeneuve is that I intend to do so in the course of my speech, which is the thing to do, because we of the official opposition are getting sick and tired of hearing the irrelevant remarks some people are making instead of taking their responsibilities, in this house, on such a vital issue, one which should bind the conscience of every member, as this proposal of a distinctive Canadian flag.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Valade: I repeat that those who are not that conscientious and who prevent a member of the house from expressing his views on that project fail to discharge their responsibilities, not only toward their own party but also towards those who elected them to be represented honestly and conscientiously—

Mr. Perron: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Beauce raises a point of order.

Mr. Perron: In my opinion, the hon. member for St. Mary is not entitled any more than the others to impute motives to members of this house.

Mr. Valade: Mr. Speaker, I submit that the point of order is as stupid as the hon. member who raised it, because we did not take the position in this house of preventing any Creditiste member from speaking in this chamber.

Mr. Perron: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Valade: I submit that—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Beauce raised a point of order again.

Mr. Perron: Yes, Mr. Speaker. When the hon. member for St. Mary says that they never prevented any other member from speaking and from saying what he had to say, I want to recall to him that the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr Churchill), the opposition house leader refused the member for Villeneuve the privilege of continuing a speech after the time limit granted to him.

Mr. Valade: Mr. Speaker, as for the point of order, I wish to say that all those interruptions have taken about three or four minutes of my time and I would ask you to allow me a few minutes longer after my time is up.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out to the hon. members opposite that I do not intend to show as much moderation in my remarks as my colleague who has just resumed his seat, for he does not have to put up with this flow of propaganda organized by the Liberal machine—

An hon. Member: Order.

Mr. Valade: —so that this flag issue may become simply and purely a partisan issue.

Mr. Caouette: Talk about the subamendment.

Mr. Valade: I am coming to it and I can assure you that you will be surprised.

Mr. Caouette: Let us hear it.

Mr. Valade: Mr. Speaker, throughout all the years I have been in this house, I never had to read my speech, but in view of present circumstances and of possible misinterpretations—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Vincent: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I would ask you to call the hon. members to order. I take this opportunity to tell them that when the hon. member for St. James (Mr. Rinfret), who is assistant whip of the Liberal party, read his speech, we did not interrupt him in any way at any time.

Mr. Choquette: Because he made an intelligent speech.

Mr. Vincent: We let him read his speech to the end. I would therefore ask you to call the hon. members to order. They should be as polite with the members of the opposition as were the latter with the government supporters.

Mr. Valade: I wish to point out to the many visitors listening in the galleries that the members of the Liberal party and the minor parties behave like school children during this debate on the flag issue. They show partisanship in their interjections, because instead of rising and stating their point of view, they have incessantly interrupted and insulted me, but I do not worry because they are too low to reach me. I think that they show the depth of their genius and their broadmindness.

Mr. Speaker, the debate on a national distinctive flag exceeds in my opinion the scope of ordinary legislation coming under administrative responsibilities. It is a question which affects those who are not affected by a piece of legislation and I am thinking of those who, on account of their age, are out of the reach of existing laws. The choice of a distinctive national flag has this characteristic; it concerns every citizen of Canada for centuries to come.

What we should deplore most is the turn taken by the debate because of the blunder made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) in steeping the flag issue in political partisanship. The introduction of the resolution as an ultimatum including the adoption of two flags in the statutes of Canada as well as two national anthems—

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Valade: —is, at once, unacceptable to any member worthy of this name.

Mr. Speaker, there is no point of order; it is all part of dilatory measures of obstruction.

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It is prohibited to read a speech and, what is more, a speech written by someone else. It is obvious that this speech was written by Mr. Allard.

Mr. Valade: This is a kind of stupidity which shows the hon. member's personality. Not only does he annoy his own government, but he annoys all hon. members of the house and the people who elected him; they will get rid of him, I am convinced, at the next election, because he has shown no seriousness in any of his interventions. If he had the courage of his convictions, he would stand up after me and endeavour to justify himself by suggesting a means to solve the dilemma in which the Prime Minister himself placed us, by his own will and awkwardness. I do not intend, Mr. Speaker, to yield to those dilatory tactics taken by government members to shorten my time. We are all well aware of those tactics.

Mr. Choquette: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Would the hon. member be kind enough to resume his seat?

Mr. Choquette: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I would ask the hon. member to resume his seat and I would suggest to the hon. members for St. Mary (Mr. Valade) and Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette) that perhaps it would be favourable to the progress of our business of the house to forget for a moment the personal remarks exchanged between the two hon. members and to restrict ourselves to the consideration of the subject now before the house.

Mr. Valade: I am precisely establishing a preamble but since the beginning of my remarks the government members and the members of the splinter parties have been continuously interrupting me. I did not make any attack against any member. I am here to submit a viewpoint and, as a member, I have the right to be respected. Mr. Speaker has the duty to silence those who want to muzzle me. Besides, I do not intend to be impressed by such manoeuvres and such tactics.

Mr. Choquette: Who wrote your speech?

Mr. Valade: If the hon. member happened to be elected by having his speeches written, at least he should not accuse others—

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I have never read a speech in this house at any time, still less a speech written by someone else.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: May I say that it is the practice and the custom that when the Speaker rises, members must resume their seats.

Once more I urge both hon. members to co-operate with the Chair and restrict themselves to the consideration of the resolution now before the house. I would ask the hon. member for St. Mary to deal with the proposal under study.

Mr. Valade: I am precisely dealing with the resolution and the subamendment, and I think that much scope has been given to all members of the house, and especially to the hon.

members for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) and Carleton (Mr. Francis) and to all other government members. I do not understand why those ridiculous interjections are made by Liberal members.

Mr. Francis: Mr. Speaker, I have not yet spoken in this house on this question.

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. One member only can be recognized at a time. The hon. member for Carleton has the floor on a question of privilege. Perhaps he should be heard first.

Mr. Diefenbaker: It should be pointed out to the hon. member for Carleton, just as a lesson in procedure, that he did not make this interruption from his seat.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: He is now speaking from his own seat.

Mr. Francis: I wish to point out that I have not participated in the flag debate so far. I understood the hon. member to say I had.

Mr. Valade: I think the hon. member is now making an interruption.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I should like to go on to say that if we are now facing a difficult situation in this house, it is because the man who received the Nobel peace award, since it was said that he had showed great qualities as a mediator on the international scene—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Valade: I am glad to hear this applause, because that man, as I was saying, proved to be unable to settle, in his own country, a situation as delicate as the flag issue and he introduced in this house a solution that produced confusion.

If I accuse the Prime Minister of such misconduct, it is because he was very keen on introducing under his own name a proposal which should have been kept outside party lines.

However, he is not the only one responsible. Pressed by the panicky mob of his supporters who saw their political ambitions fade away at the thought of a general election, he abandoned principle for partisan strategy.

Mr. Speaker, our country has never experienced so much uneasiness as it has since this Liberal administration took office.

Retreats, reversals, abdication of principles have shaken the confidence of the people in

[Mr. Valade.]

the authority of the government, and separatism exploded under this irresponsible administration.

Why, Mr. Speaker? Because French Canadians felt they were let down by co-operative federalism and by the retreats of the Prime Minister.

How can the Canadian people have confidence—

Mr. Choquette: Who wrote this speech?

Mr. Valade: —in a man who, on May 19, 1964, said about the flag:

> I have pointed out, and I think I should make it quite clear, that when the government submits to parliament a matter of policy—

Mr. Choquette: On a point of order.

Mr. Valade: —parliament must—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Lotbinière has raised a point of order.

Mr. Choquette: On a point of order. I ask that the lights be put out in order to prevent the hon. member from reading the text written by somebody else.

Mr. Valade: Mr. Speaker, there is no need to put out the lights, the hon. member is already in the dark.

Mr. Speaker, I was just going to say that the Prime Minister, when he introduced his resolution on June 19, stated that a principle was involved and that the government would stand or fall on the decision of the house.

And now that man, going back on that principle, told us a few days ago: The vote on the flag issue will not be considered by the government as a vote of confidence.

As stated by Mr. Claude Ryan in that same editorial of *Le Devoir* of August 22 last:

> We wonder if a man is serious when he says, one day, that there is a principle involved in a certain question and, the next, changes his views.

Further on, Mr. Ryan states:

> We sincerely believe that there is nothing more serious than the public reversal by the head of a state on a question of principle.

Not only has the Prime Minister contradicted himself on a question of principle, but he has lied openly. This charge is not made by myself but by two of his colleagues, the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Francis) and the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan), who said as much during their participation in the debate, when they stated that the Prime Minister had not told the truth when he claimed that he had consulted the Liberal caucus on the choice of the three maple leaves.

Mr. Speaker, why did the Prime Minister not think of including in his flag a symbol showing that our country is Christian?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Valade: I see that some people shrink at the thought of including a Christian symbol on the flag, but that does not surprise me on the part of some hon. members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, would the reason be found in the news item published in the great Montreal paper *La Presse* in 1955, on the second page—

Mr. Choquette: Who wrote that speech?

Mr. Valade: Toronto, 1955. Press release of the Canadian Press.

> The Hon. Lester B. Pearson, Canadian secretary of state for external affairs, stated yesterday evening that he doubted that organized Christian religion would be able to unite the peoples of the world.

And he listed the weak points which prevent Christendom from accomplishing such a task.

> Past experience makes us question the importance of the part played by organized Christian religion in recognizing that interdependence of nations, which will lead to greater unification in the world.

And the release adds, that, according to Mr. Pearson:

> The truth is that after 2,000 years, Christianity remains the religion of a comparatively small minority. Though missionary zeal is often praiseworthy, adds Mr. Pearson, it often results in contempt for other people's beliefs.

Those, Mr. Speaker, are the reasons which perhaps caused the Prime Minister to omit in his distinctive Canadian flag design all Christian symbols which might honour this country among Christian nations.

Mr. Choquette: Who wrote that speech?

Mr. Valade: Certainly not the hon. member for Lotbinière, who would be too stupid to do so.

The Prime Minister has sown the seed of mistrust, and he has shaken—

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Valade: —he has shaken the confidence of the people in the function—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Is the hon. member for Lotbinière raising a point of order?

Mr. Choquette: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

A lot of things have been tolerated in this debate. But now the hon. member is accusing the Prime Minister of lying. Earlier, he called the hon. member for Quebec East a fool and now, he is calling me an idiot.

I understand that when he is reading the speech of Mr. Allard, his vocabulary is more proper; but when he speaks on his own, he loses his head and uses coarse language.

I ask him to withdraw and to speak as a parliamentarian and not as a member of parliament who will be defeated in the next election.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, on the same question of privilege—

[*Text*]

Mr. Skoreyko: I cannot see, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. A question of privilege has been raised by the hon. member—

Mr. Skoreyko: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Before the two hon. members who are now standing proceed any further I would ask them to resume their seats. Would the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) kindly resume his seat. The Chair should be allowed to make a ruling immediately. I believe no question of privilege has been raised by the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette). I do not think the epithet used by the hon. member for St. Mary (Mr. Valade) is unparliamentary.

Mr. Skoreyko: With great deference, Mr. Speaker, on the question of privilege I would say that the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette) took offence at the words used by the hon. member for St. Mary (Mr. Valade). The hon. member for Lotbinière said the hon. member for St. Mary used the words "a fool". If the hon. member for St. Mary recognized certain qualities in that particular member, I do not see why he should take offence.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I suggest that very little has been added to the question by the intervention of the hon. member. A ruling has been made that there is no question of privilege. The hon. member for St. Mary has the floor.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the hon. member for Villeneuve rise on another question of privilege?

Canadian Flag

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, here is my question of privilege. While the hon. member for St. Mary talked about Christianity and the need for more Christianity in Canada giving us quotations of 2,000 years ago, he called the hon. member for Lotbinière a fool. I say this. Although for the last 2,000 years the same Bible has been preached in Canada and elsewhere, there are still people like the hon. member for St. Mary who incur damnation every day.

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I would ask the co-operation of all hon. members not to raise alleged questions of privilege or points of order to interrupt the hon. member who has the floor and who is entitled to be heard without interruption.

Mr. Nasserden: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege affecting all members on this side of the house. My question of privilege arises out of the remarks of the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette) when he referred to reading speeches in this house. I want to point out that the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. McLean) the other afternoon never took his nose out of his notes, and that is a far cry from what the hon. member who now has the floor is doing.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. For the third, fourth or fifth consecutive time, there is obviously no question of privilege whatsoever and I fail to see how hon. members' privileges are affected by the point raised at this time. I again ask the co-operation of all hon. members to allow the hon. member for St. Mary to continue his remarks uninterrupted.

Mr. Valade: Mr. Speaker, I now rise on a question of personal privilege myself. I would like to submit to Your Honour that I have been continually interrupted while making my speech.

I have been insulted, although I do not care from which corner these insults come. I think these people are causing more disruption and obstruction by their interventions in these proceedings than we ever did in the house. I think the time they have taken by these interferences should be given to me to compensate for the injustices now being caused to me.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry for having said—First of all, I did not use the words imputed to me by the hon. member for Lotbinière to the effect that I said that the Prime Minister had lied. I said that it had been said by his own colleagues.

I am sorry for having said that the hon. member for Lotbinière is a fool and is completely lacking in intelligence; I am sorry for having said that the hon. member for Villeneauve is lacking judgment. I never spoke so many truths in so short a time. I hope that the house will put up with me.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the Prime Minister because of the procedure he followed in introducing this resolution in the house, sowed distrust. He shook up forever the confidence of the people for the function he represents or which he should represent.

The man who once said:

That he preferred to live under the communist yoke rather than be killed by the atomic bomb—

—once again showed an uncommon weakness.

If the Prime Minister was not afraid to face an election, he would not have backed down. Therefore, it is not judgment which motivates his decisions, but fear. And fear is a rather bad adviser.

The Prime Minister was, at first, afraid to lose face. That is why he did not consult the party chiefs. He was afraid of an election, and that is why he sullied the matter of principle. He was afraid of being overthrown by his own members on the second part of his resolution, with regard to the adoption of the union jack as a second flag; that is the reason why he avoided the confidence vote.

The Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Dupuis) has become the official propagator—I mean official propagandist—of the Liberal government—

Mr. Choquette: Not propagator, but propagandist. You do not know how to read.

Mr. Valade: The hon. member for Lotbinière does not understand what I am saying—

Mr. Choquette: The hon. member for St. Mary cannot read.

Mr. Valade: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member for Lotbinière is a neurotic, I shall ask him to leave the house or to respect those who have the floor, as well as your authority.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to prevent the stupid member for Lotbinière from interrupting me at every turn for nothing.

Mr. Choquette: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Lotbinière rises to a question of privilege.

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, we are all fed up of hearing the hon. member using abusive language and insulting everybody, calling one stupid and the other idiot.

I cannot understand that you should have ruled that such language was parliamentary. The hon. member uses coarse language when he does not read the speech of Mr. Allard. I would ask him to read correctly the speech written by Mr. Maurice Allard; that is all I want. He should abide by the rules, be polite and refrain from using coarse language.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for St. Mary.

Mr. Valade: Mr. Speaker, now that the show is over, I will proceed with my remarks.

For the past few days, service stations have been able to write to the Prime Minister, attention of the Minister without Portfolio, to obtain at low cost, pennants, flags, beer mugs and shields with the three maple leaves of the Prime Minister.

If supplies run short, the minister may import some at short notice from Japan, because deliveries are made very quickly.

The three-leaf flag has become a profitable business for the traffickers of the country. The government has suddenly become a distributor of souvenirs. It is even surprising that the Minister without Portfolio is not seen with a cart in front of the parliament buildings auctioning the Pearson's proposal to visitors.

We, on this side of the house, want a distinctive Canadian flag—

Mr. Choquette: Now, you are reading much better.

Mr. Valade: You are now speaking better yourself.

As far as I am concerned, I shall vote for a distinctive flag of which we can be proud, a flag that we shall display with pride, that we shall respect and which will be respected throughout the world; in short, a flag that will make us feel Canadians first and foremost.

But how could we be proud of the Prime Minister's suggestion if it has to be forced upon us by a majority vote when it has been soiled by the partisan ambitions of the Liberals or by amateur hucksters.

If the Prime Minister is really sincere about his distinctive Canadian flag project, he should leave partisanship out of it. He should accept alternatives reflecting the aspirations of the Canadian people in this matter.

I have expressed my views several times on this question. Several Conservative members expressed their views on it in the house between 1958 and 1962. Those many suggestions on a Canadian flag were made by Conservative members who were then in power and not afraid of assuming their responsibilities, and they were respected by the leader of their party, the then prime minister and present Leader of the Opposition.

Never did we get, from the Liberal opposition of the day, any suggestion for a distinctive Canadian flag, but we, the Conservatives, got down to work.

We began to find a solution to that problem which had been neglected for 22 years, under the careless Liberal administration of our friends opposite.

Mr. Speaker, we now have to deal with a subamendment—

An hon. Member: About time.

Mr. Valade: In my opinion, it is imperative—and I think my friends' time will not be wasted—to bring to light now the conflicting stands taken by certain hon. members or party leaders, just to show to what extent this debate has managed to distort the objective we should all strive to achieve.

On the question of the referendum, for instance, the Ralliement Créditiste have actually disowned their past and their constituents. The member for Villeneuve, a few moments ago, intervened in the debate and he accused the opposition of trying to filibuster in this debate by proposing a referendum.

Now, on March 5, 1963, during a meeting he held in Montreal, with all his candidates of the island of Montreal, he said that if his party came into office, he would call a referendum on the question of a national flag within six months. And here is the man and his party—

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I wish the hon. member for St. Mary would have the honesty to quote word for word what I said about a distinctive national flag in 1963, because he is mistaken. Someone else said that within six months a plebiscite or referendum would be requested or held to choose a flag. If the hon. member for St. Mary claims that the hon. member for Villeneuve himself requested a plebiscite, he is lying barefacedly before all hon. members of the house.

Mr. Valade: Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to have the charges laid by the hon. member for Villeneuve withdrawn because, according to Beauchesne's, when an hon. member rises

in the house, he is responsible for what he says and if he must submit evidence to support his remarks, otherwise he can be accused of lying.

Mr. Caouette: Give us proof.

Mr. Valade: In reply to the hon. member for Villeneuve, I have here an article from the March 5, 1962 issue of *La Presse,* which reads thus:

Mr. Caouette's promise.
A referendum within six months on the flag issue.

It is written out in full and for the future guidance of the hon. member for Villeneuve, here is what it says:

Six months after coming into power, the Créditistes will ask the Canadian people, by way of a referendum, to choose a distinctive national flag.
Such was the statement made on Sunday afternoon by Mr. Réal Caouette, national associate leader of the Social Credit party, who was the chief speaker at a big Social Credit meeting in Montreal.

Should the hon. member wish me to keep on reading, I will give the names of all the candidates attending that meeting.

Mr. Caouette: Name them.

An hon. Member: Withdraw.

Mr. Valade: I think that when the hon. member for Villeneuve accuses me of lying, I wonder who is the liar in view of the evidence. I shall not require an answer, for charity's sake.

Mr. Speaker, on this matter of a referendum the hon. member for Villeneuve is not the only one who has taken a contradictory stand. On January 23, 1961—and I see the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Dupuis) taking out his references—on January 23, 1961 in the house, the Minister without Portfolio, the hon. member for St. Jean-Iberville-Napierville, seconded the former member for St. Boniface, Mr. Laurier Régnier, who moved a bill to provide for a referendum concerning the adoption of a Canadian distinctive flag. The Minister without Portfolio supported this resolution; but now that he is a member of the cabinet, he rejects the proposal for a referendum. Such a contradictory stand is not in accordance with the soundness and sincerity we should bring into the debate concerning the adoption of a distinctive national flag.

I believe that if our hon. colleagues on the opposite side, as well as the members of the smaller parties, have not got enough courage to rise in this house and express clearly and positively their points of view on the flag issue, but are satisfied with mere interjecting or charging the official opposition with filibustering, I believe they are dishonest and their present stand is contrary to the dictates of their conscience, for in taking such an attitude, they only prejudice the cause they should support, that is to gain the confidence of the people in their members by discharging their responsibilities and their duty as representatives of the people and the Canadian population.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

The hon. member has been wriggling for 20 minutes—

Mr. Dupuis: No, for 45 minutes.

Mr. Caouette: —for 45 minutes—

Mr. Choquette: This is Mr. Allard's speech.

Mr. Caouette: We do not know where he is heading. Could he tell us exactly whether he is in favour of a referendum? In favour of a distinctive national flag?

An hon. Member: Order.

Mr. Caouette: What does he favour? We wish we knew.

Mr. Choquette: That is something you would have to ask Mr. Allard because he is the one who wrote that speech.

Mr. Valade: If the hon. member cannot see what I am getting at, we know even less what he stands for since, he is now against a referendum whereas he was in favour of it during the election campaign. The same thing goes for the Minister without Portfolio. At the time, he was in favour of a referendum; now he is against it.

By expressing my opinion on this question, I am taking my responsibilities—

Mr. Caouette: Which question?

Mr. Valade: —and I am exposing the treachery of those who make believe that they are sincerely opposed to the Conservative proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the hon. member for Villeneuve to remain seated and to stop bothering me. He can speak after I am through and I shall answer—

Mr. Caouette: And I am going to give you a good licking too.

Mr. Valade: The Créditiste candidate lost his deposit in my riding.

Mr. Caouette: Wait until the next election.

Mr. Valade: Mr. Speaker, I was speaking precisely on the subamendment, that is on the referendum and my hon. friend is wondering why I do not deal with the matter under consideration. Then if the hon. member is dishonest enough to impute to others the faults he may have made himself, he should have the courage to repeat his statement and assume the responsibility of his assertions. If he does so, I will summon him before the committee on privileges and elections.

An hon. Member: As the union nationale.

Mr. Valade: I know that the hon. member for Lotbinière is a pain in the neck for the Prime Minister and parliament and I hope he will have medical treatment before too long.

Mr. Speaker, if the Prime Minister had appreciated that before introducing the flag resolution, it would have been better first to agree on the definition of the term which in my opinion give rise to all his troubles, he would have realized that it was necessary to determine what is meant by the word "distinctive".

For some of my English speaking compatriots, the word "distinctive" has quite a different meaning than for French speaking people.

For them, it can be an alteration of the red ensign, with also a symbol reminding us of the participation of French Canadians on an equal basis. If they are sincere—and I think they are—they are entitled to this opinion. But I feel that while respecting this viewpoint, we must admit that it is neither in harmony with the desire of the majority of the people nor able to establish a real Canadian spirit and to unite all ethnical elements in our country.

For us, French Canadians, this word "distinctive" means something which would not include any sign or symbol of dependence on another country.

We want to be first of all Canadians, proud of our origins, proud of our history. Confident in our future, we ought to accept nothing less than a flag which would be truly ours, which nobody might confuse with another one. Hoisted throughout the world, it will have to be the symbol of a nation on a par with the great powers. And it will open for us the doors to international discussions on an equal basis.

A flag including a foreign emblem would be likely to lower our prestige in the world. It would prove that we are not yet free from our colonial status, while in fact the Statute of Westminster of 1931 freed us from this stigma.

How can we talk of repatriating our constitution if we have not acquired yet the patriotic maturity required?

Do we suffer from a lack of patriotism? Should we not put our country above everything else? If we are able to answer yes readily to all those questions, we cannot accept anything but a truly distinctive national flag without any symbol of subservience.

But if our heart, our feelings, our attachment are not entirely centred on our country, we are not mature enough to ask for a truly Canadian flag and we should talk even less of total Canadianism.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I would like to submit to the house the ten commandments we would be wise to observe if we want to reach a settlement on the flag question. Perhaps I should have submitted them earlier, for our hon. friends opposite would have then controlled their temper.

The commandments would be as follows:

1. Establish our good faith, explicitly.
2. Speak on behalf of our constituents, courageously.
3. Avoid offending remarks, conscientiously.
4. Eliminate the racial question, obviously.
5. Avoid claiming that a Canadian distinctive flag is a concession to Quebec, naturally.
6. Co-operate in finding an acceptable solution, sincerely.
7. Express our views, freely.
8. Refrain from distributing the three-leaf flag indiscriminately.
9. Liberals should express their views, honestly.
10. Do our duty as we should in this parliament assembly.

Mr. Choquette: And the hon. member should sit down, slowly.

Mr. Valade: Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, to end this deadlock, the Prime Minister should accept an alternative; he should prove his goodwill to the people by withdrawing his three maple leaves and accepting a compromise meeting the wishes and the aspirations of the Canadian people.

Many hon. members found quite enticing the suggestion made the other night by the hon. member for Nicolet-Yamaska (Mr. Vincent). In fact, many colleagues told me they were quite ready to accept a flag bearing one green maple leaf which would in a way

recall the history of our country, a symbol which would not be a symbol of division but one of national unity. The maple leaf identifies Canadian people everywhere in the world, as at the Olympic games for instance. When our athletes go abroad, they wear a maple leaf on their uniforms and this is how they are identified as Canadians.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Valade: The maple leaf is an accepted symbol, but there has never been three maple leaves on coats of arms, jackets or uniforms of our representatives abroad. And I hope that the Prime Minister, if he wants to show his sincerity in coming to an agreement on that question, will accept this alternative and change his flag so that it will be acceptable everywhere.

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, obviously I do not intend tonight to speak on the merit of the resolution which is before the house. I plead guilty; I was the first to object, for the purposes of the discussion which followed the introduction of the subamendment, to speeches foreign to that measure.

Therefore, tonight I will keep strictly to the question of procedure, that is to the question of deciding which procedure must be admitted in a effort to put an end to the debate which has been going on for so long already.

[*Text*]

This afternoon, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) made certain suggestions about the conduct of the business which, if I am restating them correctly, were as follows: First, the official opposition is to state clearly their intentions in this debate. Then, he asked the government to take those intentions into consideration. He then urged the government to do three things: 1. To sit it out without any indication of closure of any kind; 2. To keep the door open for compromise; 3. To plan the week's business from now on with Mondays taken for legislation, Fridays for estimates and the other three days for the flag debate. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) commented on this suggestion in these words: "Accepted here and now; it is up to the government."

In the early part of his speech, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre suggested that if the official opposition wanted a prolonged debate for the purpose of bringing out every aspect of the flag question the hours of sitting should be extended. I am going to respond to this suggestion here and now on behalf of the government. We would, of course, be glad to get on with other legislation. We think the best way of doing that is to get the flag debate over with. But if that is not possible, we are not prepared to have the time available for the flag debate in each week reduced.

However, there is one way in which the suggestion of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre could easily be carried out right away. The government would be prepared, if the house will agree, to sit on Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays, in the evening, eight to midnight. In this fashion the number of hours available for the flag debate would not be reduced. The government then would be only too happy to reserve Mondays for other legislation, on the understanding that the flag debate will be concluded by the end of September.

Mr. Monteith: Go away; by the end of September.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Same old nonsense.

Mr. Crouse: Just a different type of closure.

Mr. Favreau: I am asking all hon. members to give serious thought to these proposals. I shall try to arrange a meeting of the house leaders of the various parties, tomorrow if possible, with a view to seeing whether they could not be put into effect next week. I hope this ready acceptance by the government of suggestions made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre will be ample evidence that the government is keeping the door open and is ready to consider any reasonable course in relation to the present debate.

Mr. M. W. Martin (Timmins): Mr. Speaker, as has been quite obvious, it was not my intention to enter this debate at this stage of the proceedings. I think it has been amply demonstrated that my colleagues in the New Democratic party take the same stand. However there comes a time when your concern for your country can no longer allow you to remain quiet. Certainly, the performance of this parliament from the time it opened last February, and more and more in recent months and weeks, leads anyone who has any concern for his country to stop and do some thinking. I think this concern is very well summed up in an article that came to my desk today, and what surprises me is that I think this is the first article this particular writer has ever written with which I could

agree. I am referring to Mr. Lubor J. Zink, and I would like to read his article at this time. He says:

> It is safe to assume that, as a result of partisan exploitation of dormant nationalistic sentiments, the flag controversy is by now seen by many Canadians as a symbol of English-French rivalry. In this perversion of the search for a distinct expression of Canada's final stage in her evolution from colony to full independence, most Quebeckers tend to regard the ensign as a reminder of English dominance which they are no longer willing to tolerate. Conversely, English speaking Canadians are led to believe that the maple leaf flag denotes Ottawa's betrayal of all they hold sacred in their heritage. The new flag, they are told by those who call it sneeringly "Pearson pennant," symbolizes Grit abject appeasement of and sellout to the French.
>
> All this sowing of nationalistic mistrust, which cannot but produce a harvest of hatred and strife, is done by allegedly rational men motivated by visions of a strong, united Canada.
>
> One cannot but wonder what goes on the in the minds of these blindly partisan politicians when in the same breath they deplore the fanning of nationalistic ferment in places such as Cyprus. There they say irresponsibly inflamed passions must give way to reason. The world cannot tolerate old enmities to play havoc with peace.
>
> At home, apparently it's different. And when the P.M. at the request of an opposition M.P., calls a meeting of party leaders to see if some acceptable way out of the impasse could be found, the attempt is described by his chief political rival as a sign of weakness.
>
> In this atmosphere no honourable compromise seems possible, unless the electorate shows more sanity than its elected representatives and forces them, through grass root pressure within each political party, to stop acting like a bunch of Makarioses.

I cannot help but wonder, would we have reached the situation we find ourselves in at present if, for example, we had a system like they have in Norway, where the calling of an election is taken out of the hands of the prime minister, where the calling of an election cannot be forced by an obstinate opposition, where they have a party system similiar to ours but where they hold an election every four years, and in the interval they run the business of the country and do not fight the next election every day in the house of commons, as we have seen here for months past.

How did we get in this position? It started out with the stupidity of the way the Prime Minister introduced the flag resolution, where he used his position to present his own choice of a flag and tried to shove it down the throat of the House of Commons when, by admission of one of his own colleagues, it was not even cleared in his own caucus. I cannot think of anything more stupid.

I will say that it is to his credit that he has had the common sense to back away from the position he took originally. I wish the same common sense would be shown by others. But just what happened from there? Then the ball was tossed to the Leader of the Opposition, and obsessed with his mad idea that by some design of destiny he is supposed to be prime minister in 1967—Sir John A. in 1867; Sir John D. in 1967—because of this madness he appears to be prepared to destroy this parliament and with it to destroy this country by turning English against French and vice-versa.

Mr. Alkenbrack: I thought you had a little sense.

Mr. Martin (Timmins): Unfortunately I thought some of the others had a little sense, but they have proven they have not.

After five months of frustration in this present session we had the rare good fortune of having the Leader of the Opposition ill for two days and away from the house, and in those two days, as everyone knows, we accomplished more than we had in the two previous months. Then a week or two after that we were blessed again. The Prime Minister went to England for a week, and during that week we cleared everything but three items of the order paper.

I think that the best thing we could do, both for the benefit of this house and the country, is if we could send both the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition away for two weeks. Then maybe we could get on with the business of the country.

Mr. Knowles: Send them to Hull—spelled H-u-l-l.

Mr. Martin (Timmins): Mr. Speaker, I can possibly best sum up with a few words of doggerel:

The Flag Furore of '64.

On parliament hill, we now have a bill
To provide a new flag for our land.
Letters thick, letters thin just keep pouring in
Urging M.P.'s to take up a stand.

With Mike's maple leaves three many do not agree
Some like one, some a dozen or more,
While some would go back to the old union jack,
Some dropping the ensign deplore.

But I hope you'll agree, as you listen to me,
We have more urgent problems than this.
Automation we've found makes the workless abound,
Our economy's still hit and miss.
It would take some vast sums to clear up our slums,
We need medicare, pensions and all,

Canadian Flag

And we surely are fools if we think that our schools.
Can cope with our children this fall.

As on this we reflect I most strongly suspect,
That all this flag fuss and furore;
Has been started I'll bet to make people forget
The grim future we all have in store.
If we don't toe the line, while still there is time,
A red herring, upon a smokescreen,
Is the suitable rag we should wave for a flag,
In a country that just might have been.

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, now that the hon. member for Timmins (Mr. Martin) has raised the level of this debate from a non-partisan level, perhaps it will change the line of approach that I had intended to take during my intervention at this time. Then also we had one of those rare occasions during the course of the flag debate when we had an intervention on the part of a minister of the crown, in the person of the government leader of the house. Unfortunately, as usual, he has completely misinterpreted the mood of the house and he has, as I understood the observations that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) made this afternoon, completely misunderstood the purpose of those observations. The solution propounded by the government leader of the house is a continuation of legislation by exhaustion.

He made a grave mistake last spring by keeping the house continually in session over the Easter period.

Mr. Pickersgill: Oh, oh.

Mr. Dinsdale: It was the first time in the years I have been here that members of this house were not permitted to return to their constituencies where they could get in touch with reality and refresh their viewpoint of the problems of the nation.

Mr. Pickersgill: Would the hon. gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. Dinsdale: Certainly.

Mr. Pickersgill: Is that what is wrong with the official opposition?

Mr. Dinsdale: I am quite willing to admit that the fact we have not had an opportunity to renew contact with our constituents has resulted in the sort of mood, the intransigent mood, which prevails at the present time. But if this is a problem with the opposition, how much more must it be a problem for members and supporters of the government who seem to be completely out of touch with public opinion in this nation?

[Mr. Martin (Timmins).]

Legislation by exhaustion does not improve the processes of democracy. It is a Pavlovian technique used when the brainwashers want to break down the resistance of those they want to convert to their own opinions. I would have suspected that this suggestion might have come from the minister of propaganda, the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Dupuis) because this seems to be the function he is carrying out as far as his responsibility in the cabinet is concerned.

I had intended to continue this discussion along the lines pursued by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) this afternoon. He was offering to the government a way out of the impasse into which they have led parliament at this time. Certainly, as we have seen during the course of this debate, by the reaction in the country as reflected in the press and other media of information, the government should be looking for a way out. When the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre was presenting his academic viewpoints on the paralysis of parliament at the present time he was reminded that it is the responsibility of the government to control the business of the house, and he agreed that such was the case. I asked him a question. I asked him if it was not true that when the executive arm of government, without consulting its own caucus, without consulting its members, decides to bring an issue before parliament which is not only dividing parliament but which is also dividing the nation, that the only recourse which the official opposition has in such circumstances is to bring a sense of reason to the government by means of a continuation of discussion.

There was a conference on peace, order and good government held at Couchiching a couple of weeks ago and Mr. Speaker was good enough to circulate some notes arising from that conference. I intend to quote from page two where some observations are recorded by Dr. Crick, a political scientist from the old country who was invited to speak. The document reads:

Dr. Crick agreed that a system of government should be flexible and reminded the audience that politics is the art of the possible.

I might observe at this point that the government of Canada has placed parliament in an impossible position because it has presented this house with an issue which is bound by the very nature of things to bring about divisions which are always beneath

the surface in a country which can only persist as a nation on the basis of unity in diversity. Later, Dr. Crick emphasized—

> —that the functions of the institutions of the government must take account of the changing responsibilities of government, and he felt that the present crisis in British government was due to the fact that the capacity for opposition is weaker than at any period in British history. Parliament, he said, should be a continuous election campaign, a permanent hustings, and it was up to M.P.'s to supply efficient and effective criticism continually.

This is precisely what we are endeavouring to do at the present time. But parliament consists of more than the opposition. It consists also of the backbenchers supporting the government. If the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is concerned with the fate of parliament in the present circumstances or during a period of a continued minority, I think he should be equally concerned about the disdain which the supporters of the government are displaying, as far as their responsibilities in this chamber are concerned. They are continuing what the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Mandziuk) referred to as "a filibuster of silence". This has been the subject of comment in a leading article in the Winnipeg *Tribune*, which I am sure the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre must have seen. This silence is expressive of the worst kind of arrogant disdain for their responsibilities to their constituents. Of course I can understand their silence. They are able to say little on this issue because, as the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan), recognizing his own responsibilities as a member of this house, told us, neither he nor any of the government backbenchers had been consulted on this matter. I suppose that if it were not for the rigid discipline which is maintained on the opposite side of the house they would have some observations to make on this subject which would be of interest to this house. But in the circumstances they have nothing to say.

It is more difficult to understand the silence of those who sit on the treasury benches. So far, only one minister has broken that silence, namely the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp), except for the intervention tonight of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau) which was not by way of throwing light on the reasons parliament had been brought to the present impasse, but rather was to offer more of the same legislation by exhaustion, an offer which will only intensify the unhappy mood which prevails in parliament at the present time.

It would seem that even members of the cabinet were not consulted on this matter, because they are not silent on the hustings even though they are silent in this house. Mr. Speaker, I read a voluminous quantity of speeches made by members of the cabinet in various parts of this nation. Indeed so many of these speeches cross my desk that I must confess I do not have time to read them all. I have had come into my hands a most interesting series of speeches made by members of the cabinet on the very subject under discussion in this house—speeches made outside the house, not in this chamber where they should have been made—and I hope to be able to put some of this helpful and useful material on the record before I conclude my observations here tonight. Obviously, with backbenchers remaining silent and members of the cabinet remaining silent, it is easy to understand why there is protest not only in this house but across the nation over the design of a distinctive national flag, to use the classical phrase, that has been presented to this house, and also the method by which it has been presented. These are the main points that have emerged in the discussion up to the present time. This is why members of the opposition are trying to be helpful in providing avenues of escape from the difficulty into which the government has gotten itself. This is not even a party flag. This is not a flag that has come out of the careful consideration of a party caucus, that has been carefully considered by the cabinet. This is a personal flag, a personal design. I do not know who were the advisers to the Prime Minister on that particular design. We know that my very good friend, the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson) was one of the heraldic authorities who advised on this matter. I would be suspicious of objectivity in this regard, because while the hon. member for Leeds is a very good friend of mine, he indicated during his term in opposition in this house that he was also a very zealous partisan.

Since the flag was introduced into this house there has been a lack of consistency in the government's dealing with the matter. It has vacillated in the most uncertain and confusing manner. It was brought into the house with all the bombast of electioneering flamboyance. It was said that the flag would be flying by July 1 and the challenge was issued to the opposition to move a want of confidence motion in connection with the flag. This is not the way to deal with an explosive subject

of this nature. This is inviting difficulty in the House of Commons.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Dinsdale: Then, Mr. Speaker, the opposition, realizing its responsibilities in such a divisive matter refused to test confidence in the government on the question. The hon. member for Timmins (Mr. Martin) accuses the leader of the official opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker), as he did just a moment ago, of wanting an election on this issue. If we had wanted an election, we would have accepted the challenge of the Prime Minister when he invited us to move a want of confidence motion on the flag issue during our dealing with supply. The question of an election is not at stake. I could not understand why the hon. member introduced this particular thought tonight, because while it is true that the Prime Minister took fate by the forelock and said the destiny of the government would depend on the decision with regard to the flag, he again vacillated, has backed down, and an election is no longer in question on the issue. What is in question is whether the government is going to continue, to quote the immortal words of the *Globe and Mail*, "parliament and Canada on a collision course on this vital matter".

As the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) indicated the other evening, the concession of returning to a free vote, taking off the whips in this matter, has come too late because positions have hardened; most hon. members on the government side have declared themselves, some with great searching of souls, as was indicated by the hon. member for Victoria (B.C.) (Mr. Groos) who spoke the other evening as one of the few government representatives in the debate. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, this concession is quite meaningless.

The question that arises is, just how are we going to get out of this present difficulty? Perhaps before we proceed to that question we should ask how we got into it. This is the question propounded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) tonight. I think it is a product of the bureaucratic mind. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre said that if parliament does not sort itself out we are going to transfer power to the establishment.

Mr. Knowles: We have done so already.

Mr. Dinsdale: Well, Mr. Speaker, this has been going on for a number of years in this country. The seat of power is being gradually removed from the floor of the House of Commons to the offices of the bureaucrats. This process of erosion is assisted by the silence of the government; by backbenchers who refuse to get up and express themselves on this matter. In these circumstances, this is inevitable. But the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre forgets that there are no less than six members at the highest level of the establishment who occupy cabinet positions at this time. I believe in the *Maclean's* magazine presentation of the Canadian establishment six of the present cabinet ministers were given the highest accolade; they were called mandarins, and the Prime Minister himself was described as one of the members of the establishment. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask this question. Perhaps the difficulty is that the establishment is too closely identified with the government and this is why they cannot see the wood for the trees. This is why they have precipitated parliament and the country into the present unhappy impasse to which we have been directing our attention.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Dinsdale: Certainly.

Mr. Knowles: If, as he says, the establishment is so closely related to the party in power, does not that make it all the more serious for parliament to follow any course that seems to give more and more power to the establishment?

Mr. Dinsdale: As the hon. member himself said this afternoon, it is the government that directs the course of parliament. The opposition can only direct its attention to the business that is placed before parliament by the government. As we all know, the opportunity for the opposition to initiate business in this house is restricted to the private members' hour. I think my hon. friend, who has been most active in this area of parliamentary interest, is fully aware of what a frustrating and ineffective aspect of the work of parliament is this particular part of our procedure. So if it is a case of power being transferred to the establishment, we are faced with this unhappy situation—the establishment is closely interlocked with government from the Prime Minister down.

I think we are all aware that the bureaucratic mind is something like the scientific mind. In fact, I think one of the tests of mandarin stratification in the *Maclean's* article was the necessity of being a Rhodes scholar, and most of the Rhodes scholars

operating in the Canadian establishment majored in social science studies. As I say, Mr. Speaker, the bureaucratic mind is very closely related to the scientific mind, which endeavours to reduce multiplicity to unity. But unfortunately if this process is carried too far in the political realm it leads inevitably to totalitarianism, or at least an overweening power of the executive arm of government. This can make tyrants out of those who merely aspire to clear up the mess. This has been demonstrated over and over again whenever democratic bodies around the world have reached the impasse we have reached at the present time.

Our constitution is dedicated to the fundamental premises of peace, order and good government; and I would remind the house that in order to have peace and order you have to have good government. I do not think we have good government, certainly on this issue which is before the house at the present time. You cannot resolve the problem of national unity in this country merely by making a quick change in symbols. This is political primitivism at its worst. As the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis-Kings (Mr. Nowlan), a wise and experienced member of this house, said the other day, it is political ignorance on the part of the government to think that by a sleight-of-hand change in the symbols of this nation they can resolve all the problems of national unity which have been with us ever since confederation. This is to ignore the problems of regionalism, of our vast geography, of the ethnic multiplicity, which was referred to by the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Slogan) tonight, and all the political differences. We have five parties in this house. Indeed, we might say we have seven parties, because there is not unanimity within all the party ranks, as I shall point out in a moment.

On top of this we have endeavoured to apply a political system, a parliamentary system which grew up in a unitary state, to a federal state, but with all its peculiar problems. Some have objected to the idea of a plebiscite or a referendum because they say that this has never been used in the mother of parliaments in Great Britain. But the mother of parliaments is a unitary state. There they have a homogeneous population. They have social homogeneity which we do not have in this country, and whenever in Canada a government has been foolish enough to raise an issue on controversial matters as fundamental as this one before parliament they have inevitably resorted to the referendum technique. Again this was the technique of the Liberals back in the early years of the world war. No leader who understands Canada would proceed as the Prime Minister has on this matter.

We have not only advocated a plebiscite as a way out so that we might get on with the business of the country. As has been pointed out in the debate tonight, the leader of the Creditistes was also in favour of a referendum when he spoke at a rally in Montreal on March 5, 1962, as reported in *La Presse*. Said the leader of the Creditistes:

> Six months after taking power the Creditistes will propose to the Canadian people, by way of a referendum, the choice of a distinctive national flag.

But we have gone beyond that now. We are suggesting a parliamentary committee which, if it was the intention of the government to proceed with this matter, is the way we would normally proceed in the house, instead of making a narrow partisan and political issue out of a controversial subject. The door is still open, and all that is necessary is to have a parliamentary committee representing all parties in the house, as recommended by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker), get together and try to come to some consensus so that we might resolve the divisions that are all too obvious in this house and across the nation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the only serious intervention on the part of a cabinet minister pointed out all too clearly that this was an explosive and divisive subject. He referred to filibusters and all the rest of it, but his main thesis went beyond this point. He referred to the division which has arisen in the Progressive Conservative party on this matter. He shed crocodile tears over the subject. But what about the division in the Liberal party which has appeared in this chamber? We have heard members supporting the government most critical of the way this subject has been handled. I am not going to repeat what the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) has said, but he referred to decision by a rump convention. He also referred to no consultation with members of the party and no announcement in the campaign literature, and so forth.

There is also a division in the Social Credit party. The hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Olson) the other night did not take a stand either way. He quoted some letters and said, in effect, that some of his friends are for this and that some of his friends are

he said: "I am for my friends". That is the classical example of the answer which is given by politicians when they do not want to make a decision on a controversial matter. There is also division in the New Democratic party. The only party which has demonstrated solidarity forever on this matter is the Creditistes, which is a party dedicated to extreme viewpoints and issues in this country. I think that speaks for itself.

While the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) has not spoken in this debate, he has had things to say on the subject of a distinctive flag over the years. I want to get around now to discussing some of the speeches which have been made outside the house by ministers of the crown. This matter was before Canada in 1954, when the prime minister of that day, Right Hon. Louis St. Laurent, a responsible leader who knew the political pulse of the nation, refused to proceed with an issue which had been brought forward by a backbench member of the government at that time.

Then again, even before that, I have a report appearing in *MacLean's* magazine for February 1, 1954, dealing with the debate of that year and it quotes the now Minister of Transport when he was a member of the establishment.

Mr. Churchill: Was he a mandarin?

Mr. Dinsdale: Yes, he was a mandarin. The article says:

> It didn't come up again until 1944 when another Mackenzie King government proclaimed that the Canadian red ensign should be Canada's battle flag, borne by the troops on D-day and after.
>
> On V.E. day the following year came another occasion when the issue was almost settled. Prime minister King was in San Francisco preparing a broadcast to the Canadian people. He thought he should put in something about the flag.
>
> Jack Pickersgill, then special assistant to the prime minister, asked "Why don't you tell the people this is Canada's national flag, and have done with the argument about it?"

That is in quotations in *Maclean's* magazine, the article written by Blair Fraser.

An hon. Member: No answer.

Mr. Monteith: He is trying to think one up.

Mr. Dinsdale: Mr. Fraser goes on:

> Alas, he was too blunt. People who have read Mackenzie King's diary report that on that day King recorded the incident with the comment that he wasn't going to have such a delicate matter settled by a brash young secretary.

Mr. Pickersgill: That was 20 years ago. I was only 40.

[Mr. Dinsdale.]

Mr. Dinsdale: You're still in the foolish forties.

> Instead he contented himself for the moment with authorizing the use of Canada's battle flag on the peace tower and on other public buildings at home as well as abroad.
>
> Four months later came the order in council which did proclaim the red ensign our distinctive national flag.

That was the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill), a very prominent member of that government. Back in those days he spoke out about what he thought as a Canadian.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is something of an historian himself and presumably made an honest living in academic life. I do not think he would want to distort the record. That is not precisely what happened. I made no speech whatsoever about that, but I did have a private conversation with Mr. Mackenzie King in a hotel room in San Fransisco. Mr. Mackenzie King decided it would be a rather good idea to fly the red ensign on the peace tower on V.E. day. I thought that was a good idea too because it seemed to me it was rather more distinctive of Canada than the union jack, which was flown up to that time.

Mr. Dinsdale: Mr. Speaker, is the hon. member making a speech, or is he speaking on a point of order?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: My understanding is that the hon. minister wanted to ask a question.

Mr. Dinsdale: I should like the minister to make a speech in this house.

Mr. Pickersgill: I was trying to liven up the hon. gentleman's speech.

Mr. Dinsdale: Mr. Speaker, he represents the province of Newfoundland in this house and I am sure the premier of that province would like to hear the minister declare himself heartily in favour of the three maple leaf flag.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I do so. I declare myself heartily in favour of the three maple leaf flag or any flag with the maple leaf as the distinctive Canadian emblem.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Dinsdale: Mr. Speaker, I know that the minister hopes to get around this difficulty by making these typical political dissimulations in respect of the two flag concept. Hon. members opposite have criticized us for discussing this matter in a responsible way and say: Let

us vote on the matter. They think a simple vote is going to resolve the difficulty.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Dinsdale: I would remind hon. gentlemen who are braying from the back benches that the difficulty, the division and the problems of this nation will only begin when parliament makes a decision in such a hypocritical fashion in the hope of getting around these difficulties and divisions by using the two flag concept.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the hon. gentleman a very serious question. Does the hon. gentleman really believe in the dictatorship of a minority, or does he think the majority has a right to make decisions?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Dinsdale: They are braying again from the other side. Mr. Speaker, I believe in intelligent and honest discussion of these matters rather than the catcalling that has gone on across the way during the course of this debate. I look right in the eye of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau) when I make that remark. He was looking with simulated scepticism as I made that statement, Mr. Speaker.

There have been speeches made in respect of this important issue outside the house by ministers of the crown, and I refer to a seminar that was held at the University of Manitoba last March 7, before the government was even thinking about bringing the flag before parliament as a red herring issue. The Minister of Forestry (Mr. Sauvé) and the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) took part in that debate. One caption in the Alumni Journal reads:

> Mr. Sauvé's "good sense", Mr. Pepin's "charm and wit" set the stage for a day of intensive and interesting discussion of the problem—Canada, one nation or two?

Let me quote what Mr. Sauvé said on that occasion in my native province, the province of Manitoba. He said:

> Let us not concentrate on what divides us...two nations or ten nations. Let us concentrate on one Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Dinsdale: Mr. Speaker, that is precisely what we are asking this government to do, instead of playing around with the two flags, and all those other things which are designed to divide this nation. If we have two flags we will then have symbolic separation, and that is hypocrisy of the worst kind. We would then have separatism symbolized by the presence of two flags.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and quote the remarks made by the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Sauvé). His solution was not a national flag. His theme involved a national economic policy. He said we must forget about these other extraneous matters and concentrate on an economic policy which will bring about the unity of this country. He referred to the particular economic difficulties of the province of Quebec. He then went on to support enthusiastically one measure or economic policy introduced by the former government designed to deal with this particular difficulty. He then said:

> So we have to change, and the only way to change is to have the federal government take the initiative in doing things. One field which we have been slowly working is ARDA,—

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the minister in that they have been slowly working that field. We introduced ARDA and had resources development going full steam ahead until this government moved in with its propaganda and gimmick techniques, and tried to substitute those things for economic progress.

In the one minute which remains, Mr. Speaker, I should like to quote the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. He said:

> What constitutes a nation is...having accomplished great things in common in the past and having the wish to accomplish more in the future.

That is what the hon. gentleman said on Wednesday, March 7, before the government even thought of the flag issue as a red herring technique. I agree with him heartily.

Mr. Speaker, may I call it ten thirty?

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under provisional standing order 39A deemed to have been moved:

LABOUR CONDITIONS—QUEBEC—PAYMENT OF FEDERAL SHARE OF WINTER WORKS PROGRAM

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Chapleau): Mr. Speaker, this afternoon on the orders of the day, I asked a question to the Minister of Labour (Mr. MacEachen) with regard to the incentive winter works program set up a few years ago in order to provide assistance, through municipalities, to the great number of unemployed and, by the same token, to their families, during the winter season considered as an off-season for workers.

I wanted to know if the government had paid its share for all works performed under this program during the 1963-1964 season, because several persons, namely the mayors and secretaries of municipalities in my county, have asked me why they have not yet been paid for those works already completed since April last. Those people enquired from Quebec, and Quebec suggested that the delay was due to Ottawa.

Now, I would like to know whether it is true that the federal government delays the payment for those projects, and for what reason.

I see, Mr. Speaker, that the situation is not peculiar to my constituency, for I find in the newspaper *La Frontière* of Thursday, August 20, 1964, on page 10, the following article:

No payment made on $300,000 worth of winter works in Rouyn-Noranda.

Settlers and workmen in twelve parishes of the Rouyn-Noranda county, in which winter works were completed in April last, are still waiting for their pay.

In most parishes, the Rouyn banks financed the major part of the works, so that the workers might receive part of their salaries.

Note this word: part of—

—their salaries. But the backers of those projects expect that the provincial government will give them the money to reimburse the advances granted by the banks.

According to provincial authorities, five parishes were to be paid on June 15, and seven others on June 20. Now, none of those twelve parishes has yet received any money.

The amounts due by the provincial government, under the federal-provincial agreement on winter works to fight seasonal unemployment, would amount to $300,000 in the county of Rouyn-Noranda only.

Meanwhile, the grocers, butchers, and business people who granted credit to the labourers and settlers, now begin to press them for payment.

As you know, the work has been completed since the end of April.

Those labourers hope to be paid before new winter works begin for 1964-65.

We know that the winter works incentive program was set up to assist those who otherwise could not find a job during the off season. Most of those people have families to support and children at school and besides, they are not free from illness any more than others. They needs money to buy the necessities or obtain the services they need but, in most cases, that joint plan did them more harm than good.

During the last week end, an elector of my riding came to see me to explain the situation he was facing, like those who live in the same community and took part in those works, and that is the case of almost every community in northwestern Quebec.

[Mr. Laprise.]

In the municipality of St. Vital de Clermont, in Abitibi West, work started around December 3, 1963 and ended on April 30, 1964. A first payment was made on June 9, 1964 and the balance has not been paid yet.

Like many others, that municipality could not get credit from the caisse populaire or the banks in La Sarre. Consequently, those people had to work all winter without salary, without income, and some of them had enough stamps to be entitled to unemployment insurance benefits. On the other hand, the unemployment insurance offices in Rouyn or Val d'Or refused to pay them benefits since there was work available in their parishes; others who otherwise could have secured help from the social service were refused for the same reason. Go and cut branches or shovel snow.

Now, it happened, Mr. Speaker, that those day labourer settlers went to their general merchant, their supplier, and he was kind and even charitable enough to sell on credit all through the winter, but when the first part of the works was paid on June 9 last, the merchant took everything and kept everything, and we cannot blame him for it.

However, the poor unemployed have nothing yet, as usual. That will have to be changed because there is a class in the twentieth century civilization, in that affluent century of ours, for whom it is always "nothing".

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister of Labour and the government to find an arrangement with the province of Quebec and the other provinces so that those who participate in unemployment work will be paid regularly every two weeks. They are like everybody else; they are entitled to the salary they need to support their family.

Mr. Speaker, I hope I will get a satisfactory answer.

[*Text*]

Mr. James A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, this afternoon the hon. member for Chapleau (Mr. Laprise) put a question to the Minister of Labour (Mr. MacEachen), and though I have not been able to get the exact wording of it, the question appeared to me to be, has the federal government honoured all of its obligations under the 1963-64 municipal winter works incentive program?

The figures that I have been able to obtain are not broken down province by province. However the federal government has approved projects up to $52 million and payments made to the provinces to date amount

to $17,694,000. Claims on hand and in process of payment amount to $5,529,000. Of course the payments are made by the federal government when it has received claims from the provincial governments. I would assume if the province of Quebec is behind in making these claims to the federal government it is in no different situation from the other provinces.

As can be pointed out, only something more than $17 million has been authorized, and the reason the payments have not been made is simply that the claims have not come in as certified; but all claims received since August 7 have been paid.

The federal government makes its contribution only when the province has certified that these undertakings are capable, under the legislation, of receiving the payments. It is regrettable if these employees have not been paid for the work they have done; but though we regret it, it is not within the competence of the federal government to direct these payments. We only make the payments as the claims are received. The department would be very interested in endeavouring to see to it that payments are made as the work is performed but that, of course, would require some further negotiations. I will certainly bring this to the attention of the department again.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.40 p.m.

APPENDIX

INSTITUTIONS IN THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO WHICH MAY ISSUE CERTIFICATES OF ELIGIBILITY

Universities and colleges (including federated and affiliated universities and colleges): Brock University, St. Catharines; Carleton University, Ottawa; University of Guelph, Guelph; Lakehead College of Arts, Science and Technology, Port Arthur; Laurentian University of Sudbury, Sudbury; McMaster University, Hamilton; Ontario College of Art, Toronto; Osgoode Hall law school, Toronto; University of Ottawa, Ottawa; Queen's University, Kingston; Royal Military College of Canada, Kingston; University of Toronto, Toronto; Trent University, Peterborough; The University of Waterloo, Waterloo; Waterloo Lutheran University, Waterloo; The University of Western Ontario, London; University of Windsor, Windsor; York University, Toronto.

Teachers Colleges: Hamilton teachers' college, Hamilton; Lakehead teachers' college, Port Arthur; Lakeshore teachers' college, New Toronto; London teachers' college, London; North Bay teachers' college, North Bay; Ottawa teachers' college, Ottawa; Peterborough teachers' college, Peterborough; Stratford teachers' college, Stratford; Sudbury teachers' college, Sudbury; Toronto teachers' college, Toronto; University of Ottawa teachers' college, Ottawa; Windsor teachers' college, Windsor.

Technical Institutes: The eastern Ontario institute of technology, Ottawa; The Hamilton institute of technology, Hamilton; The northern Ontario institute of technology, Kirkland Lake; Ryerson polytechnical institute, Toronto; The western Ontario institute of technology, Windsor; Provincial institute of mining, Haileybury.

Institutes of Trade and Ontario Vocational Centres: Ontario vocational centre, London; Ontario vocational centre, Ottawa; Provincial institute of automotive and allied trades, Toronto; Provincial institute of trades, Toronto; Provincial institute of trades and occupations, Toronto.

Other Institutions: Canadian memorial chiropractic college, Toronto; College of optometry, Toronto; Ontario forest ranger school, Dorset.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, August 28, 1964

The house met at 10.30 a.m.

FINANCE

VEGETABLE OILS—TABLING OF TARIFF BOARD REPORT ON REFERENCE NO. 131

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): I wish to table copies in English and in French of a report by the tariff board on reference 131, which covers oilseeds, vegetable oils and related products. I am tabling also a transcript of the evidence presented at the public hearings held by the board.

This report contains recommendations relating to oilseeds, vegetable oils, oilcake and oilcake meal. I assure hon. members that these recommendations will be carefully considered by the government. May I urge any interested parties who wish to comment on this report to do so promptly.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

WITHDRAWAL OF CYPRUS FORCE—TURKISH TREATMENT OF GREEK CITIZENS

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): I have two questions to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs. First, is he in a position to advise whether it is generally expected that the United Nations force in Cyprus will be withdrawn, a conclusion indicated by some words and expressions used yesterday by the President of the United States?

The second question has to do with Canada's position within NATO. May I ask the minister whether in view of the strong feelings of Canadians of Greek origin the government of Canada, as a NATO member, has protested to the Turkish government regarding its treatment of the Patriarch Athenagoras and the expatriation of Greek citizens in Turkey? Protests have come from our good citizens of Greek origin in this country and it is for that reason I ask this question, as well as to bring about an assurance that there will be no exacerbation of the relations between two NATO countries by reason of charges such as those which have been made by Canadian citizens.

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the statement made by the President of the United States in connection with the Cyprus force. Nothing has come over my desk this morning in this connection. I indicated yesterday that it is not the intention of Canada to withdraw its contingent from the United Nations force. That is a decision to be made following action by the security council on the recommendation, among other factors, of the secretary general. Any remarks attributed to the secretary general that refer to a possible withdrawal, arise only because of his desire, shared by Canada, that the necessary funds be made available to enable the force to carry on what continues to be, in the language of the head of the government of Cyprus, among others, a very needed presence in the island.

With regard to the position of the Patriarch and the representations made by what my right hon. friend calls good Canadians citizens of Greek descent—and I agree with this characterization—we have impressed on the government of Turkey the desirability of not taking any step with regard to the Patriarch and other Greek citizens in Ankara that would in any way exacerbate the situation. I fully agree with my right hon. friend that it is most desirable that no action should be undertaken that in any way complicates the position of our two NATO partners. It is for this reason that from time to time I have been careful, in response to questions, not to say anything that would in any way affect our association both with Greece and with Turkey.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Might I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the government of Canada specifically informed Turkey that in the opinion of the Canadian government and people anything in the nature of persecution against the Patriarch and the Greek citizens in Turkey should be discontinued, and should certainly receive the disapprobation of the Turkish government?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, we have made the strongest representations to

Turkey, as in another context we have made representations to the government of Greece, that they should not undertake any act that would excite the people of either country in respect of a situation so sensitive. I discussed this matter with the foreign minister of Turkey on two different occasions. I must say that in both instances the Turkish foreign minister denied the allegations which I put before him pursuant to representations I had received from a number of quarters, including certain Canadian citizens of Greek origin.

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of repeated reports late last evening and this morning over the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation which suggest that Archbishop Makarios is going to continue to object to the carrying out of the terms of the treaty among Cyprus, Greece, Turkey and the United Kingdom concerning the replacement of Turkish troops over the week end, can the minister give the house any information as to whether the attitude of the archbishop is likely to change or whether the Canadian government has made representations to Greece and Turkey in this regard? Could the minister also tell us whether he has any information as to what the Greek government might do in the event that Turkey commences to replace its troops presently on the island with other troops, and what would be likely to occur if the archbishop attempted to resist this with armed force? Would Greece come to the archbishop's assistance or not?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, this detailed and involved question has to do, I suppose, with the proposed rotation of part of the Turkish contingent in Cyprus. The contingent there is stationed in accordance with the treaty among Greece, Turkey and Cyprus which was signed in August, 1960 and which provided that both Greece and Turkey would have the right to station on the island contingents numbering 950 and 650 respectively. The reported action of the head of the government of Cyprus is one which has been noted by the Canadian government. The secretary general has advised us that this is one of the matters he hopes to discuss in Geneva when he arrives there later today.

Mr. Nesbitt: Just one thing. I realize I put a number of details into my question, but perhaps the minister could tell us whether he has any information as to what the Greek government is likely to do should the Turks insist on carrying out that term of the treaty and intend to rotate their troops this week end, and should the head of the government of Cyprus attempt to resist that with armed force.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): The hon. gentleman does not, of course, expect me to be able to give an answer to that question. I cannot say what the Greek government will do, but I can say that in my judgment both the Greek and Turkish governments have within the recent period been displaying a commendable measure of restraint. I would sincerely hope that the position taken by the government of Prime Minister Papandreou, which represents a constructive attitude, will be maintained. I trust that both of these members of the NATO alliance will continue to avoid further complication with regard to the situation in Cyprus.

NATO—AGREEMENT RESPECTING EXCHANGE OF ATOMIC INFORMATION

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether he is now prepared to answer the question I put yesterday. He had unfortunately left the house, but I am sure he would want to clear up the situation and correct the misleading information which he gave to the house on July 8 and July 16 with regard to the exchange of atomic information.

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I just learned after coming into the house, when yesterday's *Hansard* was sent to me by one of my officials, of the question which my hon. friend asked yesterday. I am sorry I had not seen it previously, because if I had I would have dealt with it earlier this morning.

Of course I do not agree with what my hon. friend has said, that there was any inaccurate information. What I said was that there was an exchange of atomic information for the use of members—that is, members of the NATO alliance—for scientific purposes.

Yesterday my hon. friend referred to a message of the President of the United States. I shall table this message, and I think my hon. friend will see that while my statement in this house was not detailed, it was certainly not an inaccurate statement.

Mr. Churchill: May I direct the minister's attention to the answer he gave on July 16,

when I asked him this question with regard to the document tabled:

> Is it not true that article III deals with the development of defence plans, the training of personnel and the employment of methods of defence against atomic weapons, as well as matters affecting the delivery systems of atomic weapons?

The minister said in reply:

> —it has nothing to do with nuclear weapons as such—

—and then went on to say it was just with regard to the exchange of atomic information for the use of members for scientific purposes. I suggest to the minister that this is not the information which the President of the United States relayed to congress, in which he said:

> This expanded area of information is needed to enable our allies to make effective use of nuclear delivery systems...This new agreement thus represents a logical and useful step in our continuing and varied efforts to ensure wider allied participation in NATO nuclear defence.

The question I asked on July 8 and then on July 16 was, what are the implications for Canada in this, and the minister was not clear in his answer. He is under a cloud, and I want him to clear himself.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): My hon. friend says I am under a cloud. He should know, because my hon. friend is continually under a cloud. I may say to him in the best of humour that this morning he is clearly in a fog. But I shall be glad to give the hon. gentleman information on this matter.

Mr. Churchill: The minister is, of course, very cheerful. I realize that. But the fog has thickened. I asked him to give us a clear and decisive statement with regard to this matter. Has this exchange of information to do with the advancement or fuller employment of nuclear weapons rather than being just an exchange of atomic information for peaceful purposes?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): May I point out that I was only aware of the hon. gentleman's intervention a few minutes ago. I propose later to make a statement which I think will satisfy him. He says the fog is thicker. He will not mind my saying it is not only the fog that is thickening.

CANADIAN PARTICIPATION IN CONFERENCE ON DESALINATION OF SEA WATER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. William Dean Howe (Hamilton South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a very brief question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Has the government accepted an invitation from the United States government to participate in a conference on the desalination of sea water, to be held in October of 1965?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am at sea on this subject. I will have to get some information.

HOUSING

CONSIDERATION OF REPORT OF ONTARIO ASSOCIATION OF AUTHORITIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Postmaster General in his capacity as minister responsible for housing, and I also have a question for the Prime Minister. In the absence of the Postmaster General perhaps I can put both questions to the Prime Minister.

In view of the alarming revelations contained in the report given to the government yesterday by the Ontario association of housing authorities regarding the housing conditions of hundreds of thousands of younger and elderly families, will the government give consideration to the imaginative program set out in this report?

My other question also arises out of the report and it is the one which I have for the Prime Minister. Will the Prime Minister consider the suggestion that there be appointed a full time minister of urban affairs and housing? Perhaps the Postmaster General could serve well in that post and somebody else could be postmaster general.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, so far as the first part of the question is concerned, I have had that report brought to my attention and it is receiving the careful examination of the government. Any steps that might be required will be taken, but I do not propose to make any announcement until we have had a chance to formulate them.

With regard to the second part of the question, concerning the establishment of a ministry of urban development, I do not think I can say anything about that at this time, Mr. Speaker.

COMBINES

REPRESENTATIVES RESPECTING AUTOMOBILE PARTS AND ACCESSORIES

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Chapleau): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the

Minister of Justice. Last Wednesday I asked him if he intended to do something about the brief submitted to him recently by the national automobile products dealers association. Can he give me an answer now?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I will answer that question at the next sitting of the house.

[*Text*]

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

LEGISLATION TO DEAL WITH FRAUDULENT BANKRUPTCIES

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Justice. Does he intend to propose amendments to the Bankruptcy Act to prevent fraudulent bankruptcies from increasing?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I said to the house that the Bankruptcy Act was now under consideration. A first bill will soon be introduced in the house and more general legislation will be submitted first to experts and then to parliament.

Mr. Martineau: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question.

Does the minister propose to modify the administration of the Bankruptcy Act in order to permit the establishment of an anti-fraud squad, as suggested yesterday by Mr. Donald Jupp, president of the Canadian building association?

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, the necessary measures to be taken under the act in order to prevent more adequately fraud in bankruptcies are a problem which, among others, is now under consideration and to which I am personally giving very serious thought.

[*Text*]

HAL BANKS—INQUIRY AS TO WHEREABOUTS

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Justice. Can he tell the house whether he has received since yesterday any information about the Canadians' friend, Mr. Hal Banks who cannot be found?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): No, Mr. Speaker.

[Mr. Laprise.]

[*Text*]

IMMIGRATION

TORONTO—STATUS OF PERSONS CONCERNED WITH NEWSPAPER STRIKE

On the orders of the day:

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday last the right hon. Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Melville inquired about two gentlemen who were purported to have come to Canada to take part in the newpaper labour dispute in Toronto, possibly as professional strike directors.

I have made inquiries and have ascertained that the two men in question, George Hogan and Robert Ameln, are official union negotiators and have come to Canada at the request of the Canadian local union for the purpose of assisting the union in its negotiations with the newspapers. As such, these men were legally and properly admitted in accordance with section 7 (1) (h) which provides for the entry of people engaged in legitimate professions, trades or occupations for the temporary exercise of their respective callings. As long as these two men remain in the category in which they were admitted there is no action the Department of Citizenship and Immigration could take in the matter.

Regarding the inquiry by the Leader of the Opposition as to what direction was given to the three Toronto newspapers in respect of certain persons from the United States employed by the three newspapers in question, the newspapers were directed to arrange for the immediate departure of all ten persons involved, and all these persons left Canada by July 27. No suggestion was made to the newspapers that these persons were to be given the option of applying for landed immigrant status.

INDUCEMENTS TO ENCOURAGE ENTRANCE OF DOCTORS, NURSES, ETC.

On the orders of the day:

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. Would he consider offering incentives or other inducements to encourage doctors, nurses and laboratory technicians to come to this country to relieve the very severe shortage that has developed?

[*Translation*]

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I feel that this is an excellent suggestion, and I

will discuss with the officials of my department what arrangements could be taken to facilitate the admittance of these specialists in Canada.

[*Text*]

INQUIRY AS TO OFFICES IN FRANCE AND ITALY

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. Since the minister has announced that he is considering the reorganization and the expansion of his department, could he tell us how many new immigration offices he intends to open up in France and Italy and whether he proposes to do so in the near future?

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, we are revising our immigration program in Europe and reorganization will include an increase in the staff of our regular offices in Paris and in Rome. We are also considering the opening of new offices to improve the service given to European immigrants.

Mr. Lessard (Lake St. John): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The minister has evaded the issue and has not answered my question.

Could he tell us why his department has seven immigration offices in England and five in Germany but only one in France and in Italy? Does he intend to redress such a situation so as to bring in a more equal proportion of the various European ethnical groups?

Mr. Tremblay: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

[*Text*]

AGRICULTURE

CHEESE—REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF POLICY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Clément Vincent (Nicolet-Yamaska): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture, but in his absence and in view of the fact that this is very important to a large group of people in this country, I should like to direct it to the Prime Minister. In view of the remarks of the Minister of Agriculture on August 20, and especially in view of the strong protests of farmers and dairy organizations in Canada, will the Prime Minister ask the Minister of Agriculture to call a special emergency meeting of dairy farmers and organizations to consider immediate action before the house adjourns?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to discuss this matter with the minister immediately.

PROPOSED MARCH BY FARMERS ON OTTAWA AND QUEBEC

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Robert Beaulé (Quebec East): Mr. Speaker, since the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Hays) is away, I wish to direct a question to the Prime Minister. Is he aware of the fact that the Quebec farmers intend to march on Ottawa as well as on Quebec and if so, will he take the necessary measures to meet these farmers?

[*Text*]

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am not myself aware of this particular march on Ottawa.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

REPLACEMENT OF CYPRUS CONTINGENT—CANCELLATION OF CHANGING OF GUARD CEREMONY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Pictou): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Defence. I should like to ask the minister if it is proposed that the first battalion of the Canadian Guards will replace the Van Doos in Cyprus later this month; also whether he is considering the cancellation next year of the changing of the guard ceremony by the second battalion?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, the first battalion is the stand-by battalion for the United Nations. Consequently if rotation does take place it will replace the first battalion of the Royal 22nd regiment. An advance party will be going forward on September 7 so they will be familiar with the situation there in case rotation is authorized.

In respect of the changing of the guard ceremony by the second battalion on parliament hill, no thought has been given to this particular problem. I had not really had it drawn to my attention very forcefully until I read about it in the newspapers. There are some problems connected with training that are self evident, but it is also recognized that this is one of Canada's very important tourist attractions and that it is a source of

pride to both Canadians and visitors. I can assure my hon. friend that all these factors will be very carefully weighed before any decision is made as to any change.

Mr. William Dean Howe (Hamilton South): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the government consider the employment and training of university students to perform this ceremony in future years, as is done at Fort Henry in Kingston?

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Speaker, I suppose there is no reason why we should not consider that at the same time we are thinking about the over-all problem. It would, however, involve some additional expenditure, and this would have to be discussed very carefully with the other members of the government who are responsible for the national budget.

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, the minister used the phrase "if rotation takes place" with regard to the force in Cyprus. Is he contemplating withdrawal of the force, or is rotation not to take place if the force is continued?

Mr. Hellyer: No, Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State for External Affairs has made that clear; but there is in the meantime the extension of the mandate which will take place on September 27, I presume, and if that occurs rotation will proceed as planned.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Edmonton East.

Mr. Skoreyko: My question has been answered, Mr. Speaker.

[*Later:*]

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I have a short question for the Minister of National Defence, to clarify an answer he gave a little while ago to the hon. member for Pictou. It is understood that the minister's executive assistant has announced that the ceremony of the changing of the guard will be continued throughout 1965. Will the minister therefore confirm this?

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Speaker, I am sure he has made no such statement. The matter will be reviewed next spring in the normal course, and a decision will be announced at that time.

Mr. Martineau: You had better check on what he said.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Mr. Skoreyko: Mr. Speaker—

[Mr. Hellyer.]

Mr. Speaker: Order. I would like to call the attention of all hon. members to the fact that the question period started today at 10.41.

Mr. Churchill: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I do not quite see the relevance of that statement. The question period is not limited except on Wednesdays.

Mr. William Skoreyko (Edmonton East): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of National Defence answered the last question by saying that no change is being made, as far as he is concerned—

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Skoreyko: —with respect to the changing of the guard. I want to know from the Minister of National Defence whether he is going to pay any attention to the ridiculous editorial that appeared in the *Citizen* yesterday under the name of Christopher Young. Is this going to have any influence on the minister's thinking?

An hon. Member: Who is Christopher Young?

Another hon. Member: A nephew of the Prime Minister.

Mr. Hellyer: I have not seen the editorial, Mr. Speaker.

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON RESERVE ARMY STRENGTH

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Defence. Will the minister give an authoritative statement to the house regarding the proposed over-all strength of the reserve army for the future? Is it to be 30,000 or some greater or smaller number?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, the associate minister made that point perfectly clear in evidence before the special committee on defence.

Mr. Churchill: I am asking for a statement to be made in the House of Commons. Statements made in committees may be all right, but I am asking the minister to let the house know, and let us have it recorded in *Hansard*.

Mr. Hellyer: I am sure that when the committee reports to the house, the report will make some reference to that particular point.

Mr. Churchill: Well, Mr. Speaker, the attitude of the minister shows a shocking disregard for the House of Commons. I am asking for public information. I want an authoritative statement from the Minister of National Defence with regard to the proposed strength of the reserve army. The Associate Minister of National Defence has been uncertain in his mind with regard to this and has given confused statements to the members of the defence committee. What is the authoritative statement, so the members of the militia may have some understanding of the situation for the future?

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Speaker, the associate minister made an authoritative statement to the special committee on defence and I would have expected the hon. gentleman, who has a considerable interest in these matters, to have read it before now.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, I am surely within my rights as a member of this house in asking for an answer to a legitimate question. All I want to know is, what is the proposed limit to be set on the reserve army? The Minister of National Defence should be able to give that answer. And I have a supplementary question. If there is to be a limit set, where will the reduction take place? Is it to be a reduction proportionate to the people now enrolled by provinces in the reserve army, or is the reduction to be specified in certain selected areas?

Mr. Hellyer: I am of the opinion, Mr. Speaker, that as soon as the flag debate has been resolved and a decision taken, we will be able to get on with other important business—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Hellyer: —including consideration of the estimates of the Department of National Defence. We will be glad to answer all questions at that time which are directly related to the estimates of the department.

An hon. Member: He doesn't know.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. This is a flagrant abuse—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Churchill: And I am not going to be shouted down by members on the other side.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Churchill: One of the purposes served by parliament is to get information for the people, and that is what I am asking for today. This is a legitimate question. The minister is refusing to give this information. It is a flagrant abuse of the rules of this house, a flagrant abuse of his authority as a minister, and I enter this protest against the refusal of the Minister of National Defence to give essential information to the people of this country. The information I am asking for affects our defence arrangements; it affects our reserve army, the citizen soldiers of this country. Why can we not have this information?

EQUALIZATION OF PAY FOR PREVAILING RATES EMPLOYEES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. Nasserden (Rosthern): Mr. Speaker, I directed a question about a week ago to the President of the Privy Council with regard to the situation of some employees at the Dana station and he said he would have a reply for me. I wonder whether he has it at this time.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, this matter is being looked into, but I am sorry the information by way of reply is not yet available.

CANADIAN FLAG

CONSIDERATION OF DESIGN AT DOMINION-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Georges Valade (St. Mary): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister.

Does he intend to consult provincial premiers on the flag issue when they meet here in Ottawa next week?

Mr. Robichaud: In Ottawa? In Charlottetown.

Mr. Valade: In Charlottetown.

[*Text*]

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the meeting is in Charlottetown, and the flag question is not on the agenda.

Mr. Valade: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the Prime Minister discuss this question with the premiers if some of them bring up the subject?

Mr. Pearson: I do not think any useful purpose would be served by a formal discussion at this time at this particular conference.

Mr. R. W. Prittie (Burnaby-Richmond): A supplementary question on the flag, Mr.

Speaker. I should like to ask the Prime Minister if he has taken note of the design suggested by the hon. member for Nicolet-Yamaska, a non-union jack design, and will the government give serious consideration to that design?

Mr. Pearson: I have taken note of a great many designs, including that one.

[*Later:*]

Mr. R. A. Webb (Hastings-Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister without Portfolio and ask him whether he or his office has been in contact with any firms or importers in regard to the importation of three leaved flags from Japan.

Hon. Yvon Dupuis (Minister without Portfolio): I am not a Tory; I buy Canadian.

Mr. Churchill: Insulting.

Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent, Ont.): I would like to direct a supplementary question. Has the minister been in contact with any firm that has a patent or copyright on the three maple leaf design with regard to its use on the Pearson flag?

Mr. Dupuis: That question is completely out of order.

Mr. Webb: The minister has said he is Canadian. I wonder whether he would not consider flying the Canadian flag, the red ensign?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Dupuis: I will be very happy to fly the Canadian red ensign until the moment comes that we decide to have a distinctive flag without the emblem of any other country.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lake St. John): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I should like to ask the Minister without Portfolio, who just stated that he is a Canadian and buys mostly Canadian products, whether he agreed with the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Hellyer) when the latter decided recently to purchase three submarines from England and military equipment from the United States?

Mr. Dupuis: The reply is the same as the one I gave a while ago; the submarine question had been decided by the Tories who were here before us.

[*Text*]

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister which is supplementary to the one asked a few minutes ago by the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond. In reply to that question the Prime Minister said that a large number of flags were being considered, particularly the model proposed by the hon. member for Nicolet-Yamaska. Can the Prime Minister be interpreted as saying that consideration is being given to proposing a model other than the one which is the object of the resolution before the house at present?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, we have a resolution before the house which deals with this matter. When it is disposed of, then we can decide what other steps are required, if any.

[*Later:*]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister. Since most hon. members wish to reach a solution on the flag as soon as possible, would the Prime Minister give special attention to the proposal of the hon. member for Nicolet-Yamaska (Mr. Vincent), which seems to have been approved by several members on all sides of the house?

[*Text*]

Mr. Pearson: I certainly hope there will be a decision as soon as possible, Mr. Speaker.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

REQUEST FOR NATIONAL SURVEY ON NUTRITION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. William Dean Howe (Hamilton South): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare, who was served notice of it two or three days ago, and in her absence possibly her parliamentary secretary could answer.

In view of public reports that lack of a survey of Canadian food habits and health standards is hampering research workers, and in view of a statement attributed to a spokesman at the Department of National Health and Welfare that there is need for a national survey of nutrition, a contention with which I heartily agree, would the minister consider authorizing such a survey to be made so the necessary work could be done in this highly important field, and so we as Canadians would not have to rely on the statistics gathered by authorities of the United States of America?

Mr. J. C. Munro (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I will take up this matter with the department and the minister, and try to have a reply early next week.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF WINTER WORKS PERIOD

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, my question is intended for the Minister of Labour. Is he considering the possibility of re-establishing the winter works period from October 15 to May 31, as previously, instead of the dates in effect last year, that is, from November 1 to April 30?

[*Text*]

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): No, Mr. Speaker, this change is not under consideration, although there are other changes presently under consideration.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS

HULL, QUE.—INQUIRY AS TO CONSTRUCTION

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

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

Yesterday, in reply to a question put to him by the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Caron), who wished to know whether the department intended to have at least one building built in the city of Hull, the minister stated that, in principle, it had been decided that perhaps one building would be built in Hull.

This is my question. Is the minister ready to accept the responsibility for the fact that Hull, which is right across the river, should be treated as a poor relation as compared to Ottawa?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, it is precisely—

Mr. Caouette: In principle.

Mr. Deschatelets: That is precisely why I stated yesterday that the government had decided Hull should have its share of public buildings under the proposed construction program.

When I said yesterday that the decision had been made in principle, it was because I could not actually specify what building would be erected in Hull. But it has been decided that Hull would have a building.

I further stated in reply to a supplementary question, that within a month I would be in a position to give specific details.

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister tell us whether in principle this building would be the new mint?

Mr. Deschatelets: I cannot add any further details to what I stated yesterday, but in about a month I think I will be in a position to make a statement on this matter.

In answer to the question of the hon. member for Villeneuve, this will meet a need which has been felt for the last six years.

[*Text*]

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

POLICY RESPECTING CONSTRUCTION OF SMALL POST OFFICES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. C. S. Smallwood (Battle River-Camrose): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Public Works. The former government instituted a policy of building small post offices across Canada costing less than $25,000. Is it the intention of the department to continue this program under the winter works program this year?

[*Translation*]

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): Yes, Mr. Speaker, this policy is being maintained. However, if the hon. member wants further details, I would advise him to direct his question to the Postmaster General (Mr. Nicholson) who decides where these small post offices are needed.

I think the Postmaster General will be in a position before long to give the house the details of the present program because the Department of Public Works has received from him a list of these post offices, the building of which will be completed before the end of next winter.

[*Text*]

FINANCE

APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL ADVISOR ON TAXATION MATTERS

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Yesterday the hon. member for Pontiac-Témiscamingue asked a question of the Minister of Finance regarding the appointment of certain advisers on taxation. I do not

want to go into this question any further except to ask whether these appointments have been made. If the appointments have not been made, could the minister say whether the identity of these persons has been determined and when they will begin their duties?

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): I do not know whether the Leader of the Opposition is adding to the fog or not, but so far only one appointment has been made, and that has been announced. I am hoping to announce some further appointments as soon as suitable people have been found.

Mr. Diefenbaker: One appointment has been made, and the purpose is to examine and give consideration to the recommendations of the royal commission on taxation. I would ask why the appointments should be made now, having regard to the fact that Mr. Carter, the chairman of the taxation commission, allegedly has informed the government that there will be a delay of six months in the presentation of the report. What will these gentlemen be doing in the meantime?

Mr. Gordon: The chairman of the royal commission, Mr. Carter, had previously advised the government that the report would be ready this fall. Therefore, in preparation for it, I was seeking staff who would help the government to implement such recommendations as might be approved. So far I have succeeded in finding one such person and he has been appointed.

Yesterday the chairman of the commission came to see me in my office and informed me that the commission had run into difficulties and that the completion of the report would be delayed about six months. I am now considering whether to use the individual who has been referred to—

Mr. Diefenbaker: Who is he?

Mr. Gordon: He is Mr. James Brown of Montreal. He can assist in preliminary work in connection with this matter, and I expect we shall decide that this is in the public interest and that he should take up his appointment in October.

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): I wonder if the minister would tell us whether, in accordance with well known precedent, these outside advisers will have access to budget secrets.

Mr. Gordon: I find that question rather unnecessary.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

An hon. Member: And embarrassing?

Mr. Gordon: Not embarrassing, no. I would remind the hon. member that as the pressure of public business increases, it would probably be a good thing for governments to take advantage of any expert help they are able to obtain from time to time. I hope nothing will be said in this chamber which would discourage public spirited Canadians from accepting appointments of this kind.

Mr. Martineau: I wonder whether after his long diversionary tactic the minister would mind answering yes or no to the question I asked him. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the minister was about to answer my question. If he has forgotten it, my question was simply—

Mr. Speaker: Order. In my opinion the question was out of order, and I think the minister should not answer.

Mr. L. E. Cardiff (Huron): Does the minister think the new appointments will be any improvement on the others he made before?

Mr. Gordon: I think they are all going to be excellent appointments.

Mr. Diefenbaker: With the minister taking such a friendly attitude this morning, may I ask him whether in view of the success enjoyed by the three wise men he imported for his first budget he intends to ask their advice in connection with the next budget?

Mr. Gordon: I do not know whether other people have noticed it, but it has occurred to me that since the right hon. gentleman's hands were removed from the economic levers of this country there has been a rather noticeable improvement.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Taxes have gone up and the deficits are about the same as ever. But the minister has not answered my question. Surely he does not intend to discard the three wise men he imported to produce the first budget which turned out to be such a mess.

Mr. Georges Valade (St. Mary): I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Finance. The hon. gentleman has indicated that he is finding difficulty in procuring the specialists he needs as counsellors. I wonder if he could inform the house how he proceeded to appoint this first expert, so that other persons could apply in the same way.

Mr. A. B. Patterson (Fraser Valley): In view of the announcement that there will be

a delay of six months in the tabling of this report on taxation, does the minister still intend to await this report before making any substantial changes as far as the tax structure of Canada is concerned?

Mr. Gordon: Perhaps I might defer answering that question until the time comes to present the next budget.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Fred F. Stenson (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Finance and ask him, with regard to his new appointments, whether any of these men will be tool engineers, so the tax on production machinery can be properly supervised?

Mr. Gordon: Mr. Speaker, it would be premature for me to answer that question, as they have not yet all been appointed.

WORLD BANK PROFITS FOR LOANS TO UNDERDEVELOPED COUNTRIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. B. Patterson (Fraser Valley): I should like to ask the Minister of Finance if he is yet in a position to reply to the question I asked the other day with respect to the proposal to use the profits of the World Bank for the furthering of educational and agricultural programs in underdeveloped countries.

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): There will be a meeting in Tokyo the week after next to discuss this matter. These discussions will take place at the annual meeting of the World Bank. As far as Canada is concerned, we have informed the president of the World Bank that we think this is an excellent idea and that we will support it fully.

PRIVILEGE

MR. FRANCIS—REFERENCE TO REMARKS IN DEBATE BY MEMBER FOR ST. MARY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Lloyd Francis (Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of personal privilege. In the course of last night's debate the hon. member for St. Mary is reported in *Hansard* as having said—

Mr. Churchill: What page?

Mr. Francis: Page 7366.

An hon. Member: What date?

Mr. Francis: I am quoting from yesterday's *Hansard,* Mr. Speaker. The hon. member said:

> Not only has the Prime Minister contradicted himself on a question of principle, but he has lied openly. This charge is not made by myself but by two of his colleagues, the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Francis) and the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan), who said as much during their participation in the debate—

Mr. Speaker, I have not participated in the flag debate, and I brought to the attention of the hon. member earlier in the debate the fact that I had not participated. In the course of reading his remarks the hon. member made this totally erroneous, fallacious, completely irrelevant remark which in no way represents my position and is a gross distortion.

Mr. Georges Valade (St. Mary): Mr. Speaker, on the question of privilege, if I said that the hon. member for Carleton had spoken and I accused the Prime Minister of lying, it was because these were the words used by one of his colleagues. I withdraw the remark that the hon. member for Carleton said this, but I think the hon. member for York-Humber said it. It also underlines the fact that the members on the opposite side of the house do not wish to speak in the flag debate.

Mr. Ralph Cowan (York-Humber): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of personal privilege. I have never made any such accusation in regard to my lifetime friend, and I never will.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

SUPPLY

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

DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRY

1. Departmental administration, including grants as detailed in the estimates, $4,677,100.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that if there were a few less private conferences proceeding in full tilt we might be able to hear the minister make his statement.

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Chairman, as was done on the last occasion when the various branches for which I am responsible to the house were called, I suggest that perhaps under vote No. 1 I might also make a statement on Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, the national research council, the Department of Defence Production and the atomic energy control board. This was the procedure followed the

last time my estimates were under consideration, and I think it might be helpful to the committee if this procedure were followed again. It worked quite well the last time. If that is so I would be glad to proceed with an initial statement on the Department of Industry.

I should first like to review briefly the present economic situation in so far as it concerns our manufacturing industries. Production, employment and shipment of Canadian manufacturing idustries reached record levels in 1963. Volume of production rose by about 6 per cent, employment by 2 per cent and the value of factory shipments by 8 per cent. The factors mainly responsible for this continued strong growth were a rising domestic demand, of which a larger share was supplied by Canadian manufacturers, and increased exports of manufactured products. In 1963 the exports of secondary manufacturing rose sharply and were 16 per cent above those of 1962. At home, consumer demand continued to increase and purchases of consumer goods were 5 per cent higher than in the previous year. At the same time outlays by businessmen for capital goods rose 7 per cent, although there was some slight reduction due to accumulations from 1962.

The greatest increases in production took place in the motor vehicle and related industries. Motor vehicle production rose by nearly one quarter and the parts industry increased by the same proportion. Other notable production increases included 14 per cent in the rubber products industry, 15 per cent in synthetic textiles, 12 per cent in electrical appliances. Above average rates of increase took place in such key industries as primary iron and steel, textiles, chemicals and industrial machinery.

Present indications are that Canadian manufacturing will continue to expand in 1964. Domestic demand is expected to be strong. Factors such as the continuing growth in personal income and a sharp increase in housing completions, as well as the build-up in 1964 capital spending programs which was outlined in the statement of the Minister of Trade and Commerce on July 28, will ensure a further increase in domestic demand for Canadian manufactured goods. Some industries, such as automobiles, steel, rubber and certain sectors of the textiles and chemical industries are now operating virtually at full capacity, and until additional capacity is created the rates of growth may not show substantial increase.

Capital expenditure plans show that considerable additional capacity will become available late in 1964 or in 1965. The plans of businessmen for investment at the beginning of the year involved increases of 40 per cent in capital spending in the primary metals industries, principally in steel, 45 per cent in the textile industries and 26 per cent in the transportation equipment industry. Recent announcements by a number of industries indicate the increases now planned will almost certainly be considerably greater than was at first thought. Another factor which will determine the rate—

Mr. Skoreyko: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether I might ask the minister if he has available extra copies of the report from which he is now reading, which would help us on this side who would like to follow him. If he has not I wonder whether in the future he would provide us with extra copies, since this is not a statement off the cuff. The minister is reading a statement and it would help us if he let us have copies, as the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration did.

Mr. Drury: Mr. Chairman, I think it is rather unusual for copies of statements made in the house to be distributed to all hon. members.

Mr. Skoreyko: The Minister of Citizenship and Immigration did it.

Mr. Moreau: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the hon. member for Edmonton East, when he spoke in the flag debate, gave us advance copies of his speech.

Mr. Skoreyko: Mr. Chairman, as usual the hon. member is reckless with the truth. I used no text at all. I had a few editorials in front of me, and the hon. member knows that.

The Chairman: Order. If the Chair is being asked to comment on this matter, my understanding is that when a minister makes an opening statement on his estimates he usually reads from a prepared text, and I believe it is unusual to have copies of such statements circulated, certainly among members.

Mr. Skoreyko: I agree that it is not done on many occasions, but the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration provided us with copies of his speech. I only ask for the same courtesy that is shown to the press.

Mr. Drury: I have no extra copies, Mr. Chairman, so perhaps the question is a little academic.

Another factor which will determine the rate of manufacturing growth is the extent to which Canadian producers are able to increase the domestic content of final prod-

ucts, such as automobiles and electrical goods, and the extent to which manufacturers are successful in obtaining a larger share of the growing Canadian market for capital goods and other products which are still imported in substantial quantities. The encouraging growth of Canadian manufacturing is attributable to a considerable extent to the steady improvement in the competitive position of Canadian producers. Sales abroad of manufactured goods have increased markedly during the past few years and have contributed to the growth of certain sectors of manufacturing.

Turning now to consider the Department of Industry, hon. members will recall that in November, in connection with the estimates for the last fiscal year, I spoke of dividing the work of establishing the new department into three phases: (i) organizational planning, (ii) staff recruiting and (iii) operations. I said at that time that the first phase was essentially complete, and staffing and recruiting was under way. By July 13, 1964 a total of 290 officers and supporting staff had been recruited, including offers of employment which have been made by the civil service commission and which have been accepted or for which acceptances are pending although the persons involved may not yet be appointed. This number of 290 represents 45 per cent of the total approved strength of the department.

Recruiting started at the senior levels, and directors have now been appointed for each of the ten branches concerned with particular industries, as have most deputy directors. In some branches, such as aircraft and electronics, there were substantial numbers of experienced personnel available from within the civil service, and consequently these have larger staffs in being at the present time. In other branches we have been fortunate in recruiting a nucleus of well qualified personnel from industry. I should, however, inform hon. members that recruitment has not progressed as fast as was initially contemplated. I will make a further comment regarding this matter when the administration vote of the department is under detailed discussion.

Administrative services and advisory functions, such as personnel, legal, financial or other general support services, are being provided by the Department of Defence Production. However, provision has been made within the organization of the Department of Industry for certain key functions not available from defence production, the main ones being an economic advisor and a scientific advisor together with a small staff for each. The scientific advisor and the economic advisor have recently been appointed.

Although the process of staffing the department is still underway, sufficient progress has been made to enable work on the third or operational phase to be initiated and carried on concurrently. The automotive and automotive parts incentive plan and the area development agency's program to attract manufacturing industries to the designated areas of high chronic unemployment are, of course, two of the major programs which have been undertaken. These programs have received wide attention. I would, nevertheless, like to say a word or two about area development in relation to the designated areas.

[*Translation*]

As most members know, 35 national employment service areas were designated last September as areas of slow economic growth and high unemployment. The purpose we had in mind was to stimulate quickly the establishment of new manufacturing and processing enterprises in these areas; and in this way to give immediate relief to the situation of chronic unemployment prevailing in these parts of the country. Members of this house should bear in mind that the initial designation planned to bring about quick results and meet an emergency situation, is to be regarded as only a first step in a long term program to assist the economic expansion in those areas where it is most needed.

The emphasis on unemployment criteria as the prime factor in designation, while highly desirable for maximum impact in the short run, is obviously not the full answer when we consider a more complete approach. Other factors such as underemployment and the inefficient use of manpower resources must be taken into account in assessing the progress of one area with another. With this in mind we are presently engaged with the Departments of Finance and Labour in making a detailed and exhaustive review of criteria for designating areas in order to take into account these and other factors which will enable us to single out those areas where special efforts will be required over the years if they are to participate more fully in the general prosperity of the country.

Our efforts to stimulate economic development in these designated areas by means of tax incentives for new enterprises are meeting with success. According to the intentions which were indicated to us, more than $245 million of capital is to be invested in new businesses in 23 out of 35 designated areas

and more than 9,000 people are to be employed in 103 businesses. These figures do not take into account the tremendous boost that will be given the construction industry in the areas concerned, nor does it take into account the impact it will have on service industries which will be established as a result of new industry moving into an area.

Notwithstanding these results, the same rigorous review given to criteria for designating areas will be given to incentives and I can assure hon. members that every effort is being made to develop even more effective incentives to improve the economic fortunes of designated areas in a fundamental and lasting manner.

[*Text*]

A number of other projects are also being undertaken jointly with industry groups. Detailed reports prepared by two technical furniture missions, one to Europe and the other to the United States, have been published and made available to the industry generally. The membership of these missions consisted of representatives of the furniture industry specializing in the fields of design, materials, production, management and marketing, and they studied the latest techniques in their fields which are being applied in Europe and the United States. A series of regional conferences have been organized under the sponsorship of provincial governments and the furniture industry to meet with members of the missions in order to study the application of their findings to the industry in Canada. Such meetings have been held in Montreal, Winnipeg, Calgary and Vancouver.

A design award program to encourage the development of improved design concepts for structures using steel was recently worked out jointly with the structural steel industry. The awards will be sponsored by the department and will be made annually.

All of the ten main branches of the department are working with the Canadian tariff and trade committee, considering briefs submitted by industry respecting the forthcoming GATT tariff negotiations.

The department has been receiving a steady flow of requests from industry, provincial governments, trade associations and other groups respecting a wide variety of industrial subjects. The department has been able to provide information and expert advice regarding most of these matters. This service is one of the valuable contributions which the department is offering to groups interested in fostering the development of manufacturing industry in Canada.

[Mr. Drury.]

As may be seen from the estimates which have been tabled, the largest item is vote 5, supporting the development aspects of the Canada-United States defence production sharing program. The purpose of this vote is to sustain technological capability in Canadian defence industry by supporting selected defence development programs. It has stimulated employment activity to a marked degree. Its benefits include the retention of technically trained people in development work, and it has assisted companies to maintain pace with the growth of technology in industry.

It will be recalled that the Canadian-United States defence production sharing program was initiated in 1959 to provide for more efficient and economical use by both countries of their defence industries and to offset the need for substantial Canadian procurement of certain United States weapons systems. This program, in which Canadian industry is given the opportunity to compete for production of U.S. military equipment, requires a high level of technological capability in industry. To retain this capability, a level of development activity has been required which is beyond that which has been supported by the Department of National Defence in recent years.

The development sharing program originated as a result of recognition of this need by both the Canadian and United States governments. The future role of Canadian defence industry otherwise would have been confined to the production of the more simple items of hardware, and our ability to contribute to equipment programs for the defence of North America would have been seriously weakened.

Since 1959 the Department of Defence Production has provided substantial sums to assist Canadian companies to undertake development projects for both United States and allied programs. This development sharing activity in support of the production sharing program has served to maintain some development activity in the defence industry. Many of these development sharing projects, of course, had their roots in earlier Department of National Defence research and development projects to meet Canadian military requirements.

Beginning with the current fiscal year, the vote has been transferred from defence production to the Department of Industry. The transfer took place for the practical reason that many of the people in the Department of Defence Production, who in the past have been responsible for this form of assistance

to industry under the development and production sharing program, have now largely been absorbed into the Department of Industry, which has assumed responsibility for the over-all development of Canadian industry. This vote, however, continues to be devoted to the development in Canadian industry of defence items for export.

The department's expenditures for this purpose, which began at an annual rate of $1.8 million in 1959, have now reached a level of $19 million, after having experienced a growth rate of approximately 100 per cent per year. This $19 million of Canadian government expenditure is, of course, only a portion of the total cost of the programs involved. Some $25 million additional will be provided from industry funds and by the military of the United States and allied countries.

The five year period it has taken to achieve the present level reflects the amount of time it takes to find good projects which can be expected to result in eventual sales of the developed product. It is also indicative of the amount of time involved in the relocation of technical people from stand-by occupations back to important development projects. There has been the closest co-ordination with the Department of National Defence in this program.

The response of Canadian industry in the past to Canadian military research and development requirements, and more recently to the challenge of the development and production sharing program, shows that our companies have the management, research and development ability to respond and offer unique products which are acceptable not only in Canada but to other countries. These developments include the Buffalo aircraft, PT-6 aircraft engine, the CL-84 aircraft, CL-89 surveillance drone and the OT-4 engine.

The Buffalo is a turbine powered version of the Caribou I which is being developed for evaluation by the United States army under a cost sharing arrangement among the department, the United States army and the Canadian contractor. The PT-6 is a 600 horsepower turbo shaft engine. The CL-84 is a vertical and short take-off and landing aircraft employing the tilt wing deflected slip stream principle. The CL-89 is a battlefield surveillance drone, the development of which is being financed jointly by the Department of Industry and the British government. The OT-4 is a stationery gas turbine engine which is being developed for evaluation by the United States navy under a cost sharing arrangement between the department and the United States navy.

My department's efforts in the development field are co-ordinated with the national research council program for industrial research assistance and with the defence industrial research program initiated in 1961 by the defence research board. In the defence field, considerable success has been achieved by the defence research board industrial research program in originating new scientific concepts as a basis for new development programs.

Although vote 5, development expenditures of the Department of Industry, and the associated research expenditures of defence research board in industry are related specifically to defence products, hon. members will appreciate their importance to Canadian industrial capability generally. The upgrading of our technological capability in such fields as aircraft and electronics through these defence oriented programs is of great significance to the future capability of these industries to compete in world commercial markets.

I should now like to say a word about the estimates of the Department of Defence Production which, as hon. members will understand, are linked with those I have just discussed. They appear at page 86 of the blue book.

Mr. Lambert: May I interrupt the minister at this point. I am wondering whether we are not steadily entering into a field that is rather too extensive. I certainly appreciate the connection between the Department of Defence Production and the Department of Industry, but I hope we are not going to get into atomic energy and other fields because, as my colleague the hon. member for Edmonton East has pointed out, the minister is in a field that involves statistics to a considerable extent. Hon. members do not have the minister's statements before them; therefore their discussion of these estimates is perhaps not as cohesive as it might be. They will no doubt ask questions about matters which the minister has covered in his statement, and obviously they cannot take down the points. Personally I do not think we should deal with two departments at the same time. I would much rather that we confined ourselves now to the Department of Industry.

Mr. Drury: I can understand that point of view, and my suggestion to cover both departments was made with the desire to be helpful. I do not have copies of these statements for hon. members, and because they

do contain some statistical information I thought it might help if I were to make both statements at the outset so they would then be available to everybody rather than dealing with these operations seriatim. If I make these statements now covering the items I have outlined I think it will expedite the business of the house in the long run, and help members.

In my statement today on the estimates of the Department of Defence Production I should like to speak not only of the primary responsibilities and accomplishments of the department in the field of defence procurement where, under the provisions of the Defence Production Act, the minister has exclusive authority to buy or otherwise acquire the defence supplies required by the Department of National Defence, but also to report on some of the progress that has taken place in the Department of Defence Production since the last time I presented the estimates of the department.

In my view we have had a very productive period of study, planning and organization, together with the implementation of certain undertakings which reflect these activities. There has been a great deal accomplished in the department, and this work has involved certain highly important areas. One of the primary activities of importance has been the organization of ten operational branches based on major industrial groupings. These branches, which carry out both the procurement responsibilities of the Department of Defence Production and the industrial development responsibilities of the Department of Industry, are aircraft, electrical and electronics, machinery, shipbuilding, clothing and textiles, materials, food products, wood products, chemicals, and mechanical transport. In certain instances, for example aircraft and shipbuilding, departmental procurement branches have been in existence since the establishment of the department, but in other cases it has been necessary either to reorganize existing procurement units or to establish completely new branches.

Another important activity involves the service branches of the department. These branches, which might be generally described as financial and administrative, have been made responsible for the provision of appropriate services to both the Department of Defence Production and the Department of Industry.

In the course of my estimates statement last year I referred to those recommendations of the royal commission on government organization, the Glassco commission, which involved the Department of Defence Production and which had been approved by the government. These recommendations provided that the department should be made a central purchasing agency to serve all departments and agencies of the federal government, both civil and military, other than the commercially oriented crown corporations. In addition, the government approved recommendations that the department be given the responsibility for certain additional activities associated with procurement, including responsibilities relating to the development of standard specifications, the development of warehousing and materials handling services for all departments other than the Department of National Defence, and for establishing a traffic advisory group to improve traffic management throughout the public service.

As a result of the consideration of these recommendations the concept has emerged of an integrated supply service by which the existing procurement and service branches of the department will be augmented by branches that are responsible for such matters as specifications, cataloguing, regional purchasing, warehousing, traffic management and quality assurance.

Another recommendation of the Glassco commission which I discussed in my statement last year, and which at that time had already been implemented, was the transfer and the control of certain branches from the department of public printing and stationery to the Department of Defence Production. Consequently during the past year the activities of the procurement, purchasing and stores branch have been integrated into my department.

During the past year an international programs branch was established within the department to consolidate the activities of the Canadian Commercial Corporation with those of our departmental personnel who are concerned with the Canada-United States defence development and production sharing program and the field of overseas defence exports. I shall discuss these matters in greater detail later on in my statement.

I hope that in these general remarks I have succeeded in giving some indication of the activities that have been going on in the department in addition to the carrying out of the primary responsibility, which is the provision of defence supplies for the Department of National Defence. It has been an important year, and I anticipate that the

present year will be most important too. Changes of the nature of those I have mentioned require detailed study and planning and cannot be carried out overnight. However, I might mention in this regard that in addition to taking over the procurement, purchasing and stores functions of the former department of public printing and stationery, the department is presently carrying out certain purchasing activities for a number of departments and agencies, including the departments of citizenship and immigration, public works, the civil defence college and the world fair corporation. This activity is in addition to issuing approximately 150,000 contractual documents with a value of almost $800 million.

[*Translation*]

I would like to set out now some aspects of our procurement responsibilities. In my opinion, it would not be practical to review all our procurement programs, but I want to call your attention on several fields of activity which might be of special interest to you.

In the aircraft field, the main manufacturing programs at this time concern the Starfighter F 104G and the training plane Tutor CT 114. The Starfighter F 104G is a version of the CF 104 now used by the Royal Canadian Air Force. The manufacture in Canada of about 140 planes of this type, including motors and radars, navigation, flying and ranging systems, will be financed jointly by the Canadian and American governments under the mutual assistance program. The CT 114 is a two-seater jet for basic training; 190 planes of this type and also the J 85 motors which will equip them are being made in Canada for the Royal Canadian Air Force.

Among the other great production programs, there are the CHSS 2 helicopter and the Cariboo I aircraft. The helicopter is in the course of being delivered to the Royal Navy of Canada where it will be assigned to anti-submarine warfare. Of the 24 aircraft ordered so far, four were built by the American contractor and the others are being partly built and assembled in Canada. The Cariboo I is a twin-engine aircraft STOL (short take-off and landing) designed and developed in Canada. Up to the present time, 207 such aircraft have been ordered, nine for the Royal Canadian Air Force, 164 for the American army, 16 for the Indian army and 18 for the Royal Australian Air Force. Moreover, many types of aircraft the demand of which is not sufficient to allow economic production in Canada have been ordered from American contractors. Among them there are the CH 113 and CH 113A helicopters which have been ordered for the Royal Canadian Air Force and the Canadian army, the CH 112 light helicopter, reconnaissance aircraft, for the Canadian army and the C 130E cargo aircraft for the Royal Canadian Air Force.

In the electrical and electronic field, the responsibilities of our electronic branch in matters of procurement and production have been increased this year by the transfer to that branch of the procurement of electrical materials which were formerly under the general purchases branch.

Besides the continuing procurement of radar systems, fire control communications, navigation and identification systems for the 104 program, certain needs concerning the CT 114 aircraft and the CHSS 2 helicopter for the navy must be looked after. A number of navigation devices of a new and advanced design, a data registering device in case of accident and an instrument to locate the site of a crash, all in the course of development through our defence exportation program, will be integrated as far as possible later in these production programs.

Electronic training aids remain an important item and simulators are still being manufactured for the governments of Germany, Italy and other European countries. Shipments to the governments of the Netherlands and Belgium have been completed without delay.

The Chairman: Order. I must interrupt the hon. minister to call the attention of the house to the fact that his time has expired and that he cannot continue with his comments without the consent of the house.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, we are willing to let the minister complete his remarks, but only as regards the Department of Defence Production. I do not think we could accept that the minister gave an account of the work done by the emergency measures organization or other agencies for which he is responsible in this house, for I feel we have enough on our hands for the time being. I agree to let the minister complete the statement he is now making.

The Chairman: Is it agreed?

Mr. Drury: I agree on that, Mr. Chairman.

A great variety of communication material for land and sea will be procured for the three services to support their modernization programs and further material has been ordered to improve the stationary communication system within Canada.

The needs in operation and maintenance material of the Mid-Canada line have decreased following the closing of about half the stations. Another decrease has been noted with regard to auxiliary contracts for the Pinetree line stations.

The rental of communication circuits operated on a commercial basis to maintain the administrative and operational link between the military establishments in Canada continues on a large scale.

During the past year, two other destroyer escorts were completed as well as a tanker for the navy and an hydrographic survey ship. Construction of a research ship for the naval laboratory on the Pacific coast has been continued.

Four destroyer escorts have been built under the modernization program for those vessels. A contract has been awarded for the modernization of a fifth destroyer, whereas the contract for a sixth will soon be let. The modernization program will go on for a few years until every destroyer escort has been transformed.

With regard to development work started for the national defence department, I want to mention a few projects, and, more particularly the building of a 180-ton hydroglider prototype, the design and plans as well as the final development and construction of which are taking place in Canada for our navy. This will require skill in the fields of aviation, electronic and shipbulding.

Furthermore, contracts have been awarded for the development and production of a series of satellites to complete the Alouette program of the defence research board. The main object will be to develop and produce a new Sonar and other antisubmarine detection systems for the Royal Canadian Navy and air force.

[*Text*]

I should like to make a reference to Canada-United States defence development and production sharing program. As my colleague the Secretary of State for External Affairs has already reported, a meeting of the Canada-United States ministerial committee on defence took place in Washington on June 25. Our joint defence development and production sharing program was one of the subjects discussed, and I am pleased to take this opportunity to confirm that the full support of both governments was reaffirmed for continuation of the program with the agreed objective of assuring maintenance of a long term balance at the highest practicable level in reciprocal procurement of items of mutual defence interest by the United States and Canada in accordance with principles established by agreement with Mr. McNamara in June 1963. A special study of the factors affecting this cross-border procurement is being undertaken with a view to assuring maintenance of the rough balance over the next few years.

While historically the balance of this cross-border procurement of defence equipment has been in favour of the United States, increased participation by Canadian industry in United States programs under our joint program has resulted in a swing of the balance in favour of Canada. Recent Canadian procurements in the United States such as the M-113 personnel carrier and C-130 aircraft have reduced this Canadian advantage, and present indications are that over the next year or so the balance will tend to swing toward a position favourable to the United States. It is in the light of these trends that the study I have referred to above is being undertaken, since it is possible for Canada to look to United States sources for economical supply of certain defence requirements only with the assurance that the rough balance will be maintained.

A very significant aspect of the program is the development sharing agreement. A memorandum of understanding on development sharing has recently been concluded between the United States and Canada which provides arrangements for participation by Canadian industry in United States defence development projects on a cost sharing basis. The projects being undertaken under this agreement are conducted in private industry with costs being shared by United States and Canadian governments and the Canadian firms concerned in appropriate case by case arrangements.

Beyond our Canada-United States program there has been increased emphasis on extending our efforts toward collaboration with our European NATO allies and other friendly countries in the field of defence development, research and production and in bilateral defence trade. An important recent activity was the third meeting of the Anglo-Canadian committee on co-operation in defence development and production which met in London May 25 through May 28. Following that meeting, members of the Canadian team visited other European NATO countries to discuss extension of Canada's bilateral trade in defence equipment.

To sum up, increased emphasis is being given both to continuation of our joint program with the United States and to defence

export activities with other NATO and allied countries. To this end, as I have already mentioned, the international programs branch was established to provide central guidance and direction for all the departmental activities associated with these United States and overseas programs.

With regard to the actual votes in this year's estimates, hon. members will note that the most significant increase over 1963-64 is found under vote 1, covering administration costs and grants paid on crown owned defence plants in lieu of taxes. This increase is almost entirely attributable to the establishment increases which have been made necessary by the additional departmental responsibilities that I have outlined in my statement. There has been a decrease in anticipated expenditures under vote 5 for the establishment of production capacity, and there is no change in vote 10, which covers the establishment of qualified sources for the production of component parts and materials.

Vote 15 covers the requirements of the directorate of printing which was made a responsibility of the department in July 1963. The present estimates reflect the reorganization which has taken place during the past year as a result of the transfer and control of certain branches of the Department of Public Printing and Stationery to the Department of Defence Production, and the only item where a significant increase is shown under this vote is that covering plant equipment and replacements. Over 30 per cent of the equipment at the Canadian government printing plant is beyond 20 years of age, and accordingly it is essential that some modernization be effected in order to produce work as efficiently as possible.

This year the estimates covering the development aspects of the Canada-United States defence development and production sharing program are included under vote 5 of the Department of Industry. These proposed expenditures have been discussed in conjunction with the consideration of the estimates of that department.

As requested by hon. members, I will speak separately about the votes provided under section B of the Department of Defence Production estimates relating to the emergency measures organization.

Under section C of the defence production estimates provision is made under vote 35 for the expenses incurred by Defence Construction (1951) Limited at a lower level than the previous year, which reflects a further reduction in the operating costs of this agency which coincides with the reduction in the construction program required by the Department of National Defence.

Similarly, votes 40 and 45 to cover the unrecovered operating costs and capital requirements respectively for Canadian Arsenals Limited show a marked reduction in anticipation of the possible sale to private industry of several divisions of this crown company.

In closing these remarks I would like to refer to the final paragraph of section 6 of the white paper on defence, and in this regard would quote as follows:

> Defence expenditures can make a contribution to the efficient development of manufacturing both for the domestic market and for export and, in so doing, contribute to the general growth of Canada. Programs to establish and improve production sources will continue. The closest co-operation between the armed services and the Department of Defence Production will be maintained in order to promote efficient purchasing practices and to see that Canadian products are used wherever that is feasible.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Hales: I think we must realize at the outset that the minister was confronted with a difficult task in presenting the main estimates of this department, inasmuch as there are so many branches for which he is responsible. It seems to me that to load down one minister by placing so many branches under his jurisdiction shows very poor organization indeed on the part of the government.

As I understand it, the Minister of Industry is responsible for the following departments: the Department of Industry, the Department of Defence Production, the atomic energy control board, Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, Canadian Arsenals Limited, Canadian Patents and Development Limited, Canadian Commercial Corporation, Crown Assets Disposal Corporation, Defence Construction (1951) Limited, the emergency measures organization, national research council, Polymer Corporation, public printing and stationery, and the queen's printer; some 14 departments. This in itself is not fair; it is not good business organization, and it is humanly impossible for any one minister to have all these departments under control.

I think the suggestion made by the hon. member for Edmonton East was a good one, namely that when a minister introduces estimates of the complexity of those that have been placed before us this morning, we should at least have a copy of the introduction by the minister under item 1. I think this would

be a very good idea to follow on future occasions.

This raises another question. I should like to impress upon the government once again that we have an estimates committee in our house organization. This government has not seen fit to set up the committee on estimates; they have not called that committee, and they have not referred to it any of these departments. When one considers the remarks of the minister with regard to vote 5 of the Department of Industry, having to do with the United States-Canada cost sharing program, which is a tremendous undertaking in which millions of dollars are spent, one cannot think of a better department to be referred to the estimates committee than this.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, today we have the first opportunity to look into the estimates of these many departments. And above all things, we are expected to criticize and investigate a new department that has been set up, namely the Department of Industry. However, with the time at our disposal we will just have to do the best job we can with this tremendous list of departments.

The minister started off by giving us a résumé of the great increase in trade, productivity and the volume of sales in Canada today. I would ask him to just recall a few things that were done in the past few years. I do not wish to take up the time of the committee by pointing out what we did when we were on the government side of the house, but much of this great increase in productivity, trade and development in Canada today is due to many of those things which the Conservative party put into operation in the last four or five years.

I need only mention a few of them. There was the great trade crusade that was put on by the Department of Trade and Commerce, when the minister of that day said to the trade commissioners "Off with the striped pants and on with the overalls, and get out and sell our exports". This is what was done, and the results were tremendous. We set up the national productivity council immediately upon taking office. We only need think of the winter works program, the great assistance given to the maritime provinces of $25 million a year which was later increased to $35 million; the vocational training schools program; the great sales of wheat. Remember the millions of bushels of wheat that were left on our doorsteps, and we got out and sold them to the countries of the world. Then there were the loans to farmers, grants to hospitals, and so on. I could mention others. These, Mr. Chairman, were the things that helped to bring about the high degree of prosperity that Canada is experiencing today, I would not want the house to forget them.

We are now considering the minister's estimates. I have listed all the main items, and I notice that under atomic energy, the emergency measures organization, national research, defence production, industry and public printing his estimates show an increase of $24 million over last year. When we come to the individual votes I am sure hon. members will want to question why there is this tremendous increase of $24 million over the estimates of last year.

In speaking of the economy of the country the minister mentioned automobile parts and transmissions. I wonder whether he realizes that this was brought about by the study made by Professor Bladen which resulted in the Bladen report. Professor Bladen came forth with a formula that was so simple that it is hard to understand why someone did not come up with it sooner. It was done under a Conservative regime; we appointed Professor Bladen; we instituted the Bladen commission report. We did this with regard to transmissions and car engines to start with, and the Liberal government has simply followed on with the same program and extended it to automobile parts. It simply means that for every engine or transmission part that is imported into Canada and put into a car which in turn is exported out of the country, the manufacturer of the car receives a remission of the duty on the importation of that particular part. This has been a tremendous help to the automobile industry in Canada. It will be interesting to see what stand the minister takes when he sits down at the table with his United States counterparts who are at the moment deciding whether Canada should be allowed to continue this particular program.

The minister spoke about the great competitive position in which Canadian industry finds itself today. I wonder how much better this position would be if the Liberal government had not imposed the 11 per cent sales tax on production machinery. I am sure it would have been much better.

Then the minister dealt with the organization of the Department of Industry. In this respect he set before us one of the greatest empire building programs in the history of this government, in the setting up of the Department of Industry. He said that at this time they have recruited a staff of 290 people and this represents only 45 per cent of the

staff that will be engaged. This is what I understood him to say. This means that before too long the staff will be up to 500 or 600 people, and the department was only set up last July.

I do not think I need take up the time of the committee in explaining our party's position in regard to this department. We thought the work that is being done for industry by this department could have been done quite well by the Department of Trade and Commerce, which could have been called the department of trade and industry, if necessary. I realize that the Canadian Manufacturers' Association made representations to the Liberal government to set up such a department, but I do not think they had any idea that it was going to cost the taxpayers of this country something in the order of $24 million to operate it. I think they would have been just as happy if the taxpayers' dollars had been saved and the same work had been done by a department that was already in existence.

What did they do in order to get staff? They came out with a booklet asking people to join the Department of Industry. Twenty thousand booklets were printed at a cost of $2,140, and they were spread all over the country. That was one of the minor expenditures. Then they rented a new building at a cost of $384,000 a year which has 119 private offices, 59 shared offices, 29 general offices and 21 miscellaneous areas, as outlined by the minister in *Hansard* for March 4, 1964 at page 530. I say this is a wonderful example of empire building. However, the taxpayer has to pay for it now that it is set up.

The minister went on to talk about area development. I could take all the time which is allotted to me to discuss this particular branch. The designated or depressed area system is under the jurisdiction of this branch. In case there is any misunderstanding I take full responsibility for what the Conservative government did in the designation of depressed areas. We instituted this scheme. These areas which were set up as designated or depressed areas were a result of the recommendation of the people in those areas. In other words, we as a government said to these people "If you find difficulty with the economic problems in your area, come to Ottawa and we will look into them, and if we think it is necessary we will designate yours as a depressed area". But, no the Liberal government took the opposite stand. They took the labour statistics, looked at them on a sheet of paper, and then went down the list and picked out the areas. The people in the particular areas had nothing to say about it, until the day an industry went to one of these areas and said to the officials there "We believe you are a designated area, and we think we would like to locate here".

These 35 designated areas have been set up across Canada. On different occasions I have spoken in this house about the problem existing in my own area, and I will not take the time of the committee by going into it again at this point. I would simply say that the designated area of Brantford lies plunk in the heart of an industrial area in southwestern Ontario which includes Galt, Kitchener and Guelph. The government picked out Brantford as a depressed area, and this makes the whole program very discriminatory and contradictory.

The criterion adopted is unfair. It is set up in such a way that municipal and provincial autonomy are disregarded, and the industrialists are not satisfied with it at all. The only industry interested is one contemplating moving into such an area and benefiting from these great concessions. It is discriminatory to the areas surrounding. In my community one industry was establishing itself in the city of Guelph; at least the foundations for the building were in. Then this particular industry heard of the concessions offered in Brantford, and moved over to that city. Other industries have also done this. The city of Galt is in the process of losing an industry to Brantford. I would ask the minister to remove Brantford from the list of designated areas immediately. The people in that community want no part of it, and it is discriminatory to the very roots.

The minister has promised on various occasions to look into the criterion adopted; he has said that it would be reviewed and something would be done about it. He said today that the criterion was not satisfactory, and I was pleased to hear that. The minister has admitted the criterion is not satisfactory, and I repeat that it certainly is not. As hon. members know, it is based on a six month period, on the percentage of unemployment during six months in the summertime. I submit it should be over the whole year. For example, in the city of Brantford, where the big industry is farm machinery manufacturing, for six months over the winter this machinery is produced and in the six months during the summer production eases off while the equipment is sold. This is one example which makes the criterion unsuccessful.

The minister said it has had good results, and I hope it has. The commercial industries

which move into these depressed areas would have no doubt located somewhere else in Canada. The object of the scheme, of course, is to create employment in a particular area; but when this is done in a place like Brantford, working people simply motor from Galt or Guelph to Brantford and it does not ease unemployment at all. The whole business of area development must be very carefully scrutinized. The criterion should be changed, and I hope that before too long the minister will do this and put it on a much fairer basis than at present.

The minister went on to talk about trade missions, and in particular those respecting furniture industry and design, and the meetings which were held in various parts of Canada. I am at a loss to know how this is done under both the Department of Industry and the Department of Trade and Commerce, because I cannot see anything except overlapping, confusion and added cost. The Department of Trade and Commerce holds these meetings. They also hold trade fairs. They had a great trade crusade, and now here is the Department of Industry overlapping and doing the same thing. I hope I am wrong about this, but it appears to me there is a tremendous amount of overlapping.

The minister spoke under vote 5 about the U.S.-Canada cost sharing defence arrangement, which is a tremendous undertaking. This involves a large amount, and I hope some day this matter will be referred to the estimates committee for complete study. The program is very complicated. I spent some time with the deputy minister in charge of this program, and I must confess that we only scratched the surface. There is a lot more to be learned about it, and I confess I know very little about it.

I now turn to the Department of Defence Production. The minister referred to the transfer of people from that department. When we considered interim supply on August 4 I spoke about the Department of Industry, and at that time mentioned the fact that we had been told that when the Department of Industry was set up people would be transferred from trade and commerce and defence production to industry. We may not have been told in so many words, but we were also led to believe that the staffing costs would not be too great. However, when we looked at the figures for these departments we found the over-all cost of operation of defence production showed an increase of $2,036,980 between 1962-63 and 1964-65. The Department of Defence Production staff was increased by 168, so there could not have been very many transfers made.

On interim supply I then went on to point out how confusing the situation seemed to be because of the apparent overlapping among the Department of Industry, the Department of Defence Production and the Department of Trade and Commerce. I asked many questions during the debate on August 4, and suggested that the minister should answer the questions at this time. When the minister made his introductory statement today I expected that he would answer many of those questions. It may well be that he will do so at a later stage of this debate.

The minister stated that his department was following the suggestions made by the Glassco commission, and I was very pleased to hear that statement. I feel the Glassco commission recommendations are excellent. It would seem to me that the minister is taking steps to convert the Department of Defence Production into a department of purchasing and supply. In making these changes I think it is folly and poor business to hire new and additional staff. I think the staff of the department being converted should be transferred to the new department, but for some reason this does not seem to be the case. Very little thought is given to the cost and it seems that someone just says to go ahead and do it, spend the money and the taxpayer will have to pay more. I think that practice is nothing more than folly, and is morally wrong. I think when a department is reorganized its staff should be moved from the old department to the new department.

Mr. Chairman, the minister referred to Defence Construction (1951) Limited. This corporation was set up in 1951 to look after construction and procurement for the Department of National Defence. This corporation's estimates are lower, and I think they should be because there is less and less work to do in view of the present changeover position of the national defence program.

Mr. Chairman, I was a member of the public accounts committee and remember the Auditor General bringing certain cases in respect of Defence Construction (1951) Limited to our attention. As an example of what he found, I have picked three specific cases out of his 1963 report. The first example is referred to at page 150 of the Auditor General's 1963 report and relates to the authorized payment of $12,985 to a contractor because of delay in plans for construction. Another example involves the authorization of a $36,604 payment necessitated by delays and

changes in design. This payment was in respect of a project at Camp Petawawa. The third example relates to the expenditure of $16,315 resulting from a delay in the supply of electric power to a project to extend water and sewage facilities at Greenwood, Nova Scotia.

Mr. Chairman, there seems to be something in the operation of this department which is not as it should be. There are many other observations which one could make and to which the minister made reference in his introductory remarks. There are other estimates which will be dealt with specifically at a later stage of this debate, and I am sure many other members of this party will be particularly interested.

Mr. Chairman, with those few introductory remarks I shall take my seat. I hope as the debate on these estimates continues many interesting observations will come to the attention of the minister. I conclude by repeating what I said at the outset. It is a great mistake for this government, or any government, not to make use of the estimates committee, which is a part of our parliamentary procedure. I do not understand why this government did not set up this committee and refer the estimates of some of these departments to it. When the next session is under way I hope that committee will do what it is supposed to do, so the time of this house is not taken up considering a great number of minor details which could be discussed by the committee members.

Those are my general observations, and I hope to take part in some of the other discussions later on during the debate.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Chairman, I should like to echo the remarks of the last speaker in relation to the Department of Industry being of importance to a large segment of the Canadian economy. I also feel that the minister should not be burdened with the responsibilities of those other departments under his ministry. The department for which the minister is now responsible at one time was under the ministry of defence production, and was considered to be a full time job, and one of the most important. The responsibility for administering this department has now been added to the burden carried by the Minister of Industry.

Mr. Chairman, many Canadian people will be looking to the minister for a much more forthright and frank statement about the Department of Industry and what is intended to be done in the future than he has made today. His is a department of resources, and I refer to the use of labour and production in a way that will provide advancement in the field of industry, in the form of assistance to those areas of Canada which have not been as fortunate as others. To date I believe this department has failed, as have most of the resource departments of the federal government, to give the leadership to the people in those areas which they can rightly expect. This failure is also true in respect of the Department of Forestry. That department in my opinion has been a complete flop as far as the development of the forest industry in Canada is concerned. The department of mines has also been a flop, in that it has given little encouragement to the mining industry in Canada.

This failure has probably occurred as a result of the lack of leadership. The lack of leadership I feel is a result of the lack of proper distinction between the responsibilities of the federal and provincial governments in these fields. That situation is not true of the Department of Industry, and for this reason we should be entitled to expect a great deal more.

Mr. Chairman, I am particularly interested in that branch of the Department of Industry relating to area development. I represent an area that is not a designated area. If the hon. member who has just taken his seat asks that the city of Brantford, which is a designated area, be taken out of that category he should bear in mind that that is an area which has obtained a great number of new industries. Brantford now has 29 new industries. Maybe he is saying that the plan was so successful in the Brantford area that they no longer want to presume upon the Department of Industry and are willing to share the wealth with other areas.

My problem is that the area I represent, particularly Teck township and the town of Kirkland Lake, is not a designated area. I would ask why it is not. There is very little difference between the town of Timmins, the Rouyn-Noranda area and the township of Teck and Kirkland Lake. These areas are very similar in nature and depend entirely upon mining. All of them have experienced a decrease in their labour forces because of the curtailment of mining operations; yet Noranda and Timmins have been named designated areas.

I asked the minister the other day if some consideration was going to be given to Teck township and Kirkland Lake. I am aware of the fact that the Department of Labour has more to do than any other department with the designation of these areas, but certainly

a recommendation from the minister of the Department of Industry would be helpful because that department is aware of the results achieved in designated areas and the reasons other areas should be designated. There should be some statement why Kirkland Lake has not been designated and why the assistance available to sister communities on both sides is not available to it.

When I asked a question the other day the minister said he did not intend to intervene in this particular instance. Yet the *Financial Post* for August 22 contains an article headed "New Medicine Coming for 'Weak Job' Areas". The subheading is:

> Drury team moves into phase II, plans whole raft of sophisticated remedies to cure "inefficient" use of labour force.

The article goes on to say:

> "We are going to have to develop the industries that are natural to the areas," an official sums it up. This is probably going to be much easier than the more ambitious program to cut down on underemployment. Here the area development agency will be sailing in uncharted waters. Officials of the Department of Finance and Labour are joining with the industry men in search for ways of finding and working on these pockets where the work force is being used inefficiently.
>
> It is far too early yet to guess how they will tackle the problem. But so far as the Department of Industry is concerned this is much more the sort of work it was set up to do than just moving industries into unemployment areas. In the long run, the officials believe, it will be on their success or failure in this field that the area development agency will be judged.

I have been very cautious about saying anything with regard to the Department of Industry or the area development section of the department because it was my hope that this agency in particular would provide some of the assistance that we in northern Ontario need to solve our problems. I am sure that when the Department of Industry was set up the officials were aware of what had been done by the former government and particularly what had been done by the governments in the maritimes. Because of the depletion of resources in my area and other mining communities a large unemployment factor resulted, and these communities found themselves completely unable to utilize the resources they had or to find capital to develop new resources. As was done by the maritime provinces, these people came to Ottawa with their hand out asking for assistance in the form of subsidies.

I think the people of the maritimes should be given full credit for the fact that through the Atlantic development agency they were able to do something for communities like Springhill. I have had the opportunity of visiting Springhill several times in the last few years. The mining industry there disappeared completely because of a disaster. The people of the community set up an agency whereby money was provided to industries that would settle there. It was not done, as the minister has said, on the basis of finding industries which could be tied in with the resources of the area. That is an obvious consideration but, more important, they brought in industries that had no connection whatever with the former industry. I was very pleased to be able to go through the new battery factory and the new woodworking factory which is producing prefabricated houses. It is also interesting to note that several new coal mines are being developed in the area which are not related in any way to the very large company which carried on coal production there for so many years.

It seems to me that the people of Springhill have not found the situation as disastrous as they had anticipated. New industries are being brought into the area, and it would appear to me as an outsider they have gone a long way toward solving their problems. Now that they have taken the first step with assistance from the Atlantic development agency they will be able to take further steps on their own and other industries will follow.

We in northern Ontario carried much of this country for many years. The income from the gold mining industry during the depression years is well known to those with an interest in the history of our country. That industry provided a great deal of employment and a large part of the income in the province of Ontario in those years. There are few industries today in which you cannot find workers who during the depression went to northern Ontario or northern Quebec, found jobs and as a result paid income taxes and supported their families in other communities throughout the country. I believe that the contribution which was made by that area over a long period of time is well known.

It is interesting to note that in 1931 there were 2,894 miners employed in the gold mines. In 1932 the figure was 3,197; in 1933, 3,272; in 1934, 3,455; in 1935, 3,513 and in 1936, 3,687. The number rose to its maximum in 1939 when there were 4,440 miners working underground in mines in the township of Teck. But in 1963 the figure was only 1,282.

The need of assistance has been made more imperative by something which has happened, although it was not as great a disaster as

occurred at Springhill. In one of the mines at Kirkland Lake a severe series of air blasts occurred on August 14 with the result that two miners were trapped and lost their lives. Their bodies were not recovered until August 25. The mine has not yet been able to assess the damage and is completely closed down except for a few people engaged in cleaning up operations. No decision has yet been made as to what is going to be done.

I suggest this is an additional indication that the situation in Kirkland Lake is most serious and warrants consideration by the department. But we did not hear the minister say that such consideration would be given. A delegation from Kirkland Lake is meeting the Minister of Labour today, and I hope they will be able to convince him that the situation in that area is sufficiently critical to justify the inclusion of the area when areas are being redesignated this fall. Unfortunately in this area workers in agriculture, farming and the forest industry were removed from the jurisdiction of the unemployment insurance office in Kirkland Lake and placed in the tri-town area, with the result that the actual situation in Kirkland Lake is not apparent from the unemployment insurance commission figures.

I asked the minister several days ago what assistance would be given to the Timmins area to help in developing the Gulf Sulphur project recently established there. I was surprised to find out that the assistance the department was willing to offer hinged again on the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys and the small assistance it can provide, a small consideration by the Department of Finance, and really no understanding by the Department of Finance as to what it was going to be able to do in relation to developing this industry. Yet this is something that would provide enough employment for the town of Timmins so that it would no longer qualify for designation as a distressed area.

Incidentally it would provide all northern Ontario with secondary industry, because if we can process the minerals in this area it will provide employment for a large number of men. I am told that the handling of ores from Texas Gulf in that area, over 300 million tons, would employ 20,000 employees in the smelter complex, and this in turn would provide many jobs in secondary industry. Still the department is not in a position to decide what it will do about it.

You may find it surprising to learn that a company like Gulf Sulphur is not unlike a company such as Cleveland Cliff, because in many instances a company finds it impossible to undertake a multimillion dollar complex for the development of mineral resources on its own, and has to work out arrangements with other companies or agencies to find the capital necessary to establish a refining industry.

That is what we expected the Department of Industry to do, and I had considerable faith in the ability of the deputy minister to instigate surveys to find out the potential of an area, something which is referred to in the *Financial Post* of August 22, in which it stated it was indicated by officials of the department that they would be able to decide what was the potential of an area, that surveys would be conducted according to the arrangements outlined in the booklet issued by the Department of Industry when it was seeking recruits. In my opinion all this should have been done by now.

To northern Ontario, the maritimes and many other areas this is the most important department of government and is the one that can make the greatest contribution in the shortest period of time. The minister did not announce whether he was going to initiate controls over industry. I do not think there will be any argument when I say that every time a new industry goes into the city of Toronto it creates an added liability on the resources of that city. A factory going into the outskirts of Toronto will overtax its already overtaxed school system. The city's transportation systems are vastly overtaxed and new factories put a further strain on them. I believe the Department of Industry has a responsibility to calculate these liabilities.

If the department wants to bring any type of industry into northern Ontario we will provide that industry with all kinds of concessions, but it is unfortunate that under the free enterprise system industry is reluctant to take advantage of any offer made by municipalities outside metropolitan areas. The reason is that industry believes it must centre its factories in the major areas of consumption. I have talked to industrialists who say they figure an area must be able to consume 80 per cent of a factory's production, whether it be corn flakes or radio parts, before they would be interested in establishing a factory in it. If this is true then obviously the only thing a manufacturer can do is establish his factory in a major centre of consumption, which means in the golden horseshoe or in the Montreal area.

This may be very satisfactory from the manufacturer's point of view but it is damned

unsatisfactory from the point of view of areas built on a natural resource and which find that natural resource being depleted. It is all very well for the minister to say, as his officials have said, and I am sure with his agreement, that they are going to concentrate on those areas whose basic resources can be used to develop secondary industry. In the main this will not apply to resource areas of currency or precious minerals, where the mines are facing depletion and their closing is only a matter of a few years hence.

I have some knowledge of the lumber and forest industry in Ontario, where for a number of years I represented a segment of the forest industry in negotiations with many of the companies involved. Many of these companies are nearing the end of their existence in their present localities because reforestation has not taken place, and most of the communities that were supported by the forest industry have no other resource. This is true of Renfrew, Pembroke, Temagami, Latchford and Blind River—all through the whole white pine industry where the resource will not be rebuilt in our lifetime. It will be 70 or 80 years before the natural resources of these communities can be replaced, and none of them are willing to wait that length of time. Certainly we should not wait for our centennial as an occasion to rebuild them as ghost towns, as was done in Dawson City.

I would ask the minister to give us a résumé of what the department has done in the relocation of industry. In this respect we have a lesson to learn from other countries because Canada's problems are not unique. They have been explored and solved by many other countries. In Sweden the authorities take industry into areas of underpopulation, but the minister has said that we are not interested in taking industry into unemployment areas. For that matter I am of the opinion that we are not interested in taking unemployed people into other areas but should concentrate on improving areas already settled and on spreading industry across the nation in order to give benefit to all areas.

Relocation of industry has been a very serious part of industrial programming in the United Kingdom, which has an act governing the relocation of industry. In fact many of the promises made by the Liberal party to give assistance for the relocation of industry are not unlike the program undertaken in England, but you cannot relocate industry solely by co-operation with industry because you will find industries have no intention of going into areas in which they are not interested.

It took one terrific factor, the wage factor, to move industry out of Toronto into the towns of Barrie and Orillia, whereas in England the authorities solved this problem by saying to companies, "If you want to expand, the department of industry will give you a permit to expand in areas of large unemployment where the social services are in excess of the needs of the local communities." They held out a carrot by offering concessions in a financial sense. They gave tax concessions, and the department of finance ruled that companies would not be able to draw on undistributed profits unless they were putting them into an area for which the department was giving them licences.

Take, for example, the Ford plant in Great Britain. Ford did not go into its present location because it wanted to, but because it was asked to. The authorities in Britain were greatly concerned about rebuilding certain areas of the country which, since the war had fared less well than others, economically, particularly those areas in the northern midlands which had been adversely affected by changing conditions in the textile industry. Consequently industry was invited, or directed, to places where the necessary public services such as schools, roads, hospitals and so on already existed, in addition of course to large numbers of skilled workers with housing to accommodate them. I think this system has brought great benefit to the areas concerned.

Here in Canada, one of the areas where a similar arrangement could be followed is northern Ontario. We are not situated a great distance from potential markets. We have the facilities—housing, hospitals, schools, and so on. We have the northern Ontario institute of technology. There is the Ontario-owned railway which could be used for the subsidized transport of industrial products to the main centres of consumption. We have all these advantages. We also have the people. In Kirkland Lake, a town of 17,582 persons, only 1,282 are employed in the mines, virtually the only occupation open to them. It is up to the minister to decide, in conjunction with his colleagues, that he will designate this area and use it as a showcase for industrial development. There are advantages here which exist nowhere else. Since the beginning of the war, this community has existed by reason of emergency gold mines assistance payments, receiving each year grants to the

tune of about $13 million. We have made concessions. The town has made concessions, and the whole country has made concessions. If the present minister would take a look at this $13 million and agree to put this kind of money into the establishment of new industry in this area we would be happy if he were to cut off E.G.M.A. payments tomorrow. I say this because we are not happy about carrying an industry which has no foreseeable future, or whose scope is very limited. We are interested in industries which have a future, which will grow with the community and allow the community to grow with them. Steps can be taken immediately in this direction. I will certainly support them. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that I will defeat any of his party's candidates in that area for years to come if this government neglects to do something for communities where there is obviously so great a need.

If no action is taken along these lines, then the hon. gentleman's government is not worthy of support. The minister has the ability. There is nothing wrong with it. His talents in administration have been proven for many years. Certainly, Dave Golden is one of the most capable administrators this government has. If these two men are unable to do anything about this situation it means the cabinet is not interested in the Department of Industry. If I have any justification for being here, it is to see that this department does the job for northern Ontario which it was set up to do. And if the hon. gentleman's colleagues will not support him in this effort, and if he is not prepared to make a more active presentation with regard to these issues, and to the case of northern Ontario in particular, then I hope the government is defeated in the near future, regardless what the reason is. I am confident that the very existence of the people of northern Ontario depends upon their getting federal assistance to develop industry in the area. The future in northern Ontario depends on this, just as people in the maritimes are dependant on this department for their future existence.

The government should not consider this department as being a department of the second rank. I believe it should be considered immediately as one of the most important departments of the crown. It is the department with the greatest future. It is the one which in my opinion offers the greatest opportunity. The distressed areas need strong leadership to put them back in the field of production so that they can make their contribution to the payment of income tax and the other forms of tax which support the finances of the central government. We in Kirkland Lake are not interested in drawing unemployment insurance; neither is any other community in northern Ontario. We are interested in paying heavy income tax and this will only be possible if the Minister of Industry can provide us with the means of employment which will allow us to do so.

Mr. Lambert: Since this department received some attention in the interim supply debate a few weeks ago my remarks today will be shortened because it was definitely the intention of the official opposition at the time that since the main estimates were not coming forward we would discuss the departments as though this had been the case. For this reason, my remarks this afternoon will be limited.

First, I can only agree with what was said by my hon. friend from Wellington South (Mr. Hales). As I have said many times in the past, I believe the estimates of a department such as the Department of Industry should have been referred to the committee on estimates. I think the department itself might well recognize the wisdom of this course. After all, this is a new department which is still feeling its way and I think it would be a good thing for the senior officials, as well as for the government and the minister himself, if the opportunity had been taken to explain, before the committee on estimates, the way they were going.

I cannot agree with all the hon. member for Timiskaming said, but I certainly agree that there is implicit in the erection of the Department of Industry a great potential. I myself thought initially that this department could have been maintained within the Department of Trade and Commerce. I can only agree with the criticism put forward by the hon. member for Wellington South that a great deal of this work could have been done under the one department. Since the criticism has been made, I will limit myself in that regard.

The minister painted a glowing picture of the economy as though the present situation had been brought about by the beneficence of the Liberals—they had merely to come to power for all to be well. Obviously, the hon. gentleman did not consult the Minister of Finance who is aware that the improvement began in 1961. Indeed we could point to a number of factors to explain why the minister was able to quote the statistics he did this afternoon.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, we all agree that Canadian manufacturers are much more active today than they were a few years ago. I believe the pegging of the dollar at 92½ cents gives manufacturers in this country a definite advantage. I do not think there is any manufacturer or any responsible minister who will deny that this move has given Canadian industry a considerable lift. Second, there has been through the aegis of the Department of Trade and Commerce, initiated some years ago and continued by this administration, a much greater activity on the part of its trade commissioners. This fact and the various trade fairs that have been organized have helped our industry.

I would say, too, that Canadian manufacturers are much more active abroad, not necessarily only because of incentives provided by the government. There has been a great change in their own attitudes, and I believe we must pay considerable tribute to the management in the majority of industries, and to labour, for approaching this problem from a sensible point of view. Management, who were faced with a very gravely declining international and domestic market, decided they would have to modernize; they would have to cut costs; they would have to do away with outdated methods, rebuild, re-equip, and place some restriction on the withdrawal of earnings. I believe this is one particular step that we must encourage; we must encourage industry to plow back earnings into productive capacity. This is one of the criteria used to justify a tax cut.

Labour must also assume its proper share of responsibility in this regard. It is not only a question of rates of labour, but it is the responsibility of labour, as distinguished from management, if you will, not to make unreasonable demands, although they have a right to share in a just proportion of expanded earnings. But we must first of all realize there will be no opportunity for greater employment unless there are additional capital facilities to absorb additional labour, and there must be correspondingly additional sales. I do not care how much you get people to work; you can put thousands upon thousands of people to work, but if the goods are not sold at a profit or a fair return, the enterprise is bound to fail and those people are not going to continue in employment.

Therefore we must give management the encouragement to retain earnings for the replacement of capital production facilities, whether they be new, for expansion or for replacement. Second, as I have said, I believe both management and labour must exercise due restraint, bearing in mind that it is only with an economically viable capital that we are going to get not only continued economic activity but expanded economic activity. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, labour and management must approach this problem with a real degree of sense of responsibility.

Having said that, I think we must turn to the remarks of the minister. I do not think he had seen an article that appeared in the business section of the *Globe and Mail* this morning, entitled "Boom continuing, but weak spots mar some fields". We must realize that our economy goes forward, not necessarily at an even pace but some sectors go ahead further than others. The statistics the minister gave us this morning were interesting, particularly those with regard to household appliances, furniture and automobiles. However, Mr. Chairman, I believe that if the minister had reference to certain surveys which were conducted very recently he would have a better understanding of the situation. I will quote comments in regard to these surveys, which indicate that perhaps a degree of caution might be introduced at this point and in order that the figures the minister has placed before us can be viewed in their proper perspective. I quote from this morning's business section of the *Globe and Mail*:

> Producers of household appliances and furniture have had little to crow about since spring, when the government stimulated winter housebuilding program came to an end. Retail sales of furniture and appliances, seasonally adjusted, fell 6.3 per cent between April and June.

I continue reading this article:

> The decline appears to have been centred chiefly in such big ticket items as refrigerators, television sets and record players. The demand for electric stoves and washing machines continued to rise, but not enough to offset what appears to be a developing weakness in the market for consumer durables as a group.
>
> The pattern of demand for household equipment has been disrupted by the winter building incentives—which are to be offered again in the 1964-1965 season—but it seems that market saturation also is a factor.

I would warn the minister that reliance on statistics up to, say, the end of April or the end of the fiscal year, March 31, in this particular sector will be distorted, much as the over-all building picture is distorted if it stops as at March 31. This is because there was an artificial stimulation for the period December 1 to March 31; I believe the minister would be the first to recognize this. Therefore a general conclusion arrived at on

a short period base for these indices of industrial activity can be very misleading. This is all I shall say in this regard, Mr. Chairman.

I now pass on to the question of the underdeveloped areas. The minister said that in 23 regions some $245 million of investment had taken place in plant or projected plant and that some 9,000 men were being employed. There immediately comes to mind the question that the only worth of this program is with regard to what increase it has created over and above normal development. If this is all that has happened in these regions, I would say again that there is a distortion. But if it is $245 million of additional, over the normal, development that one could expect, then I say it is all very well. However, Mr. Chairman, I think the question as to whether this is the whole picture or is an increase must be answered. I realize that because of the time lag that is required from the time you make a decision to build a plant to the time when you are employing people, when you are in production, many months can elapse. One cannot look for miracles overnight in industrial stimulation. This applied to some of the other programs instituted by the former administration, which were cut off I think much too soon. Insufficient time had been allowed to give them the opportunity to show true results.

I should now like to deal with the area development agency. The hon. member for Timiskaming has almost made this a compulsory economic planning unit, and the comparisons that he made with the United Kingdom are, I think, improper, in that dealing with Great Britain we must remember this is a very small country and the costs of moving populations are very small, as are the costs of moving plant. These costs are relatively small compared to this country. We cannot take something and say we will transfer it from some area in the Atlantic provinces to another area in western Canada, although western Canada is fortunately blessed with few underdeveloped areas. What I am concerned with is the cost of this overhead to Canadian industry as a whole. How many people are employed in the area development agency, and what have been the expenses of its administration compared with the results obtained? This is a very important question to which we should get an answer because, as in business, you cannot undertake a mammoth sales campaign unless it results in gain. If it results in no increase in sales then it has just been a great waste of money. That is the criterion on which we must measure the efficacy of the government program so far as area development encouragement is concerned.

I was glad to hear the minister in his opening remarks indicate that the criteria on which the 35 areas had been selected were not quite the right ones, and that there could be a considerable improvement. Without wishing to claim that I am one of those who said "I told you so", I think this danger was pointed out to the minister at the time. I am hoping that he will come up with some much more worth-while and viable yardsticks for a determination of an underdeveloped area which can come under this particular tension.

So far as the Department of Industry is concerned, the minister indicated that he had a staff of around 250 to 275. However, when we look at page 177 of the book of estimates we see that the paper establishment for the coming fiscal year will be 573. It is very instructive to note that of those 573 some 261, or nearly 46 per cent, are to be officers with a minimum salary of $10,000. So the minister is obviously not running a department of low-paid personnel. I realize he has to compete with industry. Although he has a lot of directors of various branches, I realize he cannot get directors from industry to assist industry unless he offers these salaries in order to encourage them to enter government service. But let us not think that this is going to be a cheap operation. At the present time it is almost composed of as many chiefs as Indians, if I might use that very slangy phrase.

I would repeat what has been said by my hon. friend from Wellington South, that I would have thought we could do the same sort of job, and perhaps a better job, by concentrating this whole complex within a section of the Department of Trade and Commerce and renaming it the department of trade and industry, if you want. This could have been done at much less cost in numbers of personnel, as well as office space and what-have-you.

Now let me turn to defence production, as I have a few matters to raise in this regard. With regard to the ten purchasing branches which the minister has set up—I think that is correct, but having taken just a brief note as he went along it is a little difficult to be sure I have all the detail—this is perhaps a refinement of what existed before. True enough, if defence production is to become a central purchasing agency perhaps there is

justification for this division of the Department of Defence Production, each section under a director, and so on. The proliferation of the hierarchy is evident in all sectors. What further concerns me is the matter of warehousing. I should like the minister to give us an explanation as to how warehousing will be controlled. Is the department going to take over warehousing from, say, the Department of National Defence which has huge warehouses? To what extent will they take over warehousing on behalf of public works, northern affairs, or transport? I am not too sure, but I have a feeling that in its first steps towards a central purchasing agency the department is caught in a sort of a tug of war with other departments which may not wish to give up the purchasing establishments which they have at the present time. We know that certain of the departments have very extensive purchasing agencies with technical staffs to back them up. I must confess I fully agree with the Glassco commission in this respect. I have come across more of the lesser departments, shall we say, whose purchases are not as great as others. I do not include in this the Department of Transport or the Department of Public Works, but there are others which have their technical engineers, and they are buying equipment. They have their own people to assess and to determine whether graders, draglines and cranes, and what-have-you, are of a certain value, and whether the new bids are based precisely on what they want. I think that a lot of this could be telescoped into a proper, efficient purchasing agency. But let me give one word of caution: It must not be up to the central purchasing agency to decide necessarily whether the item concerned is required. After all, are we setting up just another establishment alongside to query and evaluate what a department has already done?—because that is merely duplication. After all, a department, if it is going to enter into the purchase of major equipment, must justify itself to treasury board. Certainly the purchasing agency must not then set up a third body for evaluation purposes. This has applied to some extent, I think, to defence production. It has unfortunately crept in at times in defence construction. It must be something that the minister should always watch.

With regard to defence production sharing, I recall that one of the problems which the defence committee ran into in Europe last November was that each of the countries had something to say about defence production sharing. Each country felt it should have a greater share within the NATO complex. I realize I am only telling the minister something he already knows, but we found each country had its own aspirations. That is all very well, until you run into the dominant NATO partners, who themselves have their own aspirations in the production of defence equipment. This is a very complex point and I do not know whether there is an ideal solution. I think it is just a case of pushing as hard as you can, and trying to struggle on. Ideally on paper, and perhaps in editorial columns, it looks as though it is a very easy thing to achieve; but having talked to the defence people in these countries and to our friends the Americans and our own people, it does become exceedingly difficult.

The Canadian army is now using one weapon manufactured in France. I understand this weapon was purchased under the standardization procedure. It is very well to obtain this kind of equipment, but I understand it is difficult to obtain the technical information required. Unfortunately the French government, or the manufacturer is very reticent about providing technical information. When this information cannot be obtained it is very difficult to maintain the equipment or carry out further workup procedure. These manufacturers or governments may feel perfectly justified in the attitude they take, and I am not suggesting the French government or manufacturer of that particular weapon is alone in this regard. However, I think if we are going to enter into defence sharing programs everything must be put on the table. There must be complete co-operation between the partners, because if something is being held back because of a fear that one partner will suddenly commence to manufacture a specific article, this mistrust within the spirit of co-operation in the alliance will doom the whole program to failure.

Mr. Chairman, the minister in his opening remarks referred to the use of a general supply ship, and I am sure he had in mind the *Provider*. We have heard some very disquieting rumours about the *Provider*. I was on that ship and found the whole supply idea novel. It certainly represents a departure from normal supply patterns, in that we have lumped together various supply requirements in the one ship rather than having specialized ships doing specific things, which is the practice followed by larger navies. I should like the minister to tell us what corrective measures will have to be made in respect of the *Provider* in order that it may

function more efficiently in the role originally intended. Some of the equiment on the *Provider* I understand is not functioning properly. I am not criticizing the minister in this regard nor the principle of this ship because I realize this whole concept is new and perhaps has not worked out as well in practice under actual conditions as may have been hoped. I think we must be reassured that this was a proper venture, and that whatever difficulties have occurred will be corrected so the ship can take its proper place in the defence picture.

Mr. Chairman, because of the restricted activities of Defence Construction (1951) Limited, other than in respect of maintenance of our defence establishments, obviously we have reached the point where we must decide whether this corporation is required. Surely we are not going to expand our airports or army barracks, and with the cutback in our forces there will be a lesser requirement for this corporation. Surely this corporation will not be maintained merely for the purpose of constructing a new national defence headquarters. I should like the minister to tell us why Defence Construction (1951) Limited is being continued. In the event that it does remain in operation I should like the minister to tell us what experience his department has had in respect of time and material payment bonds, the use of which was brought into the picture in respect of tendering on government construction projects about two or three years ago following a series of several very unfortunate incidents. I understand subcontractors were not being paid by prime contractors because these went into bankruptcy and abandoned projects which the government had to take over and complete one way or another. I am concerned primarily with time and material payment bonds because it took three years to convince treasury board and senior government officials in certain government departments that this practice should be followed. I would appreciate receiving all the information the minister can give me in this regard.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure there will be other items in respect of which we will ask questions. I hope the minister will bring down the appropriate senior officials so that we will have the necessary information available at the time we are dealing with particular items. I think perhaps the minister will understand why we did not want him to deal with every branch on item No. 1 of his estimates. I am sure the minister will bring his officials of the various departments and crown corporations or agencies for which he is responsible, so that we may obtain information readily.

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, I value this opportunity of making a few brief comments about the operation of this very important department. The first spokesman for the official opposition made some reference to the usefulness of referring estimates of this type to an estimates committee. Since I have had the privilege of being here I have considered that estimates, certainly in the initial stages, could be considered much more effectively by various committees than by immediately commencing our consideration in this chamber in the committee of the whole. However, I must say that to have these estimates, this type in particular, studied by a blanket committee on estimates would not be the most effective way of considering them. If this is the type of procedure to be followed, and I hope we will arrive at this stage at some relatively early date, it should be changed so that estimates of various departments are referred to a committee comprised of members particularly interested in the specific topics to be considered.

I may also say in passing that I think note should be made of the fact that the previous government was not in a hurry to set up a committee on estimates to study the estimates. Certainly there was no such committee set up during the 1962 parliament, and, if I am not mistaken, no committee was created during the greater portion of the period in which the previous government was in office.

Mr. Chairman, I was pleased to hear the praise of the hon. member for Wellington South in respect of the Bladen report and formula. I find it curious, however, that the hon. member indicated the great degree of simplicity in this program, in view of the fact it apparently took the previous government some two years to do anything about it by way of implementation. I think I should point out briefly that the implementation of this formula was only in respect of transmissions, and the program was to last for only one year. It is to the credit of the Minister of Industry and the present government that the plan which has now been set up covers the whole range of automotive manufacturing and is to be in effect for a period of some three years, which is the period the industry itself believes is necessary before it will be possible to have a truly useful and beneficial effect on the economy of our country.

Mr. Chairman, I must say I was somewhat surprised to note also that spokesmen for the official opposition felt that secondary industry in this country had not yet reached the point where it merited as much attention from the federal government as the fields of agriculture, mining and forestry, all of which I will readily admit are very important to the economy of this country. Each of these fields has a separate department of the federal government to look after its interests. Each of these departments has several thousand employees and, in fact, in the case of the Department of Agriculture the number runs into tens of thousands. I would not think that a staff of 400 or 500 people is too large to help to look after the needs of secondary manufacturing in this country, a phase of our economic development which now encompasses the employment of some one million people. In fact, the latest edition of the Canada Year Book indicates that in 1960 it employed some 21 per cent of the labour force and was responsible for some 26 per cent of the gross national product.

Instead of criticizing what is really more or less a tentative beginning in bringing the attention of the federal government more fully to bear on this important segment of our economy, I think the opposition should have called for even greater attention by the federal government to this field of activity, an attention which can only be provided in a truly effective manner through a separate department and a separate minister. As I have said, Mr. Chairman, if the forest industry, the mining industry and agricultural industry are sufficiently important to require separate departments with separate ministers, surely the time has been reached when secondary manufacturing now plays such an important role that it must have a vital, effective department of the federal government to give it the proper attention it needs.

I think it should be noted that there has certainly been no real criticism from secondary manufacturing itself with regard to the fact that this vital department has been set up and is now operating. In fact, quite contrary is the case. The hon. member for Wellington South has suggested that for this vitally important segment of our economy employing some one million people an expenditure of $24 million is too large, but it should be noted that of this $24 million some $19 million is, to quote from the estimates, "to sustain technological capability in Canadian industry by supporting selected defence development programs". I hope the hon. member does not mean that the official opposition is opposed to this vital work of the federal government. In fact, this would apparently leave only $4½ million for the actual operation of the department itself and, with one million employed in secondary industry, this means in fact an expenditure of about $3 per employee. I must say I do not think that is too much for a phase of our economic activity that is so important to the country.

While some reference has been made to the attempt of the previous government to do something about areas of slow growth and chronic unemployment, without attempting to indulge in a detailed critique of these efforts at this point I think it should be recognized that the tentative steps they took in this regard were generally recognized as useless and ineffective by those directly concerned—the people in secondary manufacturing industries. I refer particularly to the very slight results from the double depreciation program. I think it must be reiterated that a very important feature of the present government's approach to dealing with areas of slow growth and chronic unemployment has been the creation of criteria which, though they may be subject to improvement, have been set up in a fair, open and equitable manner and may be applied in the same way in any area of our country.

I think it is quite well known, Mr. Chairman, that the area I represent has been included in this very important program, and I want to say at this time that as far as I am aware there has been no criticism of this program and the benefits which have flowed from it already from my community. On the contrary, there has already been not only a considerable degree of praise from the community but also of actual success in getting our community moving forward once again.

As an example of the interest of the local industrial and business community in this program, I would point to the very successful industrial development seminar which was held in Windsor at the end of March and which was attended by some 250 leaders of business, industry and the accounting and legal professions primarily from the Windsor area itself for the purpose of learning more about how the community of Windsor could take advantage of this very important program. It should be pointed out once again, as I have had the privilege of doing already in the house, that this seminar was carried on under the joint sponsorship of the Windsor chamber of commerce, the Windsor and district labour council, the Windsor industrial

commission and the greater Windsor foundation. It was a splendid example of the true spirit of co-operation that exists at the present time between all segments of the Windsor economic and industrial community.

It should be pointed out that to a great degree the expansions that have been announced and are under way in the Windsor area as a result of this very important and useful area development program have been undertaken by local firms. I think this helps to show the interest that can be generated in the areas concerned because of the new incentive program. I should like to bring to the attention of the committee one or two examples of what has happened since the program went into effect. I want to refer to one or two brief extracts from the Windsor *Daily Star*. On August 7 the Windsor *Star* had an article reading in part as follows:

> A prediction that construction in Windsor during 1964 will reach $20 million, an all time high, was made today by city building commissioner Patrick Maguire.

Another article which appeared on August 20, 1964, reads in part as follows:

> Windsor's building department is lagging about a week behind in processing building permits because of the unusually brisk pace of construction this year, Patrick Maguire, building commissioner, said today. The department issued permits worth $600,000 Wednesday. So far this year, more than $10 million worth of construction has been cleared through the building department and officials will not be surprised if this figure is doubled by the end of the year.

I must say that a large part of the building development has been in the form of commercial building, apartments, factory expansions and stores, all of which are eligible for the fast write-off of depreciation which the government has created as a part of its area development incentive program. I am sure the committee is also aware of the plant expansions that have been announced for the Windsor area since this program went into effect. One hon. member quoted from an interesting article in the *Financial Post* with reference to the new General Motors plant which will employ almost 2,000 people in the Windsor area. Other expansions have been announced. Just from memory I can recall the L. A. Young expansion, the Kelsey Wheel expansion, the International Tool expansion, and there are others as well, all of which came about only after this program was announced. While members of the official opposition may attempt to claim that this was perhaps due to some form of coincidence or to some type of program which they attempted to set up, I think it goes beyond mere coincidence or any efforts of the official opposition when we look at the fact that this prosperity, which exists in the Windsor area at this time, and which did not exist in any way whatsoever, unfortunately, because of the neglect of the previous government, came into effect only after the present government took office. The Department of Industry was established, the area development agency was established and the tax incentive program was established, and this program is already doing so much for my own community of Windsor.

Mr. Hales: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Gray: When I finish my remarks I would be happy to receive questions. There was some suggestion made by the hon. member for Timiskaming that we should have greater regard to approaches taken in other countries, when it comes to the location of industry. I think that at least in part he is making a very useful suggestion. However I would point out that in Sweden, so far as I have been able to determine, their emphasis is directed more on moving people to jobs than jobs to people. Their major emphasis is on mobility of labour, and so far as I have been able to determine there is very little in their program to encourage industries to move into areas of slow growth.

They have nothing similar to the English program of, in effect, making it necessary for firms to go into certain areas through the granting or withholding of building permits. That leads me to another point, to remind this committee that because England is a unitary state, with one parliament dealing with all aspects of national life, they are in a position to use methods with regard to the location of industry which, for constitutional reasons, would not appear to be available to the federal parliament.

The main activity of the English parliament in so far as making it necessary for firms to move from one area to another, or stay where they are, arises out of the fact that they have legislation which makes it possible to grant or withhold building permits, something which in Canada would appear to be under the jurisdiction of the provincial governments.

When we deal with this important subject we should be sure to take measures which are clearly within the competence of the federal parliament, so that if we do create plans to help industries to expand in certain areas and move into certain areas we will not create

programs which will lead only to complicated constitutional disputes, rather than to industrial expansion in areas of slow growth.

It should be clear from the measures already taken that the present government is interested in encouraging the location of industries in areas of slow growth and chronic unemployment that still may exist in this country. While it may be suggested that this type of measure might lead to some form of increased costs for individual firms, this must be balanced against the over-all economic cost to the entire country of having certain areas remain areas of slow growth with high welfare costs and high unemployment insurance costs under which many of these areas remain in their present state. If we balance the economic cost to the entire country against the cost of measures of this type, put into effect by this government, I think it will be readily seen that this is something which even from the sheer economic point of view is most necessary and valuable to the country.

I might point out, however, that the incentive approach, the tax incentive approach used so far by the government, is something which helps prevent uneconomic industry from going into areas of the country where it should not go because the use of the incentive measure means the individual firm itself makes the decision rather than the government and, second, for these measures to have the most beneficial effect it is necessary for the firms which locate in the areas in question ultimately to make some form of profit, which helps prevent firms which do not have a sound economic future from locating in areas of slow growth.

In conclusion, while this department has already made a most useful and constructive beginning, there is no question that there is more that can be done, and I want to mention one point briefly here. I am referring to the area of public relations. It would seem to me that the programs this department is administering at present, and is going to be called on to administer, depend for their success on having as many of the people in this country as possible know enough about them so that they will be able to take advantage of them, and of course the public generally needs full information about the operations of the programs of this department so that it can assess its value to the country.

It would seem to me that up to now the department to an unnecessary extent has kept its light under a bushel. I recognize this is because some of the programs it administers involve tax incentives and that there are requirements of secrecy in existing law. However I hope that in future the department will do more to encourage firms which qualify for the incentives to announce that they are taking advantage of them, or to get permission from these firms to make the announcements itself. As an alternative, in future, once the firms make the announcements, in a way that appears to a certain extent in that very interesting article in the *Financial Post* to which I referred, the department should take greater steps to spread this information throughout the country and put it in the hands of people in the business and financial communities who would be interested in it.

I must say that as yet, in spite of the good work that has been done, a lot more can be done in the area of public relations. I just mention one example. I do not think enough persons know as yet that if an area, because of improvement in economic conditions, because of improvement in employment, may leave a status where under the existing criteria it will be removed from the list of designated areas, the firms which qualify for the incentives, either the accelerated depreciation or the three year tax holiday, will be fully entitled to take advantage of these incentives for the full statutory period provided by law. There is no reason why such a community should really be concerned about at some time not being on the list of designated areas because, if that is the case, because of the specific criteria which have made it necessary to place that community on the list, it will mean there has been sufficient improvement in employment and economic conditions so that the community has now begun to catch up with other areas of the country and can stand on its own feet. This type of thing should be brought more fully to the attention of the business and financial communities, and to some of the areas that might be removed from the designated area list.

I hope that the Department of Industry will not be afraid to continue to take vigorous and effective steps, even more vigorous and effective steps, to assess the development of secondary industry in the country. There has been a negative type of criticism of the department in this chamber today, but I think that generally the secondary manufacturing segment of our economy and the people employed in it will welcome and support measures taken by the government and the department to continue to strengthen secondary manufacturing, and thereby take very

important steps to maintain and increase employment and production in this country.

Mr. Hales: Would the hon. member not agree that the institution of the Bladen commission's report by the Conservative government did more to help the employment picture in Windsor than any other single factor?

Mr. Gray: If the previous Conservative government had actually instituted the Bladen report I would agree with the hon. member. Unfortunately, that government did not have either the courage, or the interest in the Windsor community, to do so. After two years of continuous pressure by my hon. friend from Essex East, to which I added my own voice when I had the privilege of being elected to this house in June, 1962—

An hon. Member: Another speech?

Mr. Gray: I am answering the hon. member's question. Perhaps he wishes now that he had not asked it. What happened was this. In effect, the Conservative government brought forth a small mouse, a very limited application of the Bladen principles only with regard to automatic transmissions. It was a program which was to last only one year, and representatives of industry said it was not long enough to do anything meaningful for the automobile industry in Canada. The development to which the hon. member referred began only after the present government brought in a plan which reflected the Bladen principles, and applied them to the entire range of automotive manufacturing over a term of three years so that industry could really take advantage of the situation.

Mr. Hales: But would the hon. member not agree that the Bladen report was instituted in 1962 and that it took effect on engines and transmission parts?

Mr. Gray: I will agree that there was an implementation of the report only to cover automotive transmissions and parts. It should be to the eternal shame of the Conservative government and its supporters that it took them two years to do that, when they should have applied the principles of the report to the whole field as soon as it came out.

Mr. Stenson: I think the department whose estimates we are now considering is one of the most important departments to come before us. I am sorry there are not more members present on the government side of the house to give the minister their support. There are six of them in the chamber. That is how interested they are. Even the whip is not here.

With regard to these estimates, may I say I am at a loss to understand how this department can operate efficiently, spending the amount of money it does, and how it has aided industry in this country, or will aid it. The minister, like the hon. member who preceded me in this debate, the hon. member for Essex West, spoke about our flourishing economy. That, Mr. Chairman, is a direct result of good legislation and planning by the former government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stenson: I should like to ask the hon. member for Essex West if he considers the devalued dollar of any help to Windsor?

Mr. Gray: Would you like me to deal with it now?

An hon. Member: He opposed it.

Mr. Stenson: Some time ago I asked the minister if his staff would be drawn from the Department of Trade and Commerce and the Department of Defence Production and he assured me this would be the case. Yet the estimates of the Department of Trade and Commerce have increased by approximately $9 million this year. The Department of Industry itself has a budget of $24 million, and if we look at the estimates of the Department of Defence Production, we find they have only decreased by the amount of $1,857,000. So we can presume that this new department is costing the country, taking into account the increase in the estimates of the Department of Trade and Commerce, a total of $31,200,000. It is most interesting to note this increase. I know many people in the country must be wondering what the government is doing with this money. Certainly industry is wondering what assistance it is getting from the department.

The hon. member for Essex West referred to this increase. I should like to call to his attention the fact that the work of the department under consideration was formerly covered by the defence department and by the Department of Trade and Commerce. So I consider there has been a direct increase of $31,200,000. The Canadian Manufacturers' Association is extremely unhappy about the tax which has been placed on production machinery. Governments often blame the mounting tax burden on the demands made by electors. But this was not the case when the Department of Industry was set up. The

people did not demand it, neither did industry demand it. I feel it is an attempt by the government and the civil service to hinder free enterprise in industry. So far, I feel, it is a dictatorship imposed on industry, and that it is not at all necessary in this country.

The scheme to set up factories in designated areas has been a failure. In directing industries to cities such as Windsor and Brantford, discontent has resulted throughout the rest of the province of Ontario. The concessions granted to industries in designated areas are questionable. How much assistance will they be to them? New industries starting in any locality usually find their profits fairly small in the first two or three years.

In answer to a question I put on the order paper regarding industries operating in designated areas, I was told that there were seven or eight industries in production and of these not one had yet received financial aid. It will be interesting to see just how much they do receive over the next two or three years. The Department of Industry with this legislation has left a bad taste in the mouths of industrial promoters, municipal councils and provinces which have worked hard to promote industry in their own localities. Here again we find municipal governments and provinces being dictated to by a department here in Ottawa.

I should like the Minister of Industry to explain to the house what his department is doing in regard to research facilities in industry. What industries are receiving aid? How many men are working on an examination of imported items not manufactured in Canada? Is there a branch set up to advise industry regarding the manufacture of such products? I wonder how many industries would take advantage of these facilities if they were available. I think that many Canadian industries have these facilities in their own plants at the present time?

Another question I should like to ask the Minister of Industry is this: Has his department made any studies regarding the decentralization of industry, that is, the bringing of industries from centres of large population to smaller centres? Two or three weeks ago, a Toronto firm announced that it was moving its Port Hope operation to Toronto. Did the department consult this firm and try to have them stay in Port Hope? The same thing has happened in my constituency.

With regard to foreign ownership, I feel direct interference by the federal government in this situation is a negative approach. United States firms and others are primarily responsible for the great industrial advance which has taken place in Canada. United States companies have set up plants in Canada and have trained many Canadians in their skills and techniques. It has not occurred to many Canadians that we are being presented with golden opportunities to learn the tricks of these trades that are being brought into Canada so we can gradually use them in the development of Canadian owned industry.

Correction of this situation must of necessity be a long range project. Encouragement should be given to every Canadian firm that can muster the resources to get started, so they can prove they have the required skill and fortitude. This should be in the form of relief from taxes, until they are well established, and the best equipment should be made available to them at the lowest cost; financing should be made available on reasonable terms and in amounts proportionate to the progress that they make with the resources available.

I consider the further development of secondary industry to be of prime importance to the future economic welfare of Canada. A high level of activity in the primary industries of Canada, such as mining, pulp and paper, agriculture, and so on, with their correspondingly high level of exports is excellent for Canada's financial stability; but these industries do not provide jobs in proportion to the dollar value of their output. Secondary manufacturing industry is the major provider of jobs.

To encourage the development of secondary manufacturing I suggest the government start by removing the most detrimental forms of taxation. At the moment I would class the sales tax on production equipment as the worst, not because of the actual tax rates but because of the complexity and uncertainty it introduces into the operation of this industry. It is my opinion that increased export of manufactured goods is necessary for the expansion of our secondary manufacturing industries. Canada must import large amounts of industrial equipment and other items, the manufacture of which cannot be sustained on Canadian volume alone. To balance this it is imperative that we manufacture many items on a high volume basis so that we can successfully export, and in so doing can easily compete in the home market. In this way we could supply the Canadian market at a much lower price than when these items were imported.

I spoke in the house regarding the Fisher Gauge Company and I warned the government that if this tax on production machinery was retained, this company would be forced to move part of their manufacturing plant to the state of New York in the United States. The other day in the house the Minister of Finance made the statement that this move was prompted because of the high excise tax on their products going into the United States. I have here a letter that the president of this firm wrote to the Minister of Finance and I would like to read parts of it into the record. It is addressed to Hon. Walter L. Gordon:

> Your recent statement in the House of Commons that our firm was establishing a plant in the United States because of the U.S. customs tariffs and not because of the Canadian sales tax came as a surprise in view of the effort that we have made to advise the government of the effects of this tax on firms such as ours.
>
> I wish to state emphatically that our establishment of production facilities in the state of New York is primarily because of the detrimental effects of the Canadian sales tax on production in Canada. The U.S. customs tariffs and other factors are secondary considerations. The present tax situation will permit us to continue the manufacture of machines and tools in Canada, providing that they are not used to turn out products in this country. If you can spare a few minutes of your extremely valuable time to read further, I will explain why this is so.

He goes on for several more paragraphs, but I am just going to read the last three:

> The regulations require that tax must be paid if a tool is used to produce an article in Canada, whether the article is exported or not. However, if we move the tool across the border and use U.S. labour and material, we will be exempt from the tax and spared the headaches of its administration.
>
> We have recently built a tool costing many thousands of dollars. After producing and exporting less than one hundred dollars worth of castings from it, a design change made retooling necessary. Nevertheless, because this tool was used "for production" in Canada, the tax must be paid, being a direct loss to us.
>
> I am sure that you will see that this intolerable situation left us with no alternative but to set up production facilities outside Canada.

This is just one industry. How many others are affected and will be taking the same steps? As the Minister of Industry knows, our industries in Canada are British or American owned in a good many cases. This tax will affect their Canadian plants in the same way, and it is a serious threat to their economy in this country. However, these industries have a choice. If the manufacturing conditions are not healthy in Canada, they can switch to their United States or British plants. That is what this Canadian industry had to do, namely move to the United States. I believe that the United States plants will not use our plants in Canada to manufacture their goods, but will use their own plants and import their products into this country instead of having them manufactured here.

Cannot the Minister of Industry see what is already happening across the country? Not only is the Fisher Gauge, a Canadian company, moving, but in the Peterborough *Examiner* recently there was an announcement that Canadian General Electric would move into the European field. The vice president and general manager of the Peterborough plant has often spoken of the keen competition from overseas suppliers, and any added taxes on production increases the threat of losing these markets. This type of legislation on production machinery is just one of these added costs.

When other countries are going ahead industrial-wise, are we going to sit back and put up with a government that puts up roadblocks and hangs millstones around the necks of our industries? The other day in the house the minister announced the construction of a new atomic energy power plant in which Ontario hydro, the Ontario government and the federal government are taking part. Everyone seemed happy to hear this announcement. However, Mr. Chairman, I feel that private industry should have been given a chance to bid on this contract. I know that Ontario hydro could have received a fixed price in regard to this nuclear power station. The estimated cost of the station is $266 million. That is just an estimate and we do not know how much more it will cost. It will probably run over that amount, rather than under it.

I should like to ask the minister how long this government is going to subsidize Atomic Energy of Canada Limited while ignoring private industry, with the facilities it has set up to carry out this work? I am referring to Canadian General Electric, who I am sure would have been interested in making a firm bid on this type of station. The Department of Industry should take a look at this matter.

I feel that private industry could have built this nuclear electric power station at a fixed price and completed the work for less money and in less time than Atomic Energy of Canada. Private industry cannot be encouraged to develop if government controlled industries are given these contracts without fixing a set price and are subsidized by the Canadian taxpayer. Just last Wednesday the United States government released to private enterprise whole atomic material which will create a full-fledged private nuclear industry without federal competition.

I think Atomic Energy of Canada should get out of the field of building nuclear power plants and leave it to private industry.

The Chairman: Shall the item carry?

Mr. Hales: Mr. Chairman, in order that we might have some orderly arrangement I was wondering whether the minister would like to make some report to the committee on these two departments, industry and defence production, before we get into the many other items which he may wish to speak on or introduce.

Mr. Drury: Mr. Chairman, I was going to wait until all the questions had been asked in general speeches before endeavouring to answer.

Mr. Hales: On these two departments?

Mr. Drury: Yes, on the two departments. A question was raised here about Atomic Energy of Canada Limited on which I have not yet made a statement. I understand the desire is that we should proceed with just the two departments at the moment.

Mr. Lambert: Yes, just the two.

Mr. Drury: Are there any more questions to be asked about the departments of industry and defence production, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Doucett: Mr. Chairman, may I say I fully realize the problems that the minister has with a department such as this, but it has been said by other hon. members that his department has developed very rapidly by way of taking on a very large staff. Some 248 employees have been taken on during the last few months at a cost of some $3,614,000. This is a fairly large amount of money for such a new department to be spending in so short a time, and an envisaged expenditure for this year of over $24 million seems to indicate that the expenses are mounting up.

This is probably the way in which many new departments have developed into a size which probably is far beyond immediate demands. If we look over some of the information he has given us we find that 105 persons have been employed at a salary of over $8,000 a year. There are 142 employees receiving salaries below that figure. I am wondering whether his department within a few months of its organization needs a staff of that size, involving this huge expenditure. What are these men doing? The department has only one office outside the city of Ottawa. Do the rest of the employees travel throughout the Dominion of Canada? We got along in Canada for many years without such a department, and now within a few months we find this huge army of employees and a contemplated expenditure of several million dollars. This seems to indicate a little more than the normal growth which should take place within so short a time.

I do not think we should be empire building when there are so many other urgent matters of importance to consider. If it can be proven that this is going to develop the economy of Canada, produce markets in the world and add to the industries of our country, then that is a different matter, of course. However, I just wanted to bring this matter to the attention of the minister and to say that the expenditure and size of the department seems out of all proportion to the time it has been in operation.

Mr. Stenson: Mr. Chairman, when I referred to Atomic Energy of Canada Limited I felt it tied in so closely with industry, on which the minister made a statement, that it was appropriate to mention it. That is why I hope he will have something to say, after he makes his statement on atomic energy.

Mr. Cantelon: Mr. Chairman, from what we have heard so far in the comments from this side of the house, it is quite obvious that there is a question in the minds of many of us whether this new Department of Industry is actually going to be able to justify its added cost to the government. I think the question is: Will it add more to the national economy of Canada than it costs the taxpayer? I know very well the government and the minister feels that it will indeed do this. I hope he can justify this feeling, and I wish him every success in his attempts to do so, but I think he should realize that this is a question which will crop up certainly with a great deal more force next year when we have more figures on which to base our opinions.

Nevertheless I do feel the costs are excessive. One of the preceding speakers thought there were something like 105 executive personnel involved. My figures are a little larger than his; my count is 125 executive personnel. I estimate—and this is all I can do, of course, because I do not know exactly how much each individual is being paid—that on the average the cost will run somewhere between $1.5 to $2 million for executive personnel alone. The minister pointed out that he already had 290 officers—I do not think he means just executive personnel—which represents 45 per cent of the total strength. So indeed we have a case of empire building once more. I think it would be well for him

to realize that this government is being tagged with the accusation that it is enlarging the civil service establishment at a tremendous rate; and undoubtedly the minister will hear more of this. Therefore I hope he can justify the expenditure he is incurring through the establishment of his new Department of Industry.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a few words about the policy of designated areas. I think we all understand that the purpose of placing some areas in a designated category is to rehabilitate these declining areas. I wonder whether the present method followed is the most economically feasible one. I understand that Sweden is following an entirely different procedure, moving the people to places where industry can and will operate most efficiently. I feel that is the proper procedure to follow, and I am sure if assistance can be provided to people in moving from one area to another, many will do so, although others may have very strong roots and prefer to remain. I am sure the vast majority could be persuaded to move to areas where development of industry is logical. I do not think the method followed by this government is a particularly efficient or economical way of carrying out a good idea.

In this country we will certainly face a great deal of development within a relatively short number of years. Many areas are close to markets, and have other advantages, such as the ready supply of fuel. The area from which I come has an immediate supply of gas, oil, salt, and also potash which is becoming very important to our economy. I am sure potash will become more important to our economy within the next two decades. I hope the existence of potash in my area will encourage the development of a chemical industry there, just as was the case in Germany. I think that modern industrialized Germany owes a great deal to the development of the potash industry there. I think a similar development could take place at other points in the west where these potash deposits are located. I am very happy to say that the government of Saskatchewan did not approve a plan to build a pipe line to carry the potash to Chicago. I hope that government never does approve of such a plan, because if such a pipe line were built, neither the federal government nor any other government would be able to develop that industry in this country as it should be developed.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that we should allow the economic forces to work a little more than we have allowed them to work. In this connection I should perhaps mention the heavy water plant industry. As a result of a recent visit, I appreciate the needs of the maritime provinces, and I think everything we can do should be done to develop industry there. Nevertheless, having regard to where heavy water plants could be developed economically, considering the enormous quantities of coal which can be obtained very cheaply by strip mining in Saskatchewan, I think it would have been more economical to have constructed that plant there.

With those few comments, Mr. Chairman, I should like to conclude by again emphasizing that I feel the designated area policy is good, but should not be used to prevent industry from locating in areas where they would be closer to the source of supply of raw materials and can operate more economically. Second, I would warn the minister that in future he is going to have to answer the question as to whether the Department of Industry actually warrants the expenditures now required.

Mr. Danforth: Mr. Chairman, I had thought the hon. member for Essex West, having taken part in this debate, would have covered the several things I intended to say, and thereby obviate the necessity of my getting to my feet. That hon. member represents a riding adjacent to my own, and is interested in industrial problems which are similar to those experienced in my area. However, sir, when he spent three quarters of his time on a partisan, political theme, and the rest congratulating his own government and this department, he left a great deal to be brought to the attention of the Minister of Industry.

The hon. member pointed out in no uncertain terms, and I agree with him, that there is a tremendous increase in building and expansion of industry in the particular area to which I have referred, although not nearly as much as we had hoped. Perhaps I may dare to suggest that this expansion, in spite of the hon. member's claim, was partially occasioned by the government's pegging the dollar at 92 cents, which encouraged business to take advantage of the then existing situation, before taxes were increased. That fact had as much to do with the industrial activity that has taken place as anything else.

Having made those remarks, Mr. Chairman, I should like to bring two specific problems to the attention of the minister. I hope in his reply this afternoon he will give consideration and answers to both problems. I am sure his

department is well aware of the first one, and I assure the minister that we know he is following the proceedings with a great deal of interest. The automobile industry is very much concerned about the attitude of the treasury department of the United States in respect of tariffs on the importation of Canadian parts into the United States. I wonder whether the minister could make a statement this afternoon which would allay the feelings of deep concern on the part of the officials of the automobile industry in respect of this very serious problem? I understand the secretary of the treasury in the United States is taking this situation under very active consideration. Any statement the minister could make this afternoon in this regard I am sure would be welcomed by the entire industry.

The second point I should like to bring to the attention of the minister is one which I brought to the attention of the house on an earlier occasion. I should like to ask the minister whether he or the officials of his department have taken cognizance of the differentiation on freight rates in the entire area of southwestern Ontario, and the great discrepancy in transport costs east and west. May I assure the minister that it is the concern and the opinion of various chambers of commerce and leaders of industry in that particular area that if something can be done to equalize transportation costs east and west this would go a long way towards encouraging not only expansion of present industry in that area, but would encourage new industry to locate there. Certainly when there is such a differentiation in rates it works a direct hardship on industry in the particular area, and does encourage industry to move further east.

I should like to ask the minister whether he or his departmental officials have taken this fact into consideration and, if not, whether he will assure us that he will consider the problem and intercede with the Minister of Transport on behalf of local industry? I have brought the situation to the attention of the Minister of Transport, but it is my opinion that to date nothing has been done about it in a concrete way. I am concerned about this situation, as are the officials of industry there, and I am sure that concrete steps taken to alleviate this situation would do much not only to help the major industries located there but also subcontractors. No doubt major industry is in a position to arbitrate rates that are beneficial to them, because of the tremendous amount of freight they are moving, and thereby can circumvent this differentiation to some extent. That does not assist small industry in my area. Quite to the contrary, small industry is penalized by the additional cost of moving freight and their lack of ability to negotiate equal relief in this area.

Mr. Minister, I hope in the course of your reply this afternoon you will be able to comment briefly in respect of these two particular problems facing industry in our area. I refer to the uneasiness of the automobile industry and parts suppliers because of the latest tariff development, and the manner in which transportation costs are creating definite hardships for industry in southwestern Ontario.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Chairman, coming as I do from an area in Quebec which is considered to be one of the main industrial centres, I could not very well refrain from making a few comments concerning the Department of Industry.

First, I should like to inform the minister that St. Hyacinthe and the surrounding area have the most stable and qualified labour force one could find anywhere. I also wish to ask him to use his influence, while reminding him that, if ever he is short of a place to direct new industries, the city of St. Hyacinthe will always be the ideal location for them. Indeed, he could guarantee those companies making representations to that effect the same success now being achieved by industry already established there.

At this point, I wish to call the attention of the minister on a report published in *Le Devoir* of August 3, 1964 by Mr. Jean Pierre Fournier. It seems that Mr. Fournier agrees with several members that the new Department of Industry has not brought the results that people were entitled to expect. In fact, if the results obtained up to the present are compared with the estimates of the department, it is realized that the little relief the Department of Industry may have brought cost a lot to the Canadian taxpayers.

Mr. Fournier's article is entitled:

The designated areas: a failure?

Here is what it says:

The limited information given to the House of Commons by the Minister of Industry, Mr. Charles Drury, about ten days ago, shows in a convincing way the futility of the federal policy of fiscal discrimination designed to favour industrial development in economically depressed areas.

Although that policy has been in effect for about a year, only nine firms have already advised the

government of their intention of establishing plants which will give jobs to a total of 1,265 workers in all the areas eligible for tax incentives. Out of those nine plants, three will be established in the province of Quebec and will provide jobs for a total of 87 men;

Mr. Chairman, we were certainly entitled to expect much more than what the Department of Industry is presenting today, a year after it was set up.

I cannot help but remind the minister that during the election campaign of 1963, according to a pamphlet I have here, the Liberal party promised to create 250,000 jobs a year in order to meet the needs of the increasing population. Now I wish to remind the minister that the needs felt during the election campaign are more urgent now, and the people clamour for new jobs in order to earn a livelihood.

A quick look at the information contained in the estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1965, will show that 301 new employees have been recruited to provide the staff of that new department. Looking at the salaries paid, we find that the minister was rather generous for those who were fortunate enough to be employed in that new department.

It seems to me that we could very well come to the conclusion that the minister is building up what could be called a patronage empire. I would like to draw the attention of the minister to the fact that that is not what the people are expecting, quite the contrary; they are expecting the Minister of Industry to do his part in carrying out the various programs promised during the last election campaign to promote employment in Canada.

That department has been in operation for a year already. I feel it is high time it should do something.

Just think, Mr. Chairman, that only nine industries have shown any intention of establishing new plants. Incidentally, that does not mean nine new industries; they are nine companies which have expressed interest in that measure.

Just think also that those industries would create only 87 new jobs.

Therefore, you would be justified to conclude with Mr. Jean Pierre Fournier that this new department is a complete failure.

Since it is recognized that the minister has a great number of job-creating ideas, I take this opportunity to ask him to implement some every day of the week; I suggest to him also to ask his officials to make extraordinary efforts so that Canada, and the province of Quebec in particular, will get the industries they urgently need.

In addition, I should like the minister to tell us in which Quebec communities the new industries will be established and whether they will be located only in designated depressed areas.

When I have that information, I will probably have other questions for him.

[*Text*]

Mr. Rynard: Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to say a few words. Most of what I intended to say has been fairly well covered, but I should like to say to the minister that I do not believe the yardstick used in assessing depressed areas is a good one. I do not believe it is as broad as it should be. I do not think that unemployment, summer or winter, is a complete indication of the situation. I think you also have to know certain other facts. I think you have to know why the area is depressed. Why is there a blight on industry? What caused it? I think we must also know certain other things such as what preparations have been made in the field of sanitation. What about water pollution? What about sewage facilities? Is the water supply adequate? I think you also have to consider transportation. Right at the present moment there is one industry moving out of a town in my area, and one of the reasons given is the high cost of transportation. I do not believe that the minister can do a good job without assessing all those facts.

I do not see any point in going into a so-called depressed area and building it up, erecting schools, churches and facilities, only to find out that it still has the disease that caused the problem, with the result that at the end of a period of 10 or 15 years the facilities constructed in school and hospital housing and which cost millions of dollars, are not being used.

I wonder whether the minister has taken a long look at some of the smaller industries that do not seem to be able to get the help they should get from the government. They are not getting the direction they should receive. This is a very important factor in decentralizing industry and getting employment out of the huge city areas.

I want to speak to the minister on another matter which I brought to his attention previously, namely the taxing of certain parts of a machine. I brought a specific instance to his attention where a manufacturer was producing a machine but one part of the machine could not be purchased in Canada.

Nobody would offer to make it at a price which would make the complete machine competitive. For that reason I believe this is a part that should be allowed to come in tax free, and I look to the department and the minister to do something about this matter.

Another matter I wish to draw to his attention is something else I have also discussed with him previously, the question of some machines which in some instances are tax free and in other instances are not. I have a good example of this concerning people right across the street from each other in a manufacturing area. One of the firms buys a machine and pays 11 per cent tax on it, while the other company buys a machine and does not pay any tax. This matter was brought before the department and the officials said they could not do much about it. Surely these companies are creating work, and if a machine is free in one particular case it should be free in the other. I have reference to the Mosley giant shear, where one company buys a similar machine tax free and the other does not. It is used to cut scrap iron into sizes suitable for melting. I hope the minister will look into this or have the Department of National Revenue look into it to see that these inequalities are removed.

If you are going to set up industry and build an empire, you don't want a lot of impediments on the wheel. This is what the minister is operating with today, and I think he is operating the same way in choosing depressed areas. I do not think his officials have taken public health and associated problems into consideration, and I believe the Canadian taxpayer deserves a better deal than that.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Frenette: Mr. Chairman, I shall take only a few minutes of the time of the house to make some observations concerning the estimates of the Department of Industry, because several of my colleagues probably also wish to get some information from the minister.

I listened with tremendous interest to the statement read by the Minister of Industry, at the beginning of the discussion on his estimates, on the situation prevailing in that field in Canada.

I congratulate him for his enthusiasm while he read his statement, giving us a description which I hope is on a par with the situation as regards industry.

[Mr. Rynard.]

Listening to him, it seems that everything is fine and dandy, that our economic situation is particularly brilliant, that the industrial growth is progressing, in brief, that we are now in the midst of an unprecedented wave of prosperity. At one time, we could have thought we were in an advertising agency to promote immigration to Canada.

However, I noted the information given to the house by the minister. It goes without saying that it is only a summary report of the activities of the department during the year, but on the other hand, that report suggested that there is some hope and that we can expect a substantial improvement in the industrial picture and, therefore, in the field of employment also.

Contrary to the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Bagot (Mr. Ricard) who seemed to reproach the minister for not appointing several new officials to ensure the orderly administration of his department, instead of blaming him, I must commend him for it, because the minister seems well disposed and willing to face up to the responsibilities entrusted to him when he accepted to be Minister of Industry or when the department was set up.

The hon. member even mentioned that he found the salaries high. I disagree with him once again, because I feel that if officials of that department are well paid, they obviously deserve even more. I put all the more trust in their competence if they are well paid. Since they decided to leave private enterprise to serve the government of Canada, it follows logically, it seems to me, that they have decided to forgo promotions which they might have expected if they had remained in private industry and that leads us to expect a noticeable improvement in that respect.

However, there is a particular point on which I want to dwell longer. Other hon. members did it before me but I feel obliged to add some remarks of my own, especially with regard to the designation of surplus manpower areas.

It goes without saying that the designation of these areas is far from being perfect. I readily understand the method used by the Department of Industry, in co-operation with the Department of Labour, to look after the designation of these areas.

I could appreciate that the most accurate data available had to be used as a base for the designation of these areas. However, the practice is now approved and subject to improvement.

Once again, and I am perhaps optimistic, but I place confidence once again in the minister and his officials in the matter of reviewing the designation of certain areas, taking into consideration factors which came to their knowledge since this designation.

First, it must be taken into account that the statistical data of the various offices of the national employment service do not necessarily reflect the unemployment situation in a given area. There are surely particular needs in certain areas served by employment offices sometimes located in cities which are quite remote from the affected areas.

May I at this time, Mr. Chairman, make special reference to the Portneuf area which, in my opinion, suffers from the fact that it is located between Quebec and Three Rivers, which are relatively far from certain centres of the Portneuf area.

Inasmuch as the needs of Three Rivers as well as those of Quebec city and Shawinigan, are not the same as those of the Portneuf area, the citizens of the Portneuf area are at a grave disadvantage.

Therefore, I think that the department ought to make a more detailed analysis of the statistics issued by the various employment offices in order to review the designated areas which may benefit from certain tax incentives that are now put into force.

Consideration should also be given, in designating those areas, to the economic situation which exists there. The people's wish to use all available natural resources should also be taken into consideration.

I appreciate the fact that it is hard to come by a solution and that this rather abstract problem is a headache for the officials who are entrusted with the designation of the labour surplus areas. The situation is so serious that departmental officials should be strongly encouraged to look deeper into the causes of unemployment in order to find the remedies which could be applicable in certain areas in particular.

I was pleased to hear the minister state, a while ago, that designated areas will not necessarily remain so for an indefinite number of years, but that their status may be revised from time to time.

Then, when he has an opportunity to reply to the questions put to him would the minister mention the new criteria to be used to designate these labour surplus areas? On what basis will such areas now be designated? What will be the standards and the criteria used to designate such areas?

Again, may I insist on the fact that some areas, like that of Portneuf, are located between urban centres and are consequently far from the unemployment insurance office where workers go to register; consequently, statistics do not show the real situation as concerns unemployment.

This is a new department, and it goes without saying that the minister is quite willing to accept any suggestion made to him. We must not only seek long term solutions to the serious unemployment problem which prevails more particularly in eastern Canada, but also try to find immediate solutions to such problems. Mind you, I quite agree that the department should seek to develop a vast program to check unemployment, but I am also of the opinion that more immediate solutions should be sought to cope with this problem which unfortunately has prevailed for a long time.

While we are dealing with suggestions, I would also like to urge the minister and his officials to study also the progress made in the field of automation. The serious problem of automation is increasing so rapidly that even industrial promotion does not create enough new jobs to fight unemployment. Therefore, something new will have to be found, something more cogent and efficient.

The hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Bagot (Mr. Ricard) made a remark earlier today which seemed rather whimsical. He said to the minister, that, if he was still trying to place an industry, the county of St. Hyacinthe-Bagot would be happy to receive it. I shall go one better than the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Bagot. In the district of Portneuf, we do not expect to get the dregs and wait till the minister is in a plight, but we cordially invite him to promote the establishment of industries in our area, because it is easy to find qualified labour there, and we also have easy access to a road and waterway system as well as other advantages which certainly deserve to be considered by some industries.

The minister has given us some information with regard to the possible establishment here of a French automotive industry. Now, we hope that the minister will do his utmost to insure the success of that project, that he will work diligently towards this aim, and make every effort to have this industry set up in the area most likely to promote the growth of that French industry.

May I suggest to the hon. minister an ideal site for that industry. As a matter of fact, Portneuf is an ideal industrial site. In

addition to highway and railway services, it offers a deep-water wharf built nearly ten years ago at a cost, to the federal government, of $4 million and which, in spite of everything, is still unused.

Once again, Mr. Chairman, for the minister's information, I should like to give certain specific details about this deep-water wharf, located in Portneuf, which has yet to be used. At low tide, it is 37 feet high, which means that 10,000-ton ships and, needless to say, smaller ones, can berth there easily and quite safely. That is a priceless advantage and one which is readily available. It can accommodate ocean-going vessels as well as coasting ships. An industrialist can ship his products directly throughout the world without going through other ports and even receive raw material from Europe or from any other country.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to make this small contribution during this study of the estimates of the Department of Industry. I know that the minister is well disposed; on the other hand, I realize that the means at his disposal are very limited. I trust him all the more, however, because he seems willing to surround himself with able officials who are determined to carry out their responsibilities.

In conclusion, I hope that the minister will see to it that new criteria are established for the designation of areas with surplus manpower and that with the help of his officials, he will succeed in finding a more realistic formula likely to relieve unemployment in eastern Canada and more particularly in the province of Quebec.

[*Text*]

Mr. Pascoe: Mr. Chairman, I have here a Department of Industry press release regarding the appointment of R. H. Dorrett as regional officer, area development agency, assigned to the western provinces. Mr. Dorrett was industrial commissioner for the city of Regina, part of which I represent in parliament. He was a fine industrial commissioner and I find no fault with his appointment by the Department of Industry. Perhaps the minister has already explained just what is involved in the position of regional officer, area development agency. If he has, I will be able to read it in *Hansard*. I am interested to know just how much attention the Department of Industry is paying to industrial development in the west, particularly in Saskatchewan; how Mr. Dorrett fits in with this development, and how he can help it to expand.

[Mr. Frenette.]

The hon. member for Kindersley mentioned potash mining in Saskatchewan. There is considerable development in this respect in my constituency of Moose Jaw-Lake Centre. In the area around Moose Jaw potash development has taken the form of solution mining instead of the regular shaft mining. Can the minister tell the committee whether there are any tax arrangements or other assistance which apply to shaft mining but do not apply to solution mining; and if there are, will he take steps to remedy this situation?

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Chairman, before the minister answers the various questions that have been asked, and before any other hon. members speak, I wish to say a few words in connection with the Department of Defence Production. Really the comments made and questions asked today have not come to what I think is the root of this department, and that is the question of its reorganization and the work it is doing.

I believe this department is one of the hangovers from the days of the second world war, and to the average person, the person on the street, and to a good many members there seems to be no real reason for its existence. We do know that there is a certain amount of stand-by equipment to be maintained—I refer to defence production equipment—and that certain stationary requirements and duties have gone into this department; but there has never been, certainly since I have been here, and that is a little over seven years, any detailed inquiry by the house or by a committee of the house into the actual work that the Department of Defence Production is doing, or what it is accomplishing on behalf of the people of Canada. We have skirted around the question today and I would like to ask the minister a few direct questions, if I may.

The first item, Mr. Chairman, is this. If the name "defence production" is now a misnomer, is consideration being given to renaming the department so as to give it a name that has some relation to the duties it is performing? If it is not a misnomer, then what is the department producing? As far as I can gather, nothing is actually being produced by the department and the production is done merely under the direction of the department and not by the department itself.

I think a case has been made out today for a complete examination of the work of the Department of Defence Production. It was the subject of an examination by at least one commission and we expected there would

be some reduction in the number of personnel, some reduction in the expenditures, and an effort to bring under control what seems to me and to many others to be a colossus of administrative effort, with insufficient productive capacity and result.

I should like the minister to advise us whether there is any intention of reducing, cutting back, to the capacity of the department the personnel it employs. I notice, for example, that while, as has already been pointed out, a number of people from defence production were expected to be moved into the Department of Industry, this is certainly not shown in the estimates of the department, under the two sections of vote No. 1. Whereas last year, 1963-64, a total of 1,887 people were employed, for the upcoming year the number is 2,194. That is an increase in personnel of 300, in a department which has been questioned as to its usefulness for the job it was originally set up to do. I would like to know why there is an increase in personnel. At first I thought perhaps it was the addition of the directorate of printing; but I find they are separately detailed in the estimates. I can see no direct reason why there should be this increase of 300 personnel in the department.

It is not unusual for a member to be speaking about something of which he has not full knowledge. I admit that in my case. I will state, though, that on many occasions I have made the effort to find out what the department is doing, and in most cases have been unsuccessful. I believe the need for a referral of the estimates or the operations of the department to a parliamentary committee has been established. I would hope the minister would take some opportunity of doing so—not just explaining to us here this afternoon the reason for the increase. I think the whole scope of operation of this department is due for a re-examination. I have not any doubt in the world that everybody in the department is doing a job and the best job they can. This is not the point of my argument. If the department is not doing the job for which it was originally set up, if it is not so required, and if it is not given other duties, then an effort should be made to transfer people to the Department of Industry or other departments. I thought this was the place where this could have been done.

However, Mr. Chairman, unless I misread the estimates of this department and the estimates of the Department of Industry, there has been very little transfer; in fact, there has been an increase of 300 personnel in one department and over 200 in the other. I congratulate the minister for managing to put himself at the head of such a tremendous administrative machine. I merely ask him, what is it doing?

Mr. Pugh: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say just a few words with regard to some remarks made by the minister this morning, namely with regard to the setting up of a group of experts to further our talks under GATT. I would like to sound a word of warning to the minister at this time. I feel a great deal of harm can be done to allied industries in Canada. I am now talking of various import quotas for farmers and people who grow fruit and vegetables. I hope that when the minister and his group are furthering their talks with GATT the experts will take time off to go over very carefully with the Minister of Agriculture the effect of any reductions in specific duties.

My reason for saying that is this. Let me give two specific instances. If you look at the duty on fruits and vegetables over a period of years you will see the impact of GATT when it first came into effect. If you go back to the early thirties you will find that up until 1935, quite marked specific duties existed on certain soft fruits and vegetables throughout Canada. From that time on there took place a watering down. I do not want to be political about this, but it occurred under a Liberal administration. Then when GATT came into existence Canadian producers were put in a rather invidious position simply because of large exports to this country from the United States of fruits and vegetables.

Then from 1957 on there was quite a change, in that the government of the day saw fit to increase the duties. For example, duties were increased on certain soft fruits and vegetables such as asparagus and onions, which are grown in my area. Potato quotas were made more workable and as a result Canadian farmers were put in a much better position. In other words, this was done to stop this flood of United States imports.

I should like to be sure that the minister understands that it is all very well talking about industry on a large scale, but if you make any changes in GATT, either to lower tariffs because of markets elsewhere or to get into other countries' markets, it should not be done at the expense of the farmer. He is in an extraordinarily poor position if he does not have specific duties protecting him. I might also mention the protection of fair value for duty.

I said I would give two instances. I think it is only fair also to refer to turkeys at the present time. I understand the removal of the quota on turkeys was because of a fear of retaliation by the United States and others throughout GATT. In 1955 and 1956 there were 10 million and 12 million pounds of turkeys respectively brought in. In July 1957 import controls were put on which restricted the import of turkeys to one million pounds each quarter, or four million pounds each year. That worked very well until last year.

I see the minister is rising. Perhaps he has not been following what I have been saying.

Mr. Drury: Mr. Chairman, I had been following but I just wanted to assure the hon. member that I have nothing to do with quotas or restrictions on the import of turkeys. This is entirely outside the scope of the Department of Industry, as I think it properly should be. The Department of Agriculture is very well equipped to handle this particular problem, and to endeavour to duplicate the functions of that department in one relating to manufacturing industries does not seem to be quite appropriate.

Mr. Pugh: I am rather glad the minister interjected because it only proves what I have thought all along, that he was not listening to the tying in of the negotiations with GATT. To reiterate what I said previously, the minister specifically said this morning that a team of experts was being geared to deal with GATT. I suggest that while dealing with GATT he should also talk it over with the Minister of Agriculture. I mentioned specific things which had been done through the years up until the commencement of GATT, and how this affected our fruits and vegetable industry.

All I am saying to the minister is this. Do not do anything with regard to making changes in GATT which might help industry to the detriment of the farmer. I am pointing out the specific instance of what happened in August last year, when it was feared that there might have been retaliation in GATT because the quota for turkeys was chopped to four million a year. Up to August of this year over seven million pounds of turkeys have already been brought in, and this has upset the industry tremendously. When the minister is in his office trying to help industry throughout Canada he should attempt to do so in conjunction with the other members of the government, and in this case specifically the Minister of Agriculture. I hope he will talk over any tariff changes which might have an adverse effect on the farmers and fruit growers throughout Canada, and specifically in my own area where the turkey industry is suffering badly. If we take off duties on onions and potatoes and soft fruits, and change the quotas on asparagus, and do not pay attention to fair value for duty, then we are in a bad spot.

I am glad to see that the minister has been paying attention to what I have just been saying, and I know he will use his good offices in this respect.

Mr. Nasserden: Mr. Chairman, in rising to say a few words on the estimates of the Department of Industry I should like to remark on the glowing way the minister referred to the export investment goals which have been reached during the last few months. I know that with this many responsibilities he has one of the heaviest loads that any cabinet minister has to carry in the present government. I might also say that he did not forget to carry part of that political load which cabinet ministers sometimes also carry.

With regard to the goals which he said had been reached, particularly in reference to investment in new plant and machinery, when you take a look at the figures the actual increase amounts to little more than the increase in taxes levied by this government in the first budget of the present Minister of Finance; and little more than the normal expected outlay for the reproduction of plant to meet the needs of automation in the changing complex of industry today could be attributed to the figures which have been given by the minister. I would also point out that even if there had been an increase in those figures at the present time the new Department of Industry could hardly expect to take any credit for that increase, because they have been in existence for about only a year.

I was very interested in the minister's reference to designated areas and the area developed criteria. I should like to remind the committee and the minister that that was one of the criticisms offered from this side of the house at the time he first brought his measure before the House of Commons several months ago. What was said on that occasion is still true, and the discrimination that has taken place as between one community and another has not contributed to that orderly development of industry in this country which should be the concern of any government having the welfare of all areas of the nation at heart.

The member for Essex West made some reference in respect of what has taken place in the Sudbury area. He referred to the Bladen report and stated that that report should have been acted upon as soon as it came out. I should like to say I believe the government should study the reports made from time to time before it takes action. Indeed, sir, if we were to look at the other reports which have come forward to the present government referring to other matters I believe they would indicate that study is necessary before action can be taken in respect of those particular matters.

Mr. Chairman, there are those who have suggested that the estimates of this department at the present time indicate that too much is being allotted to it. As I look at the figures of the various branches of the department that are concerned here it occurs to me there has been some juggling of the departmental estimates in an attempt to create the impression that this government is doing something for industry that was not being done previous to the creation of this department. Indeed, sir, that is an impression that I cannot understand, and does not have regard for the facts. I can understand that the minister would like to claim the credit for the expansion and progress that has resulted from the devaluation of the dollar, and I understand his effort to attribute some of that expansion to the creation of his department as well as perhaps to the efforts of the remnants of those other departments now included under industry, but I do not think he will fool very many people in Canada today.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the whole concept of area development, as laid down by the government, has led to an artificial interference with the orderly development of industry in the nation. Certainly when we look at the figures given to us by the minister it can be said that very little of the investment that has taken place in the past year in Canada in industry is anything more than that compelled by the normal competitive factors of world markets today.

I should like to draw attention of course at this time to what has taken place in the province of Saskatchewan, and particularly in the area around Saskatoon where there is the prospect of the development of the potash resources, and the possibility of a chemical industry. I hope that the minister will try to bring the policies of this government to bear in an attempt to aid in that development. I remind him that the whole matter of the freight rate structure enters into that particular situation. I remind the government also that in the province of Saskatchewan the south Saskatchewan dam and irrigation project will soon be a reality, and with the resource of power and water the province will have at that time, together with the potash deposits and the prospects of a chemical industry development, we believe this is one area of Canada that not only deserves but will require the very careful attention of the government in the immediate future.

Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to say anything more, except that I think with hardly a year of activity under the belt of the minister in this department we can hardly at this time assess the progress he is making. I believe perhaps during the next session it would be a good idea to refer the activities of this department to a parliamentary committee, if for no other reason than to give some publicity and knowledge across this country to the scope and mission of this department in so far as the government's plans for this department are concerned.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Drury: Mr. Chairman, a considerable number of questions have been asked and various suggestions offered. I should like to say that I welcome the suggestions made and have listened with interest to the criticisms offered, although I do not necessarily agree with all of them. I will endeavour to answer at least some of the questions posed.

The hon. member for Lanark asked about the duties of the officers of the department. That was the subject of a parliamentary question some time ago and a long written answer was provided on June 9 in response to question No. 1,251. I refer the hon. member for Lanark to that answer.

The hon. member for Peterborough made mention of the fact that the Fisher Company had decided, by reason of taxation policies, to have its company locate in the United States. While I agree with his description of the events, namely that the subsidiary manufacturing operations are being undertaken by the Fisher firm of Peterborough to supplement the manufacturing operation they are carrying out in Peterborough, and to this degree expansion of their operations is taking place in the United States rather than in Canada, I think the reasons given to me by the Fisher firm are perhaps not quite the same as those given to and recited by the hon. member for Peterborough.

The fact of the matter is that in respect of equipment, materials or products manufactured in Canada for export, and in fact exported to the United States, none of the taxes complained of are payable. Indeed if they have been paid they are all remitted. So by moving to the United States there would be no savings of taxes. There would, however, be a very significant saving in duty. As the Fisher officials explained to us, they wished to save the payment of United States duties by having the fabrication or completion of the products done in the United States. This makes good economic sense.

Mr. Stenson: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the hon. minister a question regarding taxes? I pointed out that the company would have to retool and set up a machine to produce the product that would be shipped to the United States. If the company kept that machine in Canada and manufactured the part in Canada, shipping it to the United States, it would have to pay tax on the machine. The tax would be considerable in relation to the cost of the item. I have this part in my hand and it sells for three cents. The cost of retooling and setting up the machine is $12,000. The company would have to pay 8 per cent tax, and if after January 1 the tax was still in existence, it would have to pay another 3 per cent. This company is still trying to maintain the business in Peterborough, but how can they get around that situation? If they instal the machine in Canada, manufacture and ship the part to the United States, they will have to pay tax on this machine. I do not think that argument is fair to this company.

Mr. Drury: There is no question that taxes on production machinery bought for use and employed in Canada are payable, and there is no remission on any part of those taxes by reason of the output from the machine going abroad. To this extent what the hon. gentleman says is entirely correct.

He also asked what industries were receiving research and development assistance. There is contained in the estimates a substantial sum provided for the maintenance of technological skills in Canadian industry, the so-called vote 5. The industries involved are generally speaking in the aircraft, electronics and armament fields. The amount of assistance to date since the inception of the program is some $38 million payable to some 32 companies in respect of 62 defence development projects. That is under the heading of vote 5.

[Mr. Drury.]

In addition, there is the defence industrial research program of the defence research board on which expenditures to date amount to roughly $5 million. Some 50 projects in substantially the same categories of industries are the beneficiaries of this development assistance. Another source of help is the industrial research assistance program of the national research council. Expenditures to date have amounted to approximately $2½ million on some 80 projects and the beneficiaries of this particular program cover the entire section of Canadian industrial activity. All three of the programs I have mentioned are co-ordinated, studied jointly and duplication avoided through the operation of interdepartmental committees on which representatives of these agencies sit.

Mr. Stenson: Could I ask the minister if the names of the industries receiving this aid are available?

Mr. Drury: I think they are probably published in the public accounts and have been for a number of years. If the hon. member wants us to go back over the years and tabulate the names of the companies I will be glad to see he is furnished with this information.

The hon. member for Kindersley made reference to the location of the heavy water plant. While I will not comment on his views as to where the plant should or should not be, whether it would be more appropriate to have it in Saskatchewan or where it is going to be in Nova Scotia, I would point out that the choice of location was made by the company which put in the lowest bid for the manufacture of this heavy water for government account, and that the location of the plant was not in fact determined by the federal government but rather by the bidder for the underwriting on the 1,000 tons of heavy water that we require.

I was interested to note that while the same hon. gentleman rather feels that the best economic or social solution to our unemployment problem is to move people to work rather than to move work to people, there were other participants in the debate who did not share that view. I think I will let him settle his differences with them rather than try to argue the question myself.

The hon. member for Edmonton West asked some questions regarding performance bonds in respect of Defence Construction Limited. I think he indicated that in the past security for the performance of work had been demanded in the form of a cash bond, and that as a result of his insistence or urging, per-

haps, it is now possible to furnish bonds of another character. This has been in operation successfully for the past few years and it represents from the contractors' point of view a preferable and less expensive alternative than the furnishing of cash security, which sometimes is financially difficult. I am told that these bonds are required to a value of 50 per cent of the amount of the contract, and I think everyone will agree this is a very substantial cash requirement to have to find in addition to other problems in financing a contract. I am given to understand that the system is working well and to the satisfaction of Defence Construction Limited, and the contractors.

The hon. member asked about warehousing and suggested that the Department of Defence Production may be taking over warehousing from the Department of National Defence. It is not. The Department of National Defence is continuing to do its own warehousing for its own purposes, as it has done in the past in installations constructed to meet its own particular needs. However, in respect of warehousing operations contemplated for the balance of the government agencies to be performed by the Department of Defence Production, a very profound study has been carried out of warehousing needs and the techniques of most effectively doing the job, and arrangements have been made with the Department of National Defence that where they have facilities and space available for warehousing on behalf of other departments or agencies of the government this will be used on a co-operative basis. But warehousing by and for the Department of National Defence will continue to be done by that department.

The hon. member also asked what the story was on the *Provider*. As hon. members will recollect, this is a supply ship designed to provide replenishment at sea facilities for the Royal Canadian Navy. A number of difficulties arose during the course of construction and necessitated some repairs and some changes being made to the ship following her delivery for trials to the Royal Canadian Navy. A substantial amount of information was provided on July 6 in reply to question No. 1321 indicating the terms of the contracts, claims made against the government and various figures of cost. However, the major faults which were discovered during the sea trials are being rectified by the contractor and at his expense. Following rectification of these major faults the navy will endeavour to work up the efficiency of the vessel.

I am told there is one other troublesome problem relating to vibration in the stern of the vessel. This, however, is a design rather than a construction problem and the navy hopes to give study to this when the major deficiencies have been made good by the contractor.

I think it was the hon. member for Wellington South who made mention of the fact of three observations made by the Auditor General in relation to Defence Construction Limited. These were all in connection with contracts executed some years ago, in 1961 and 1962, and do in fact represent payments by Defence Construction Limited to contractors over and above the total firm price of the contracts, for errors or changes made necessary by the crown. I think most members would agree that where additional expense is occasioned to a contractor, by changes to a plan or an error in a plan on the part of the crown, it is up to the crown in having these changes made to reimburse the contractor the cost of such rectification.

The hon. member also suggested that one might use the designated area program statistics based on a 12 months rather than a six months period. I should point out that the six months or summer period was explicitly chosen in selecting criteria for the designated area program to avoid the factors which would be introduced on a 12 months basis by winter seasonal unemployment.

As hon. members well know, there is a very extensive and, I hope, successful winter unemployment assistance program under the aegis of the Minister of Labour, and this is the series of programs which are designed to cope with the problems of seasonal unemployment, whereas the designated area program is not in itself or of itself supposed to operate to counteract seasonal unemployment. It is supposed to counteract chronic, continuous unemployment; and consequently if one looks at the statistics on the period of the year which is unaffected by a seasonal unemployment he is likely to get a more accurate and less distorted picture.

The hon. member for Saskatoon wondered whether I could not make a statement on automotive parts. Much as I would like to, and interesting, though complex, as this subject is, hon. members will appreciate that this question is now sub judice in the United States, and until such time as the commissioner of customs, who now has under advisement a plea made by some U.S. manufacturers for the application of countervailing duties

against Canadian imports, has made a finding on this, it would be highly inappropriate for me to make observations on the state of affairs in this regard.

The hon. member also observed on the inequity, inequalities, the distortions of freight rates. This is something of which not only I but the officials in my department are very conscious, although we as a department do not have primary responsibility in this field. Basically the question of freight rates is one for the Minister of Transport and his department, but there is no question about it that freight rates in Canada are now a very significant, and will come to be an increasingly significant, determinant, not only in the location of manufacturing industry but also on its profitability and on its economic success; and just as one general observation I would point out that we have had a freight rate structure which contains a number of artificialities, productive consequently of a number of distortions.

It is extremely complicated, even more complicated than the Customs Tariff, and does require a serious examination. It suffers from one fundamental defect which is perhaps incurable, and that is that the rates are geared so as to rise with the amount of manufacture going into an article—the more an article is manufactured then the higher is the per pound freight rate. This has the effect of encouraging manufacturing establishments to set up as close to their final markets as possible, and consequently as far away as possible from the source of raw materials. If we could be successful in inverting that structure in terms so that rates per pound declined with the degree of added value this would induce manufacturers to locate close to the source of raw material, rather than to the markets, and this would have the effect of producing a powerful incentive to move industry in a northward direction from the United States. However to do this to the freight rate structure is a little implausible to suggest. It may be nice in theory, but unfortunately it may not be too practical.

The hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Bagot quoted an article by Mr. Jean-Pierre Fournier in *Le Devoir*. Mr. Fournier concluded, and the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Bagot agreed with him, that the area development agency had been a distinct failure by reason of the fact that in its history to date only nine companies had been set up in Canada, or rather had declared their intention to set up business in the designated areas, and of these three were in Quebec employing a total of 87 men.

[Mr. Drury.]

Were these facts true I would agree both with Mr. Fournier and the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Bagot. Unfortunately the premise is entirely wrong. As I outlined in my remarks, and these curiously enough were part of the observations I made in French—perhaps the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Bagot can understand my English better than my French—I pointed out, and I am not translating, that in 23 of the 35 designated areas new enterprises representing an investment of $245 million capital, and designed to employ in excess of 9,000 people, numbering in total 103, have declared their intentions to set up in the designated areas, and to come into commercial operations so as to take advantage of these tax concessions. This is substantially far removed from Mr. Fournier's basic assumption of a total of nine companies employing 87 people. I shall repeat those figures—103 companies representing new capital investment of $245 million, to furnish employment to 9,000 people in 23 of the 35 designated areas have declared their intention to come into commercial areas have declared their intention to come into commercial operation so as to take advantage of the incentives. If the assumptions of the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Bagot were correct, I would agree that the plan had not been a success. But I think it has achieved more than that.

A number of members suggested that the critera for the selection of designated areas should be changed. I have undertaken on a number of occasions to have this reviewed and the matter is currently under review. I hope to be able to make a report later in the fall on the outcome of this review by the officials and by the government. It is complained that the program is discriminatory. As I have said on previous occasions, it is. It is designed to be discriminatory. It is designed to provide additional advantages to those areas which suffer from high, chronic unemployment, and to provide these advantages over other areas which are more fortunate and which do not suffer from high chronic unemployment. If endeavouring to assist such areas by incentive measures is discrimination, then this program is discriminatory, and it is intended to be so.

The hon. member for Portneuf made a number of suggestions for which I am grateful regarding factors we might take into account in establishing criteria. While I do not undertake to accept all of his suggestions they are interesting, and will be considered. But they do present some difficulties. The hon. member

also expressed the hope that the government would play its full part in encouraging enterprises for the manufacture of motor cars of French design in Canada. This we have been doing; this we are doing, and this we will continue to do.

The hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka suggested that a fundamental re-examination of the work of the Department of Defence Production should be undertaken. As I indicated in my opening remarks, the entire scope of the work of the Department of Defence Production is undergoing alteration now as a consequence of the recommendations of the royal commission on government organization, and I did endeavour to indicate some of the things which are being done. As a consequence the Department of Defence Production will be, in effect, the supply department for the government, and the name which it now proudly bears will be inappropriate. It will therefore have to be changed, but this of course would require legislation and we have a heavy legislative program of priority items to get through before we can reach this one.

A number of members have referred to the staff, and to the size of the staff, of the Department of Industry. As I said in my opening remarks, we have not been as successful in recruiting staff, in terms of speed anyhow, as was anticipated, at the time these estimates were prepared. We have been insisting on high quality, and consequently we have not got the numbers at the rate we had hoped. We have been able to achieve the quality. As a result, I should like to introduce an amendment to vote 1 of the estimates of the Department of Industry. In recognition of the rate of progress which is being achieved in recruiting personnel for the Department of Industry, I would ask my colleague, the Secretary of State, to move:

That vote 1 be reduced by $600,000.

Mr. Lamontagne: I so move, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman: Shall the amendment carry?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Lambert: Would the Chair not put the question at the end of the minister's remarks on item 1, because this is an amendment to item 1? Perhaps it would be better to have it put at that time.

Mr. Drury: This is item 1 of the estimates of the Department of Industry and I hope that my remarks on item 1 of the Department of Industry are now complete.

Mr. Lambert: If that is so—

Mr. Pugh: Before we vote, I wonder whether the minister would care to make any comment on the suggestion I made with regard to GATT.

Mr. Drury: I have not very much to add to what I said earlier. Needless to say, in putting forward its views as a department to the interdepartmental committee on tariffs in connection with GATT, we shall have in mind the desirability of not recommending courses of action which would have a deleterious effect on any sector of the economy whether it be fruit growing, turkey raising, or the production of worsteds. I think my officials are as responsible as any of our citizens and that they will bear in mind the undesirability of inflicting damage or hardship on any segment of the community.

Mr. Pugh: I take it this will be the policy for the government with regard to changes in GATT, and that this will be the policy given to those who are to carry out this work under the minister.

Mr. Drury: Bearing in mind the responsibilities of others, that will be the policy of my officials in the context of this work. I do not want to give the hon. member the impression that I am giving some kind of guarantee that in no circumstances will there be any tariff changes made which would adversely affect, for example, turkey growers and fruit growers. I am not doing this, because I am not responsible for this question of tariffs, as I tried to explain. Tariffs on fruit and turkeys are the responsibility of somebody else. But I can assure the hon. member that my officials will be fully responsible in the exercise of their duties to provide advice.

Mr. Ricard: We have learned recently that Japan intends to send to Canada textile commodities in increased amounts. I come from a city where the textile industry is the major industry and I should like to know what the minister's attitude is toward protecting our textile manufacturers. We have textile factories which are particularly interested in the manufacture of shirts and, from what I gather, shirts are to be imported in greater numbers than ever before. The same applies to shoes and shoe manufacturing. I should like to urge the minister to do all he can to protect our workers because it is just as important to protect the industries we have already as it is to bring new industries here. If we do not do this, I think we are missing the point. At the same time, I should like the minister to tell us what he plans to do to protect our textile industry.

Mr. Drury: Mr. Chairman, I thank the hon. member for both the exhortation and then asking me for an account of my stewardship. The hon. member will recall a long statement made by the Minister of Finance a couple of days ago on the particular question of the entry of Japanese goods into Canada in the past, and indeed in the future, and his concern over the matter of textiles, which he undertook specifically to raise on his forthcoming trip to Japan for the interministerial council meeting. He is seized of the importance to the textiles industry of not allowing excessive entry of textile goods into Canada. This is a view which I quite naturally share. I should say, however, that I think perhaps the basic cure for our problems in this respect, not only in the textile industry but in other Canadian industries, is to increase efficiency and effectiveness of productivity. This is the main problem to which the department is going to address itself. Not only must we be able to satisfy a domestic market with domestic production—and we could achieve this by the imposition of high tariffs—but to be successful and grow we must also export. In order to export we must be able to meet world or export prices. To do this we must increase our efficiency. If we can increase our industrial efficiency to the point where we can meet world prices in exports, we do not need to worry about high tariff protection against imports.

Mr. Cantelon: Mr. Chairman, I think the minister's oversimplification of the one point I was trying to make, when I suggested we could put more people to work by bringing the people to the work and not the work to the people, was perhaps my own fault. Perhaps I oversimplified what I was saying. However, I was trying to indicate that if the economic advantages of location, of supply of raw materials, power, and so on, are not available in a particular area, and if the taxpayer is required to subsidize industry to go into that area, in the long run we are going to find that the advantages of having the industry in that area will be overbalanced by the advantages in the areas to which it should have gone; and particularly they will be overbalanced by the advantages that industry has in other countries, which I would suggest would lead to the ruin of the industry in the long run. I think this is the reason for Sweden adopting the other policy, and I think it is a wise policy to adopt.

The other point I was endeavouring to make was that the new areas which hope to develop in this country—and there are a great many of them—are being, frankly, discriminated against by this legislation. While I realize that something needs to be done for the people in the areas where the work is required, I think that great care should be taken to see that the newly developing areas are not in this manner discriminated against.

Mr. Stenson: Mr. Chairman, I have just two questions. With regard to designated areas the minister was holding up the summer months. Would he take into consideration places like Windsor and Brantford, which have high employment in the winter months due to the auto industry and agricultural implements being produced in those areas? If the minister had considered the winter months in relation to Brantford, I think he would have reached a different conclusion. The auto industry does not have layoffs and is tooling in the summer months. I wonder whether the minister would take this into consideration when studying the question of designated areas?

I have another short question, Mr. Chairman. The minister just mentioned that we had to have production efficiency to gain exports in the world markets. Does he not feel that if he took off the 11 per cent sales tax on production machinery, this would be the first step in that direction?

Mr. Drury: I am not sure I agree that this should be the first step, Mr. Chairman. Clearly, if the 11 per cent tax were to be removed this would lower the costs of production; there is no question about that. However I think it is a noteworthy fact that even with the removal of exemption from tax there has been a very substantial and a very satisfactory rate of growth of the gross national product, and growth of exports, too. I will not for a second argue that if the 11 per cent tax on production machinery were removed, the costs of production would go down to some degree. Whether it is essential that we do this in order to maintain our position in the export markets of the world is perhaps another question.

Mr. Danforth: Mr. Chairman, I was very interested to hear the minister express the interest of himself and the department in transportation problems. May I, after the minister's general statement, pursue the matter one step further? Can the minister tell the committee whether there are any particular experts in the field of transportation who have been added to his department, or whether there is a particular part of his

department that is devoted to the study of the transportation question in relation to the development of industry? In other words, Mr. Chairman, has there been any specific approach to this matter by his department?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Chairman, we have engaged the services as traffic manager of a one-time employee of Dominion Tar and Chemicals, who I think enjoys as high a reputation for ability in this particular field as almost anybody in Canada.

Mr. Danforth: Mr. Chairman, may I pose one further question to the minister? Would the minister take under consideration the application of some corrective measures in the field of transportation, particularly where a designated area is concerned, and consider this as one of the methods that might be employed to erase such an area from the field of chonic unemployment?

Mr. Drury: This suggestion might be a little difficult to put into practice, and complicated to work out; but we will certainly have a look at it, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Stenson: Mr. Chairman, the minister referred to the economy and the way industry is going ahead in this country. In view of this I would ask the minister, does he have in mind the trade imbalance we have with the United States at the present time, which is growing all the time?

Mr. Drury: I am not aware of the precise figures, Mr. Chairman. I do know that as a direct consequence of a substantial increase in economic activity in Canada our imports from the United States have risen materially over the past six months. This is to be expected. It is part of the job of the Department of Industry to try and see that Canadian industry progressively moves in to take up this increasing consumption in Canada, rather than by increasing imports.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Frenette: Mr. Chairman, as the minister said earlier that he would make a statement next fall in respect of designated areas, could he tell us if he will make it before the beginning of the winter works period?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Chairman, the program of the Department of Labour will begin on November 1. We are hoping to receive our reports just before then; we may not be lucky, but we shall try.

[*Text*]

The Deputy Chairman: Shall the amendment carry?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Amendment agreed to.

Item as amended agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENCE PRODUCTION

1. Departmental administration, including the care, maintenance and custody of stand-by defence plants, buildings, machine tools and production tooling and grants to municipalities in lieu of taxes on crown-owned defence plants operated by private contractors, $15,324,200.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, before we get into item No. 1, I should like to raise a few questions which are actually dealing with vote No. 15. Since they are really concerned with the administration of the minister's department I should like to clarify the position of the Department of Public Printing and Stationery, particularly the handling of contracts with regard to public printing and publication of books.

The transfer of powers here is rather intriguing and I should like a clear indication from the minister as to what has happened in this regard. I should like to refer to orders in council P.C. 1963-1254 dated August 21, 1963; P.C. 1963-1450 dated August 3, 1963, and perhaps the last, February 3, 1964, P.C. 1964-156. The first question I would put is this. Is the Minister of Industry, qua his position as Minister of Defence Production, in charge of public printing and stationery in so far as calling of tenders and awarding of contracts is concerned? Second, what is the amount of contracts awarded in the current fiscal year as related to public printing without tenders having been called, either publicly or by invitation? There are two categories there. There may have been invitational tenders to, say, three or four approved printers. How many are there in that category, and how many contracts have been given outright on the basis of negotiation, if any?

With regard to the order in council of August 21, 1963, I should like to ask: Was there a transfer made of the supervision and control of purchasing, procurement of outside printing, and so on, to the Department of Defence Production? I presume this comes—although this is not clearly indicated—from the department of public printing and stationery, but is the minister satisfied that the order in council so states? The order in council of October 3, 1963 refers to the "responsibility for the procurement of print for books and publications". That matter is transferred from the Department of Defence Production to the department of public printing and stationery. Does this mean that there had been a transfer

of part of the responsibility from the department of public printing and stationery to the Department of Defence Production in August of last year, and in October there was then a segment carved out of that group and retransferred back to the department of public printing and stationery? Is that the explanation of this order in council? Because otherwise it means that somewhere along the line in the past defence production had some responsibility for the procurement of print for books and publications. I should like a careful and detailed explanation of that order in council.

Then might I ask: Is the committee to be satisfied that the order in council P.C. 1964-156 is the final order in this series of exchanges, or has it been superseded by any other order in the interval? That order in council is a transfer to the Secretary of State for Canada of the powers, duties and functions (1) of the Minister of Industry relating to the Department of Public Printing and Stationery. I was wondering how there was any responsibility on the part of the Minister of Industry in regard to this, in that the original transfer on August 21, 1963 is from the department of public printing and stationery to the Department of Defence Production. How does the Minister of Industry have any powers or functions relating to the department of public printing and stationery if they were never transferred to him? They may have been transferred to him qua Minister of Defence Production, but unless there is an order in council missing in this reshuffle, the Minister of Industry is transferring something which he never possessed. I should like to have that point clarified.

My penultimate point is: Who has jurisdiction over the printing bureau? Is it the Minister of Defence Production, is it the Minister of Industry, or is it the Secretary of State? Where does the officer who occupied the position of queen's printer fit in now? I am referring directly to Mr. Duhamel. What precisely is his authority and under whose jurisdiction is this gentleman? Or has he in this shuffling about been trimmed of powers like one would lop off branches from a tree in the spring?

I should also like to know who is the person responsible for the control and the awarding of printing contracts. Is he an official who was formerly with the department of printing and stationery, or is he an official in the Department of Defence Production or the Department of Industry? However, my main question is: Does the Minister of Industry

[Mr. Lambert.]

feel he has authority to deal with any printing contracts? Because unless he comes up with an answer which says there is a missing order in council, there is something very much adrift. The transfer seems to have been from the department of public printing and stationery to the Department of Defence Production and then somehow from the Department of Industry to the Department of the Secretary of State. I cannot understand how that ever came about.

Mr. Drury: Perhaps at the outset I should try to divide the printing business, if I can call it that, into two clear sections. One is the production of books, pamphlets and other things, which are the product of the printer, among other people, and forms, letterheads and other products of the printer, which hardly would qualify as books and pamphlets. Basically the way things are now organized is this; the production of books and pamphlets, including the procurement of print, therefore, is the responsibility of the man known under the legislation as the queen's printer, concerning whom indications have been given that he is to have his name or title changed to queen's publisher. He under the Secretary of State runs really in its entirety the business of selection, editing, printing, by whatever means necessary, distribution, and sale of books and pamphlets. This is the job of the man to be called the queen's publisher.

Mr. Lambert: Has this position actually been created at the present time, or is it to be created?

Mr. Drury: The position of queen's publisher is to be created and it will require a legislative enactment. The functions are now being carried out by Mr. Duhamel, who is known officially as the queen's printer. His title, as I say, will be changed. He is carrying out these functions but not under the new title.

In addition to that there is the non-book, non-pamphlet printing and stationery business involving the editing, printing and distribution of printed forms and printed work not qualifying really as books or pamphlets but including, however, *Hansard* and all the publications of parliament. This operation includes the setting of the print, the running of the presses, the proofreading for *Hansard*, and a number of other things which are now done by the printing bureau. This is the responsibility of the Department of Defence Production, and the Department of Defence Production has as its minister the Minister of Industry.

This then is the situation. All the elements in the production of print in book or pamphlet form are the responsibility of the queen's publisher, or the queen's printer, responsible to the Secretary of State. All the mechanical printing operations done by and within government establishments is the function of the Department of Defence Production, which is responsible to the Minister of Industry.

How did we get into that position? Order in council, 1963, 1130 of July 25 provides for the transfer to the Minister of Industry of the powers, duties or functions of the Secretary of State under the Public Printing and Stationery Act. The Public Printing and Stationery Act can be found in the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1952. I am not sure of the date of its enactment. That order in council brought under the Minister of Industry the queen's printer, who then had the responsibility for the printing of books, pamphlets, provision of stationery and the mechanical printing within the government.

The next step was order in council No. 1254 of 1963, dated August 21, which transferred to the Department of Defence Production the control or supervision of the procurement, purchasing and stores for the branch of the department of printing, the production branch, the outside printing production branch, and the supporting services of the departmental secretaries branch and the administrative services branch, from the department of public printing and stationery. This included the printing operations in the bureau in Hull and the procurement of stationery, pencils, paper and the rest of it. It took this responsibility away from the department of public printing and stationery, and put it under the Department of Defence Production. That department is in turn responsible to the Minister of Industry.

The next step was order in council October 3, 1963, No. 1450, which transfers from the Department of Defence Production to the department of public printing and stationery the responsibility for procurement for printing of books and publications, and the procurement of print.

Mr. Lambert: Was that restored to the department of public printing and stationery?

Mr. Drury: Under the provisions of the order in council the items I mentioned were taken from the department of public printing and stationery, and that includes all printing both inside and outside, and the procurement of print inside and the procurement of print outside.

Now, this purports to pass back to the department of public printing and stationery the procurement of print for books and publications, but not the procurement of print for stationery or forms. This final order in council for 1964 is No. 156, dated February 3, and transfers to the Secretary of State for Canada the powers, duties or functions of the Minister of Industry relating to the department of public printing and stationery, which had been circumscribed in its activities to editing and procuring the print for books and publications.

Mr. Lambert: I think I understand the situation now. Order in council No. 1130 is the order in council that was missing in the chain I had. That is the order in council which placed something under the control of the Minister of Industry.

Mr. Drury: Perhaps if I had just referred to that order in council I could have avoided that long explanation.

Mr. Lambert: I thank the hon. minister for giving that full explanation because I think the pattern is now clear in respect of the framework relating to these transfers. I would remind the minister that I did ask other questions in respect of individual responsibilities.

Mr. Drury: In respect of the hon. member's specific question dealing with contracts for print for books and publications that have been let without tender during the past period mentioned, perhaps I should say that this is under the jurisdiction of the queen's publisher, who in turn is now responsible to the Secretary of State, and his estimates will be dealt with when the estimates of the Secretary of State are called.

Mr. Lambert: The minister did not let any contracts for printing without tender when he had jurisdiction back in 1963?

Mr. Drury: There was a short period during which I was responsible. I can only say I do not recollect having let such contracts but I will do a check if the hon. member would like me to.

Mr. Lambert: Yes, all right.

Item agreed to.

Emergency measures organization—

20. Administration and operation, $2,600,000.

Mr. Drury: Mr. Chairman, it was agreed that votes 20, 25 and 30 would be stood and that we would consider these items along with atomic energy and the national research council.

The Chairman: Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Item stands.

35. Expenses incurred by Defence Construction (1951) Limited in procuring the construction of defence projects on behalf of the Department of National Defence and procuring the construction of such other projects as are approved by treasury board, $2,318,000.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, the minister has answered some questions that were raised with regard to Defence Construction Limited. As far as I am concerned, I believe everything was answered except that I do not recall the minister saying anything about the future of the corporation. Has any decision been reached on the future of the corporation, and whether or not it will continue?

Mr. Drury: The committee will remember that the royal commission on government organization looked into the agencies of the government which were engaged in administering and dealing with real estate of one sort or another, including the construction of buildings. One of the agencies covered was Defence Construction Limited. The committee reviewing the Glassco recommendations is looking, *inter alia,* at Defence Construction Limited in this particular context, and one would hope that in the not too distant future they would have a report to make.

Item agreed to.

40. Canadian Arsenals Limited—administration and operation, $2,500,000.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, there is a substantial reduction in the amount of the vote here and the minister might indicate how that comes about. Second, where is the major work being done in Canadian Arsenals in the manufacture of weapons and ammunition? Third, has a substantial proportion of this work been transfered to private industry?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Chairman, vote No. 40 shows a substantial reduction in 1964-65 by comparison with 1963-64. This reduction is in anticipation of the disposal to private industry of a number of Canadian Arsenals plants, and advertisements inviting bids for these appeared in the newspapers last spring, specifically for the Val Rose plant just outside of Quebec near Valcartier camp, which has been devoted to the manufacture of small arms ammunition, the Valleyfield plant just outside of Montreal, which has been devoted to the manufacture of explosives, and the Long Branch plant of Canadian Arsenals Limited located on the waterfront in suburban Toronto, which has been devoted to the manufacture of small arms. Bids were invited for all three.

Bids have been received and are now in the process of being reviewed with a view to concluding, we hope, a satisfactory arrangement whereby the government will be able to divest itself of the ownership of these three establishments with suitable safeguards for guaranteeing (a) continued production for government of Canada account of arms, ammunition and explosives of the qualities required by the Department of National Defence; (b) adequate arrangements for the security of tenure and continued employment of the present Canadian Arsenals staff and an assurance they will not be unreasonably cast out and (c), the offering of an appropriate price related to the value of these properties.

I hope that in the not distant future we may be able to make an announcement in this regard. If we are unsuccessful in securing adequate and satisfactory bids accompanied by suitable guarantees for these three properties, then perhaps the optimism which the figure of $2,500,000 reflects may not have been justified.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, I do not know on just what hypothesis the officers of Canadian Arsenals and the government are proceeding, but it seems to me that the market for this type of establishment, with the conditions imposed by the minister, is extremely limited. It might be limited to one or two concerns. A good friend of mine, formerly in the armed services, went into the business of manufacturing small arms for sporting purposes and I know he found that the market in Canada was not particularly good. If a plant like that failed because the Canadian market for arms of this type is not sufficiently large to be able to compete with larger firms like Remington, Winchester and others in the United States, as well as the excellent arms production from Belgium and Great Britain, I am wondering what anticipation of sale there can be. After all, these plants are not for dismantling or conversion to some other use. If they are to continue to supply small arms to the government in the future, surely they will have to be kept within very narrow production limits. Therefore I am wondering what really honest anticipation there can be in this regard.

I noted the other day a report that there had been some difficulty between Canadian Arsenals and Canadian Industries Limited, I believe, concerning the manufacture of substandard small arms ammunition by one of the Canadian Arsenals plants. I think this

also requires some explanation and I shall sit down now in order to give the minister 30 seconds.

Mr. Drury: What the hon. gentleman says is entirely true. The conditions imposed on the prospective purchaser of the small arms plant to which he has made reference will make it less attractive financially to him than if there were no strings involved. As a consequence of these limiting conditions we would expect to have to lower our sights as to the price we might get. But, provided the capability to manufacture small arms in the quantity indicated is retained, the purchaser is quite free to use the facilities for commercial purposes. This does not necessarily limit him in this particular plant to the manufacture of small arms or rifles. He can manufacture anything he wants. I would agree there are few purchasers in Canada who could contemplate operating that plant for the manufacture of small arms alone on a profitable basis. It has to be made use of for purposes other than purely small arms if it is going to be operated successfully. This is what we are working toward.

So far as the substandard ammunition delivered by Canadian Arsenals to C.I.L. is concerned, about which reports appeared in the newspapers, I am advised that what was defective was the finish. It appears that a higher finish on high velocity sporting ammunition is required than is demanded by military specifications for military ammunition, where perhaps the purchaser is not as conscious of elegance as of reliability. Because of the different standards of elegance required by C.I.L., both C.I.L. and Canadian Arsenals are now in consultation on adjustment for a higher price to cover the higher finish.

Item agreed to.

Atomic energy control board—

1. Administration expenses of the atomic energy control board, $159,000.

Item stands.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Chairman, may I direct your attention to the fact that it is five o'clock.

Resolutions adopted in committee of supply this day reported and concurred in.

AGRICULTURE

AMENDMENT OF SUBSIDIES ON FEED GRAINS

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): Mr. Speaker, would the house be agreeable to reverting to motions, as I have a short statement to make?

Mr. Churchill: Related to what?

Mr. Sauvé: A statement I promised the house yesterday on feed grain assistance.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Sauvé: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the house that the government has authorized certain modifications to the new interim feed grain assistance policy announced in the house on July 24 last. The modifications are as follows:

1. The new rates will become effective September 14, instead of August 31.

2. A new zoning system will be applied in all eastern Canada.

3. There will be no balance of transportation cost greater than $2 per ton by the least cost method of transporting grain.

4. The assistance now provided for transportation will remain, with adjustments within provinces to equalize balances of transportation cost where they exist.

5. Separate and higher levels of assistance to apply on millfeeds and screenings transported by rail or truck to certain maritime destinations have been provided for.

6. The payment of storage costs in the Halifax elevator one month earlier in the fall than elsewhere in eastern Canada is provided for because of the extra time required to build up stocks in that area for winter use. Storage payments at Halifax will commence September 15 rather than the October 15 date which applies elsewhere in eastern Canada.

7. Separate and higher rates of assistance will be paid for this winter only on grain moved to certain maritime destinations by rail during the period December 1, 1964 to April 30, 1965.

8. The rates announced for British Columbia on July 24 last will remain the same.

There appears to be some misunderstanding with respect to this new policy. This is an interim policy to make necessary adjustments and remove certain inequities in the policy which has been in effect up to date. As I have indicated, adoption of a permanent policy must await the report of the house committee on agriculture, on feed grain price differentials, which subject was referred to it on June 24, 1964.

As payments of freight assistance will be allowable to shipments by trucks, and as more transportation competition occurs, the farmers

will have even further reductions in costs, which is an important consideration and one which seems to have been overlooked by many people.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I am a little surprised that we have this statement at this time in view of the minister's easy familiarity with the subject of feed grains for eastern Canada, but I am also a little concerned that it was deferred until five o'clock on Friday afternoon because those people in this party who are primarily concerned, and who have the greatest interest and knowledge of this matter, are not here. The same can be said of other parties. I am hopeful that the minister did not purposely defer his statement until this time, rather than making it this morning when those people who really know something about this subject would have been here. I trust that this practice will not continue, of coming in with statements on motions at five o'clock on Friday afternoons.

Mr. Grant Deachman (Vancouver Quadra): On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the hon. member can raise the point that this should be deferred to another time on the grounds that members are not in the house. Hon. members interested in matters of this kind are expected to attend the house, and if they are not here perhaps they should explain to the house why not.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I believe the minister was about to reassure the hon. member for Edmonton West.

Mr. Sauvé: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday in answer to a question put by the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg (Mr. Crouse) I said:

> Mr. Speaker, the interim assistance measures that were announced at the end of July will be amended, but no final decision has yet been reached.

It was not until this afternoon that we could come to a final solution, and I am very sorry I had to make the announcement at this time, but this will come into effect on September 14 while the policy announced on July 24 would have come into effect on August 31. Therefore in order to give time to the trade and the people involved to make the necessary adjustments I was forced, with great regret, to make it now. I would have preferred to have made it earlier.

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, on the point of order raised by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Deachman) I think a comment in reply ought to be heard. Surely the purpose of an order paper and the purpose of designating various pieces of business is that those particularly interested will be present at a particular moment and be prepared to answer the comments that are made. There was unanimous consent given a few minutes ago, and I think it most unfair for the hon. member to make such a comment, that everyone should be ready at all times. That is not in accordance with the orderly carrying on of business in this house, and I think the comment was unnecessary.

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, the members of this group welcome this announcement as a temporary adjustment and some improvement in freight assistance policy, no doubt as a result of the government's finally listening to the representations made from the opposition benches on behalf of farmers; but we look forward to a final and more definitive policy after the agriculture committee has reported to the house.

Mr. Rynard: Just one point—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order please. I believe it is the custom of the house to have only one comment from each party in connection with a statement made on motions.

Mr. Churchill: What about the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Deachman)?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Well, of course, there was a question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Deachman), and if it is necessary to say so I would state there was really no question of privilege, and I would suggest to hon. members that we now proceed with the business of the house.

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.

Mr. Walker: I wonder whether, in an attempt to gain some time, the house would agree to stand all the bills as they are listed on the order paper—the first 24 items—and then proceed to item 25.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed? This, of course, would include one of the items which involves a resumption of debate. There would have to be unanimous agreement that this particular item stand.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

FISHERIES ACT

AMENDMENT RESPECTING CONFISCATION OF NETS AND GEAR

Mr. C. W. Carter (Burin-Burgeo) moved the second reading of Bill No C-73, to amend the Fisheries Act (forfeiture floor).

He said: This bill contains two main features. One is a principle which simply states that there should be a limitation on the power of confiscation contained in section 64 of the Fisheries Act. The other feature is a suggested application of this principle with respect to the amount of limitation, and a method by which the limitation should be determined.

The bill suggests that the power of confiscation be limited by granting an exemption from forfeiture, and that the amount of exemption should be the same as that provided in the income tax act with a basic minimum exemption of $1,500. This amount may seem to be somewhat low to hon. members from British Columbia, but it was chosen for two reasons. One reason is that it illustrates the principle of the bill. The second reason is that the exemption laid down in the income tax act represents the minimum income for the survival level of a man and his dependants, or at least we assume this is how the exemption is justified in the Income Tax Act. I would however point out that these are mere details which can be modified at the committee stage, should the committee think this necessary in the light of further consideration. It is to the principle of the bill that I wish to draw attention now, because this is the important part of the measure, and after all it is with the principle that we are concerned on second reading.

In considering the principle of this bill the first and most obvious question which comes to my mind is this: Why limit this confiscatory power? Why not abolish it altogether? I may say I think a good case could be made out for the abolition of confiscatory powers as far as the Fisheries Act is concerned. However this is a principle which is to be found in other legislation, the Customs Act, and the Excise Act, for example. It is also to be found in some provincial game laws. Possibly a case could be made out for the retention of these powers in connection with the Fisheries Act, but I wish to emphasize that the present bill asks only that they be limited.

The second question which comes to mind is this: Why should minor breaches of the Fisheries Act be treated differently from minor breaches of other laws? If a man commits a minor offence the usual procedure is for him to be brought before a court of justice where punishment is meted out in accordance with the magnitude of the crime. The person concerned is either fined or sentenced to a term in jail. But in cases under the Fisheries Act the penalty does not stop there. For a very minor offence a person can be hailed before the court of law, fined, and in addition face the confiscation of his property. This procedure seems to violate a basic concept of justice, namely that punishment should fit the crime. In the case of a big operator, a person who has a large fleet of ships, if one ship is confiscated he still has plenty of other ships left, which he can continue to operate to carry on his business. But take the case of a little man who has only one boat or half a dozen nets. If that one boat is taken from him, or if those nets are confiscated, he is left with nothing with which to earn his livelihood. There is a wide discrepancy in the manner in which this penalty bears on a rich man as compared with a poor man.

I should like to give one or two examples to show why I felt it was necessary to bring this bill before parliament. Two or three years ago one of my constituents set his herring nets in a position inside the mouth of a river in accordance with fisheries regulations prescribed, with the approval of the Minister of Fisheries of that day. Apparently the district fisheries officers had the power to move those stakes back and forth as they wished. Anyway, the officers moved the stakes further out and then the nets were in a position where they consituted a breach of the regulations. What happened was that this man's nets were confiscated by fisheries patrol officers in the patrol boat. They were kept a considerable time before the case was brought before a magistrate. When eventually the case came before the court, the magistrate dismissed it and held that no offence had been committed. But by the time the nets had been returned they were all mildewed and completely ruined. So although this man was legally innocent he had really paid a severe penalty—a much harsher penalty than would have been imposed by way of a fine for an offence of a similar nature.

To illustrate my point, Mr. Speaker, I might give another example of what befell a number of salmon fishermen in my riding. In my province there is an extremely idiotic regulation. I have not the time to describe it to the house now, but to show hon. members

just how idiotic it is, it means that two fishermen can set their respective nets of the same size 100 feet apart in a particular spot, and one man's net is legal while the other man's net is illegal. This foolish regulation was dreamed up many years ago but was not enforced for a long time. Long before Newfoundland became part of Canada it had never been enforced. In 1949 Newfoundland became a part of Canada, and right up to 1957, when the government changed, it had not been enforced. The next administration did not enforce it. Only now, within the past year or two, has it been decided to enforce this particular regulation.

The regulation provides that you can pick a point, that on one side of this point your nets must have a mesh of 5 inches, while on the other side of the point a 4½-inch mesh is permitted. This law had never been enforced for years and years and years. The fishermen had nets with a mesh of 4½ inches; they were the only ones they had; they had no money with which to buy other nets, and they knew from experience that the others would not be any good anyway. So, as their livelihood depended on it, they set their nets in the water, and along came the patrol boat and confiscated all the nets. These poor fishermen were left without any means of earning their livelihood. This is a very serious matter for them, Mr. Speaker, because they have been pushed out of this means of earning a living. I suppose they are existing on provincial relief or some other form of assistance. This salmon fishery constituted the bulk of their income. Their total net income was probably not more than $700 or $800 a year and perhaps $600 of that amount was derived from the salmon fishery—and that was taken away from them.

This was justified by the department in terms of conservation—"We must conserve our fisheries". But, Mr. Speaker, there are many, many other ways in which salmon are taken illegally in other nets of this size and the department does not bother at all; it just happened to single out these poor, unfortunate fishermen. I personally asked the department to supply me with evidence and information to show that this method of fishing was actually having some effect which was detrimental to conservation. I have never received any information or evidence that it had any effect at all on conservation. I cannot see how it could, Mr. Speaker, because I know from personal experience that ten times as many salmon as would be caught by these fishermen are caught by other means, in cod traps and in other ways. Therefore, what these poor fishermen were catching was really a drop in the bucket; yet they were singled out for action by the Department of Fisheries.

I am one of those people who believe that a human being is the most important thing in this world, Mr. Speaker. If I had to choose between a human being and a salmon, or the whole salmon industry, I would choose the human being, because according to the philosophy to which we say we subscribe, the human being is paramount and we must conserve him. He has to conserve himself regardless of any other consideration—and this was the only means these people had to earn a livelihood.

We must bear in mind that although parliament vests these tremendous powers in the minister, in the final analysis the powers are exercised by very minor officials who are far removed from the original source of power; and very often they are not qualified, either by training or experience, to wield such great powers or to appreciate fully the consequences and the end results when these powers are improperly used. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, when these powers are used to deprive an individual of his means of earning a livelihood, by way of punishment for a very minor offence, it goes far beyond the concept of justice and amounts to petty tyranny.

This bill suggests a remedy, but it is a remedy only. Doubtless it can be improved in a number of ways. I would hope, therefore, that this bill would be sent to a committee for further consideration and improvement. Today we who are here in this house at this moment have a choice. We can send this bill to a committee, we can take action to remedy this problem, or we can talk the bill out. If we take this latter course, we will not be doing any credit to ourselves either as a government or as a parliament, because our action will amount to a condonation of the evils which I have described. This bill, Mr. Speaker, is a very reasonable one. It asks only for the very minimum of safeguards against the tyranny which the Fisheries Act now permits and which I know from personal experience has too frequently occurred. I hope all hon. members will see fit to support it.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, there are just a few words I should like to say in connection with this bill. I will immediately disclaim any connection with the fishing industry; but I have, as a lawyer, some observations to make with

regard to the purpose or the objective that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Carter) is trying to accomplish with his bill. I find it a little strange that the hon. gentleman, in his capacity, has to present a bill, in that he could not convince his ultimate colleague, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Robichaud), of the justification for his cause. I realize what he is trying to get at is the average fisherman who gets cleaned out by one of these seizures, and he has nothing else.

We know that under, for instance, the Excise Act where there has been illicit manufacture of alcohol, the vehicles used in the transportation of the goods or the equipment used in the illicit manufacture of alcohol are forfeit, and there is nothing in the way of an opportunity, as under the Customs Tariff Act, to put up a bond which is the equivalent of a fine when goods are forfeit, in order to exempt the vehicle from seizure.

I can readily see why the hon. gentleman pointed out that when waiting for a magistrate to dispose of a case the equipment is of no value. You might as well give a man the death sentence, because he loses his all. There is no doubt there must be some control and a penalty imposed on improper and illicit fishing practices, but I am wondering whether, in the case of these individuals, the penalty should be so severe.

I am also wondering why, within the legislation of the province of Newfoundland, there would not be something which is akin to the exemptions act of the province of Alberta. I should like to see any federal authority trying to impose the seizures provided for in this act in the province of Alberta in face of the exemptions act of that province, which exempts from seizures and sale the basic holding, shall we say, in so far as land, in so far as an automobile and in so far as personalty and tools of trade. You cannot touch them.

I know I have resisted some seizures under the Income Tax Act precisely under this particular heading in the exemptions act of the province of Alberta. I think there may be some parallel legislation in other provinces which comes under the heading of property and civil rights. We know that property and civil rights is under the complete jurisdiction of the province. When occupying a position on the other side of the house I had occasion to have amended by the government proposed legislation because the government were running into this particular trap. In effect it is a *brutum fulmen* in that it is of no power whatsoever, since it steps beyond its jurisdiction.

Having said that, and while expressing full sympathy for the hon. member, I think there are grounds in this particular case for providing, shall we say, an umbrella for a particular individual. After all, a breach of the Fisheries Act is in the same category as a breach of the Excise Act or Income Tax Act. These are civil matters. They are not in the nature of a criminal act against the person of an individual where we provide for certain sanctions under the Criminal Code. These are actions against the crown. The crown imposes these regulations, true in the public interest; but I am wondering whether this is almost tantamount to the old provisions where one could be hanged for the theft of a shilling. The penalty here is far too severe. As the hon. member pointed out, what happens to his equipment if after a series of delays he is found not guilty? What would happen to the fish? Would they sell it? I suppose it is sold immediately, because if it was returned to him after he is released I am afraid it would be a little odorous. However, I must express a word of warning to the hon. member. I think his proposed amendment to the act is also a little loose in that if there is going to be a seizure in the case of perishables, an immediate disposition must be made in order to realize on the value of the articles concerned. Or if they are going to seize nets, and so forth, they must take care not to damage them, because until a man is found guilty he is not to be presumed guilty and be penalized right from the start. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member's legislation would require a little dressing up to impose this sanction on the court. I do not think the responsibility entirely rests with the individual to be honest and just, but that the administration of justice must also be expedient. Justice delayed is justice denied.

Having now embarked on a certain sea with which I am not familiar I will not say anything about the problems of the fisheries; but as a lawyer concerned with the administration of justice I certainly commend the hon. gentleman for the principle he is trying to advance in this bill and I would support it.

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member for Burin-Burgeo (Mr. Carter) is to be congratulated for bringing this bill forward because I think it does open up for discussion in this house something which may very well over the

years not have had much thought or consideration by the members of this house generally. It may result, perhaps, in some of the members who come from what I describe as non-fishing constituencies, at least in the commercial sense, and who do not understand the fisheries, taking a closer look at the Fisheries Act, in which case I would not be surprised if some of their reactions were similar to my own the first time I had occasion to look through it.

The Fisheries Act as it stands, rightly or wrongly, is really a very harsh and strong act. I have more than once remarked that if we were to show the same concern for the protection of human beings as we show for the protection of fish as set out in the Fisheries Act we would have to do a lot of revision to the current laws as they stand on our books. Having said that, I think everyone in this house, certainly anyone with any knowledge of the importance of our commercial fisheries, recognizes the need for adequate laws to protect and to conserve the fishery resources of this country, and for regulating the manner in which fish can be taken and placed on the commercial fisheries market.

I recognize there are a great many differences in the traditions and needs of fisheries laws and regulations as between the part of the country from which the hon. member comes and the Pacific coast. Our fisheries by and large are of a different nature. I have to confess that in my years as a member of this house I have had very few complaints brought directly to my attention as to the manner in which this act has been administered by the fisheries department and the fisheries officers of British Columbia. Indeed I think it is only right to say that by and large they have administered this act in a very fair and equitable manner, and some of the harsher penalties which the act provides are rarely, if ever, carried out as a result of prosecutions in the courts of British Columbia. Nevertheless, the hon. member has raised a very real problem and has attempted by this bill to provide a solution to that problem. I am not at all certain that his proposal of creating a floor, under which confiscation cannot take place, would be particularly practicable in the part of the country from which I come. Putting the floor at $1,500 would not in most cases protect from seizures the actual boat and gear of the average fisherman in British Columbia, although the amount could be more in respect of a married man with dependants, as it is under the Income Tax Act.

I am not sure how one could seize half a boat, or a quarter of a boat, or, for that matter half a net or a quarter of a net.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that hon. members should be prepared to give careful consideration to the principle advanced in this bill. I note that the hon. member sponsoring the bill suggested the possibility of referring it to a committee of the house, I presume the marine and fisheries committee, for study and report. I certainly am happy to support that kind of suggestion.

If the same kind of penalties were applicable to other fields, for example in respect of offences committed under the motor vehicles acts across the country in a way comparable to the Fisheries Act, in which seizure and confiscation is provided, I am sure there would be a great hue and cry, because a great many people would be likely to have their automobiles seized or confiscated for offences no more serious than those provided in the Fisheries Act, which can involve seizure or confiscation. I think this bill certainly deserves the support of the members of the house and should be given consideration, particularly in respect of the principles advanced.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to quote from one section of the act to indicate the kind of powers that are vested.

Section 7 of the act, for example, provides in the first line that the minister may in his absolute discretion do so and so. There are not very many of the statutes that this parliament has placed on the statute books of this country that provide a minister of the crown with this kind of absolute power. I think this is something which should not go unnoted by hon. members of this house.

Mr. Speaker, I have often thought if I could find time to do so I should like to engage in a little historic research in respect of the genesis of our present Fisheries Act. I have the feeling that it came to its present form a number of centuries ago in the days when poaching a private fishing preserve was considered to be one of the most serious offences an ordinary citizen, not able to call himself lord or baron, could commit. I feel that some of the concepts applied at that time may have been carried forward without our having given very much attention to them.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I should like to again emphasize, as someone who is concerned with the conservation and development of fisheries resources in this country, that I feel we need an act which will properly protect these resources and properly regulate the

manner in which various individuals should be allowed to take the products of the sea. I hope that the house will agree with the suggestion made by the hon. member, and that someone will be prepared to move that the subject matter of this bill be referred to a committee for detailed study and report back to the house. In saying that, I think it would be a good idea to have members such as the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) on the committee, because he has some knowledge of the implication of laws and their relationship to basic human rights, so that the committee would not be entirely composed of members from fishing constituencies who would just discuss the subject matter among themselves.

Mr. Jean-Eudes Dubé (Restigouche-Madawaska): Mr. Speaker, I have listened very carefully and with sympathetic attention to the remarks made by the hon. member who has sponsored Bill No. C-73. I must say that he has shown in his remarks and in the drafting of the bill a great deal of compassion for fishermen. Fishermen are in a class of people which deserves our understanding and our praise. As we all know, fishermen lead lives of hardship and danger and yet more often than not their rewards are not commensurate with their labours.

The purpose of Bill No. C-73 is to amend section 64 of the Fisheries Act by adding two subsections, 5(a) and 5(b). Section 64 (1) of the Fisheries Act, as amended in 1961, is divided into 12 subsections. The first subsection deals with the seizure of vessels and other articles. Subsection 2 deals with the custody of the seized articles. Subsection 3 deals with perishable goods. Subsection 4 deals with the proceeds of the sale of seized goods. Subsection 5, which is the one of interest to us now, deals with the act of forfeiture.

Mr. Speaker, the bill now before us proposes to add two subsections in order to limit the basic exemption by a floor, to a minimum of $1,500 and up, based on the income tax exemption. As the hon. member for Burin-Burgeo (Mr. Carter) has stated, the purpose of the amendment would be to render less drastic the impact of confiscation. I must say at the outset that the goal proposed by the amendment is appealing. I think it has some merit and deserves careful consideration. However I believe that the bill itself should be examined in light of the Fisheries Act as a whole. We know that the Fisheries Act, as I see it, is to promote conservation and preservation of fish, as well as to ensure the protection of fishermen. The regulations relating to forfeiture are not directed toward the fisherman who is lawfully engaged in his operation, but are aimed at those who would act in breach of the regulations and could be convicted of an offence. I think therefore the laws are directed toward protecting the law abiding fisherman against those who would use unlawful means to fish, as a consequence of which the lawful fisherman may be deprived of his catches.

Mr. Carter: It should be a sensible law.

Mr. Dubé: I agree entirely. The penalty of forfeiture is a drastic one but it is not exclusive to the Fisheries Act. As was said this afternoon, forfeiture exists under the Excise Act and other federal acts as well as under provincial fish and game, and liquor acts. I would agree that the penalty should be in proportion to the offence. I would admit also it would be unfair, brutal and inhumane to seize a vessel for a very minor offence. No one would accept that a fisherman should be deprived of his means of livelihood for the mere commission of a petty offence. But the act does not say that.

Section 64 does not state that the convicting court or judge shall order that the vessel or article be seized. It provides that the convicting court or judge may order. In other words, the section is merely permissive. It means that the authority is there to punish grave offenders. The authority is there as a warning, a deterrent against major offenders. The authority is also there as a protection for law abiding fishermen. Moreover if a convicted person feels that a forfeiture penalty is excessive he may appeal to the minister and he may also appeal under the provisions of the Criminal Code. Section 75 of the act is very clear in this matter. It reads as follows:

> Persons aggrieved by any conviction for any offence under this act may appeal by petition to the minister, who may remit penalties and restore forfeitures under this act; but when a conviction takes place or an order is made by a justice of the peace or fishery officer for the payment of money or dismissing an information or complaint under this act, nothing in this section prevents any person who thinks himself aggrieved by any such conviction or order or dismissal, the prosecutor or complainant, as well as the defendant, from the right of appeal that he has under the provisions of the Criminal Code relating to summary convictions.

It must also be pointed out that the Fisheries Act was extensively revised in 1961. Before 1961 fishery officers had arbitrary powers of confiscation, and confiscation was automatic following conviction. But the 1961

revision of the Fisheries Act has changed all this by taking away the powers of confiscation from fishery officers and giving these powers to the courts, where they now rest.

I would also submit that the effect of having the proposed floor of $1,500 in my humble opinion would be to nullify completely the value of the section where the item seized was of a value less than $1,500. The explanatory notes of the bill are not entirely correct in some particulars. The first sentence reads in part as follows:

> The purpose of this bill is to put a floor on the penal power of the crown—

I submit that this is not correct. The crown has no penal power whatsoever in this matter. The penal power rests solely with the court, and section 64, subsection 5, spells it out very clearly by using these words:

> Where a person is convicted of an offence under this act or any regulations, the convicting court or judge—

In other words, it is not the minister or his agent or any fisheries officer who would order forfeiture. This power lies solely in the judge who may or may not do so. The act does not say he shall: It says he may.

Mr. Lambert: May I ask the hon. member a question? Would that not reinforce my argument that this matter would really come under property and civil rights, and if it ran counter to any exemptions in any province it would be a nullity since the magistrate acts under provincial authority?

Mr. Carter: Would the hon. member permit a question? The hon. member says that the power does not reside in the officer but only in the courts. Does the act say that the fisheries patrol boat officers must lay a charge before taking the fisherman's gear and nets? Does the Fisheries Act say there is a time limit within which the matter must be brought before a court? How is the man protected? The fisheries boat officers take his gear out of the water and they can keep it, with the result that his gear is ruined before the matter comes to trial.

Mr. Dubé: I do not deny this at all. I am just saying that the explanatory notes are not correct in stating that the penal power rests with the crown. It does not rest with the crown, but with the court. I do not wish to take too much of the time of the house. I only wish to say that all these points I have mentioned should be considered. In concluding I must commend the sponsor of the bill for his devotion to the cause of fishermen.

Mr. Knowles: Now you know how we feel.

Mr. Herridge: It was a very fishy argument.

Mr. Knowles: Question.

Some hon. Members: Six o'clock.

At 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 INDUSTRY

1. Departmental administration, including grants as detailed in the estimates, $4,677,100.

[*By amendment: Less* $600,000.]

5. To sustain technological capability in Canadian industry by supporting selected defence development programs, on terms and conditions approved by treasury board, and to authorize, notwithstanding section 30 of the Financial Administration Act, total commitments of $50,000,000 for the foregoing purposes during the current and subsequent fiscal years, $19,500,000.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENCE PRODUCTION

A—Department—

1. Departmental administration including the care, maintenance and custody of standby defence plants, buildings, machine tools and production tooling and grants to municipalities in lieu of taxes on crown-owned defence plants operated by private contractors, $15,324,200.

5. For the establishment of production capacity and for capital assistance for the construction, acquisition, extension or improvement of capital equipment or works by private contractors engaged in defence contracts, or by crown plants operated on a management-fee basis, or by crown companies under direction of the Minister of Defence Production, subject to the approval of treasury board, $1,046,000.

10. To establish qualified sources for the production of component parts and materials, subject to the approval of treasury board, and to authorize, notwithstanding section 30 of the Financial Administration Act, total commitments of $1,200,000 for the foregoing purposes during the current and subsequent fiscal years, $450,000.

15. Directorate of printing—Administration and plant equipment and replacements, $979,000.

C—Crown companies—

35. Expenses incurred by Defence Construction (1951) Limited in procuring the contruction of defence projects on behalf of the Department of National Defence and procuring the construction of such other projects as are approved by treasury board, $2,318,000.

Canadian Arsenals Limited—

40. Administration and operation, $2,500,000.

45. Construction, improvements and equipment, $336,000.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, August 31, 1964

The house met at 2 p.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. MANDZIUK—OBSERVANCE OF 1964 AS SHEVCHENKO YEAR

Mr. Nicholas Mandziuk (Marquette): Mr. Speaker, may I beg leave of the house to draw to the attention of hon. members an event in history important to all Canadians regardless of their ancestry, but in particular to those of Ukrainian racial origin. The Ukrainian branch of the Canadian family tree has designated 1964 as Shevchenko year to celebrate the 150th anniversary of the birth of Ukraine's poet laureate and national hero, who was born on March 9, 1814.

Some hon. members will recall that three years ago, on March 10, this house honoured my compatriots by granting me leave to address it briefly on the solemn occasion of the centenary of Shevchenko's death and to commemorate the unveiling of a statue in his honour on the grounds of the Manitoba legislature on July 8, 1961. The unveiling ceremony was performed by the then prime minister of Canada, the present leader of the official opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker), in the presence of some 40,000 people. Hence this is the year of celebration of his birth in Canada, the United States and in the whole free world. Last June the former president of the United States, General Dwight D. Eisenhower, unveiled a magnificent statue of Shevchenko in Washington, D.C. in the presence of some 100,000 people. Our own C.B.C. showed a part of this ceremony, and it thrilled the hearts of my compatriots.

On Wednesday of this week in Winnipeg His Worship Mayor Juba is issuing a proclamation declaring the 5th, 6th and 7th of this month as Shevchenko days in Winnipeg, and during these three days thousands of Canadians of Ukrainian and other origins will converge on the capital of Manitoba for three days of deliberations under the guidance of the Ukrainian-Canadian committee. On Sunday September 6 these people will again march to the foot of his statue to pay homage to him and to dedicate themselves to the ideals of freedom they enjoy in this land, freedom for which Shevchenko prayed and fought but which was denied him and his people in their native land.

Shevchenko was a writer and poet who proved to the world that the pen is mightier than the sword. His prophetic exhortations gave birth to and have kept alive the vision of national unity and of his people's aspirations for independence. He was a patriot of the Ukraine but he was not a narrow minded nationalist. His fiery words, for which he suffered banishment to Siberia, condemned the imperialist policy and oppression of all Slavs by Moscow.

This branch of the Canadian family are again marching to the foot of Shevchenko's monument to proclaim to all their fellow Canadians that they bring to this nation their heritage, their ideals which have guided their race through a thousand years of turbulent history, ideals and visions which Shevchenko crystallized in his poetry and whose works became their national bible. We want our fellow Canadians to share him with them, to share his visions, to share him with all who are oppressed.

Our fellow Canadians may wonder why such universal adoration is given to this man here in Canada and in the free world by those who were forced to flee from their native land but who found a ready welcome and freedom elsewhere. Their complete loyalty is to the new motherland, but they are concerned about the land of their fathers. Shevchenko gives the answer in a poem written in prison before his banishment to Siberia. May I give you the English translation:

> It makes no difference to me,
> If I shall live or not in Ukraine
> Or whether any one shall think
> Of me 'mid foreign snow and rain,
>
> BUT
>
> It makes great difference to me
> That evil folk and wicked men
> Attack our Ukraine, once so free,
> And rob and plunder it at will.
> That makes great difference to me.

I thank you, sir, and this honourable house for giving me an opportunity of saying these few words on such an important occasion.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this is one occasion when

I find no difficulty whatever in agreeing with the hon. member for Marquette. Only yesterday I gazed at the statue to which he referred in his remarks in the grounds of the legislative building in Winnipeg. We all know that next week, when the Ukrainian-Canadian committee will be meeting, there is to be a great manifestation at that momument.

As the hon. gentleman has very rightly said, this will be a demonstration by Canadians; by Canadians who have not forgotten their origins or their past and who are demonstrating that in this new land to which they give their full loyalty as their homeland they can still maintain the traditions which they brought with them. And that, of course, is one of the bases on which our Canadian nationhood is being built.

But, as the hon. gentleman very rightly said, Canadians, United States citizens and people of the free world generally would not have the same devotion to Shevchenko if he had merely been a Ukrainian patriot. It is because he was the champion of the aspirations of all men everywhere for freedom, aspirations that are sometimes deeply submerged by tyranny, and these aspirations for freedom transcended, as the hon. member has said, narrow national boundaries, that this great poet is revered all over the free world; and that in his native land, which is not free in the sense he understood freedom, his memory is revered and keeps alive the hope that one day there too the freedom of which he spoke so eloquently, and to which he devoted his life, will reign.

MR. THOMPSON—REPORTED STATEMENT IN "TIME" MAGAZINE

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, August 26, the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg on a question of privilege raised a matter regarding a report in the news magazine *Time*, as it related to a quotation from myself, and at that time said I was either talking through my hat or I had been misquoted by this magazine article, and that I should completely dissociate myself from it because, he said, that statement was a complete falsehood. Checking on the article to which the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg referred—and by the way I have the highest personal regard for him—I find that the article quotes these words:

"Mr. Diefenbaker refused to consult with his own party or to consider any reasonable compromise himself. His proposal for unanimity would give him the power of veto, and the lack of any time limit merely prolongs the agony. He disregards completely the normal democratic process of majority rule."

[Mr. Pickersgill.]

Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not always agree with the reporting of this magazine. In fact many times I find myself in disagreement with it, but on this occasion I find that they have quoted me, so far as I remember, exactly as I made this statement in reply to a question from a reporter for this magazine. I was not talking through my hat, nor can I dissociate myself from this statement because, as I understand it, it is a statement of fact.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is necessary to go back briefly, to review the situation by way of explanation, to August 4, the date I believe the party leaders first met in the Prime Minister's office.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member need not go beyond that statement wherein he said the Leader of the Opposition did not consult his caucus to prove himself entirely wrong. Any time spent going back to explain that situation would be completely wasted.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. MacInnis: He can be very easily proved wrong by every member sitting on the Conservative benches.

Mr. Speaker: Order. In my opinion the hon. member for Red Deer is entitled to give a short explanation, but not to review a long historical series of incidents.

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, if the hon. member for Red Deer wishes to open this question it should be done in debate and not on a question of privilege of this kind, because that is a violation of the rules of the house. This should only be done in debate, and an opportunity should be available to him within a very short time to do so.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure all hon. members would like to know whether in my opinion there is a question of privilege. On June 10, 1964, I had to deal with certain statements or words uttered outside the house, and on that date I gave a rather detailed opinion, it seems to me, in which I quoted United Kingdom authorities referring to the fact that the authority of the house supersedes that of the Speaker in the case of occurrences which have taken place outside the house and that in respect of incidents which take place outside the house it is the house itself which has the authority and responsibility of resolving any question of privilege. These

reasons are set forth in detail at page 4141 of *Hansard* of June 10, 1964.

In the light of the circumstances as I have them at this moment I do not see that there is a bona fide case of privilege.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to make a lengthy statement, but I believe you stated at the time this question of privilege was raised that I would have the opportunity to answer for myself. All I wish to do is state the facts that are directly behind the statement found in *Time* magazine. My statement will not be lengthy. If hon. members do not want to hear the actual basis for the statement in *Time* magazine, which is true, I cannot help that.

Mr. Nowlan: Again on a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Thompson: On August 4—

Mr. Nowlan: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member has a matter to raise I say it should be raised in the debate and not as a question of privilege at this time, particularly in view of the fact that Your Honour has intimated there is no question of privilege before the house at this time.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion there is no question of privilege. There may be a serious grievance, but certainly not a question of privilege at this time.

[*Later:*]

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Speaker: Order. If there are no further questions, before calling orders of the day I should like to refer to the matter which concerns the hon. member for Red Deer. On August 26 an alleged question of privilege was raised, and I suggested at that time, after a little discussion:

> It seems to me that we should await the return of the hon. member for Red Deer.

That is to be found at page 7277 of *Hansard*. Later on the same page I said:

> Certain allegations have been made. Let us hear both sides of the story before we reach a conclusion.

According to Beauchesne's parliamentary rules and forms citation 127 (3):

> When a statement is made affecting an honourable member which he denies, Mr. Speaker thinks that the house will feel that the honourable member has a right to make an explanation on a personal matter. He will not exceed an explanation of the particular matter.

It seems to me at this time that it would be only right, in view of the commitment in effect given by the Chair, that the hon. member for Red Deer should make a short declaration, if he feels so inclined.

Mr. Thompson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was going to state that the one criticism of this newspaper article in question is that it gives the implication that the leader of the official opposition never consults with his members. I had no intention of giving that interpretation to what I said. I was speaking to a specific point that had been raised by the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg.

Mr. Speaker, the situation behind this question is that on August 4 the Prime Minister called a meeting of the party leaders to consider a proposal that had been made by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam, regarding a way to solve the difficulties for the immediate moment, and also give some definite formula for concluding the flag debate later on when the house would resume after a recess which he had suggested.

Without breaking any confidence that we have in respect of this meeting, I believe it is general knowledge that we could not come to any agreement. As a result I made an alternative proposal. This alternative proposal was not original with me, as I read it in a leading editorial in the Montreal *Gazette* that morning. It seemed a very reasonable suggestion by which all members of this house could honourably get out of the position they found themselves in, and which was becoming increasingly difficult with each continuing day of the debate.

Very briefly this suggestion was that the three maple leaves should be replaced with a single maple leaf, and the amendment to the motion bringing this to pass would be made by a member of the opposition; that the union jack be replaced by the red ensign to represent Canada's membership in and our belonging to the commonwealth, and that the Prime Minister should take steps to immediately declare all votes as free votes in the house.

We discussed this suggestion at some length, and at that meeting it was agreed that each of us would take this suggestion back to his party members. I did not regard this in any way as a matter of confidence, because one could hardly talk it over at one's own caucus on that basis so I did what we had agreed to do. I took the suggestion back to our party caucus and we discussed it. I went even further than that. I notified my own constituents that such a proposal was before us,

and recorded in the Red Deer *Advocate*, the newspaper of my home town, on August 8 a brief summary of what I have just said. I did this with the idea of getting a response back in order that I should have some sense of what my constituents would think about this particular suggestion.

I was dismayed some days later, I believe on August 12, when the hon. member for St. Mary stood up in this house on the orders of the day and asked the Prime Minister the following question, as reported on page 6719 of *Hansard*:

> Would the Prime Minister agree to a meeting of the leaders of the five political parties represented in the House of Commons to discuss the Canadian flag?
>
> That meeting would be called to reach a unanimous decision on the choice of a distinctive Canadian flag, other than the three maple leaves, which would then be submitted to the house by the Speaker, in order to dissociate that matter from any political partisanship—
>
> —and that, within a set period.

In reply to this question the Prime Minister said:

> Mr. Speaker, we have already had useful meetings with the party leaders, and I hope this procedure can be continued.

Then the right hon. leader of the official opposition rose and said:

> I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. There was no question raised at this one meeting or at any meeting regarding the nature, kind and design of a flag. I am sure the Prime Minister, in answering as he did, did not intend to leave that impression.

Mr. Speaker, I was not only confused but upset by this statement, because to me it was in direct opposition to what we all knew had taken place at the first meeting, and on which we had acted, I think in good faith, in bringing this to the attention of each of our members. I was also disturbed by the fact that many members of the Conservative party were coming to me and others of our party, asking if there had been any discussion regarding an alternative design.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, it is not for me to rise, but if this be your ruling then I presume anyone in the house may rise and discuss this matter; because this goes far beyond the question of privilege. This is an exculpatory statement by one who finds himself in a difficult position, having learned what the people of Red Deer think of his attitude, and it is quite out of keeping with the question of privilege. We are not concerned whether he was amazed or deceived.

Mr. Speaker: I hoped the hon. member was drawing to the close of his remarks, because it seems to me we have had quite a long explanation of a matter which has taken too much time.

Mr. Thompson: I am practically through with my statement. I am not in a difficult position with regard to this matter except that on the basis of my own conscience I want the facts to be known not only to the house but to the people of the country generally. This is why—

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member again, but this is really not the time to enter into a debate. A short explanation is called for, and I am wondering whether the hon. member could bring his remarks to a close fairly soon.

Mr. Thompson: I will end them by saying that I mention this only because it was the basis behind the report in the press to which reference has been made. I simply say in closing that my assumption that members of the Conservative party had not been consulted in regard to this matter was verified by the admission of their leader on at least two occasions that he had not done so. Mr. Speaker, this is the explanation behind the report, and it is a statement of fact.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Mr. MacInnis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I certainly am doing my best to accommodate all members, but it does seem to me we could leave this matter where it is resting at the moment and get on with the business before the house.

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, you say that we should leave it for the moment, but when is it to come up again? The hon. member for Red Deer has just resumed his seat after making a final remark that his statement is a statement of fact. When the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg raised the question in the house he did so on the basis of the statement that the Leader of the Opposition had refused to consult with his own party or to consider any reasonable comprise. I as a member of the Conservative caucus and many other members were fully aware of the situation. This statement is an unfounded lie, and the hon. member should dissociate himself from it, because in his early remarks he said he never meant to intimate any such thing.

MR. LAING—STATEMENT RESPECTING VANCOUVER VETERANS HOUSING PROJECT

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of personal privilege. It arises out of a series of questions addressed to the Postmaster General on Tuesday last, as found on page 7228 of *Hansard*, especially a question directed to him by the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich which, if left unanswered by me, could in my opinion reflect upon my integrity as a member of parliament.

I have responsibilities as a member of parliament in addition to my responsibilities as a member of the government, and in respect of the Fraserview housing matter I have such responsibilities and intend in the future to discharge them as a member of parliament. I made a commitment at the time that I would do my best to obtain an adjustment in the selling price of the properties. An adjustment has been made in the selling price of the properties, and since the decision was taken by the government I will stand by it.

Mr. Diefenbaker: What properties?

Mr. Laing: Fraserview housing. I think these are matters where the interpretation of what is right must be made by oneself and the defence of one's integrity must be made by oneself. I thank the house for giving me the privilege of doing so.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY TO TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 8

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, it is true that the meetings of the house leaders do not always produce conclusive results. We had a meeting this morning, part of which will have to be adjourned to a later date, but I am pleased to report that we agreed on at least one thing which is of importance both to the members of the house and their families, and the staff of the house. All the leaders, in the names of their respective parties, have agreed to the suggestion of the government that this house should not sit on Labour day. I therefore ask for an order of the house: That when this house adjourns on Friday September 4, 1964, it shall stand adjourned until 2 p.m. the following Tuesday, and that the relative standing and provisional orders be suspended in relation thereto.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: By leave of the house it is so ordered.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

BANK ROBBERIES

Question No. 1,565—**Mr. Barnett:**

1. For each of the last ten years, how many people in Canada have been convicted of bank robbery and sentenced to serve terms in the penitentiaries of Canada?
2. How many persons are currently in the Canadian penitentiaries as a result of convictions for bank robbery?
3. What is the average length in years of the sentence they are serving?
4. What is the estimated cost per person, per year, for maintaining these persons in penitentiaries?
5. What is the estimated annual amount taken from banks in bank robberies?

Mr. D. S. Macdonald (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): 1. In the Canadian penitentiary service, for treatment and statistical purposes, the crime of bank robbery is classified as armed robbery.

People in Canada have been convicted of armed robbery and sentenced to serve terms in the penitentiaries of Canada in the following numbers for each of the last ten years for which statistics are available: 1954, 159; 1955, 171; 1956, 147; 1957, 93; 1958, 192; 1959, 187; 1960, 268; 1961, 294; 1962, 229; 1963, 204.

2. Statistics are not at hand on the numbers of persons in the penitentiaries by the types of crimes for which they were convicted.

3. The average length in years of sentences served by persons who have committed crimes of armed robbery is 4.2 years.

4. The estimated cost per person, per year, for maintaining these persons in penitentiaries is $2,800.

5. This information is not available.

BRUSHING CONTRACTS, WABAMUN INDIAN RESERVE

Question No. 1,600—**Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson):**

1. Since 1961, how many brushing and sale of right of way contracts have the Paul's band of Indians of the Wabamun reserve entered into, and the value of each contract?
2. Have there been any claims made for unpaid debts with regard to or arising out of these brushing contracts?
3. Has the Indian affairs branch made any attempt to see that the claims were just and fair, and if settlements could be made, and, if so, what steps were followed?

Questions

4. Has there been any meetings with the Indian affairs branch, the chief and council of the band, and a Mr. Couch?

5. Was there a meeting between the three parties concerning the debt owed Mr. Couch on March 21, 1963; were minutes kept of the meeting; and was general approval given at the meeting authorizing the collection of debts owing Mr. Couch?

6. What is the total amount in the band funds of the Paul's Indian tribe at the Wabamun Indian reserve?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): 1. Since 1961, the Paul's band has approved of the sale of the following rights of way: (a) in August 1961 to Canadian Delhi Oil Company for a pipe line right of way across part of Buck lake Indian reserve 133C in the amount of $2,029; (b) in September 1961 to the Calgary Power Company for a power line right of way across the Wabamun Indian reserve 133B in the amount of $12,560; (c) in June 1963 to the municipal district of Stony Plain for widening a road through the Wabamun Indian reserve 133A. For this land the band is being paid at the rate of $100 per acre but the total amount will not be determined until the final survey has been approved.

Paul's band did not enter into any brushing contracts directly with the purchasers of these rights of way. However, the purchasers agreed to employ members of the band in any clearing and brushing operations which were undertaken.

2. Credit was apparently advanced to individual members of the Paul's band by Mr. J. C. Couch, a storekeeper of Highvale, Alberta, in anticipation of being paid from wages received from brushing and clearing operations, interest payments, and other sources of income. Mr. Couch subsequently advised that a number of individuals had failed to settle their accounts with him and he asked for assistance in collecting the amounts owing.

3. As the arrangement for credit between Mr. Couch and the Indians concerned was a private matter, it was made clear that the Indian affairs branch could not assume responsibility for payment. Mr. Couch was also informed that the Indian affairs branch could neither use the funds of the band for the settlement of individual debts nor direct that treaty moneys, interest payments, pension cheques and other moneys payable to Indians be used in payment of their debts. However, arrangements were made through the Edmonton Indian agency office for Mr. Couch to meet the band council and members of the band in an effort to assist him to have the accounts settled.

4. Yes.

5. A meeting was arranged between the band and Mr. Couch on March 21, 1963, at which the superintendent of the Edmonton Indian agency was present and minutes were recorded. At this meeting the Indians authorized Mr. Couch to attend a band meeting on April 30, 1963, when cash payments were being made so as to give him an opportunity to approach those owing him and arrange settlement of their outstanding accounts.

6. The total unexpended balance as at July 29, 1964, is $341,037, comprising a capital account of $326,204 and a revenue account of $14,833.

BANKRUPTCIES

Question No. 1,629—**Mr. Peters:**

1. How many bankruptcies have been registered with the superintendent of bankruptcy for the years 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964?

2. How many in each industry in the designated years?

3. What was the average value in each category in the designated years?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): 1. The following is the total number of bankruptcies in Canada reported to the superintendent of bankruptcy for the calendar years 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962 and 1963 as well as the approximate total for the first four months of 1964: 1959, 3,238; 1960, 3,641; 1961, 3,511; 1962, 4,297; 1963, 5,189; 1964, 1,965.

2. The number of bankruptcies estimated by the dominion bureau of statistics in each industry is as follows:

Year	Primary industries	Manufacturing industries	Construction industries	Transportation communications and other utilities	Trade	Finance, insurance and real estate	Services
1959.....	81	374	449	76	906	36	307
1960.....	100	323	619	129	1,229	65	363
1961.....	86	285	470	113	1,234	69	402
1962.....	93	326	573	143	1,496	82	477
1963.....	111	365	714	166	1,634	110	577

Questions

3. The average value in each category estimated by the dominion bureau of statistics in the designated years is as follows:

Year	Primary industries	Manufacturing industries	Construction industries	Transportation communications and other utilities	Trade	Finance, insurance and real estate	Services
			(thousands of dollars)				
1959.....	36.5	61.9	48.7	18.3	35.5	150.7	28.8
1960.....	481.5	71.0	58.6	33.5	37.0	115.7	27.3
1961.....	91.8	65.6	50.4	28.7	37.5	74.3	28.9
1962.....	45.9	88.9	48.4	40.4	35.3	163.2	34.6
1963.....	42.9	89.2	56.3	41.1	37.5	246.8	39.5

FACILITIES FOR CIVILIAN AIR TRAVEL, B.C.

Question No. 1,661—**Mr. Barnett:**

1. What, for each fiscal year since such expenditures began, are the amounts spent in British Columbia west of the Cascades for the construction, maintenance and operation of facilities for civilian air travel, including both ground facilities and air navigation aids?

2. What, in addition to amounts included in the above, is the estimated cost of facilities constructed originally for the Department of National Defence which have since been transferred to civilian use?

3. What is the estimated annual value of facilities provided for civilian air travel at Comox airfield, in so far as such expenditures are not made directly through the Department of Transport?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): 1. Expenditures by the Department of Transport for fiscal years commencing 1945-46 on construction, operation and maintenance of airports and air navigation aids, west of the Cascade mountains in the province of British Columbia, are as follows:

Fiscal Year	Amount
1945-46	$ 274,000
1946-47	462,000
1947-48	1,014,000
1948-49	1,206,000
1949-50	1,140,000
1950-51	1,131,000
1951-52	1,855,000
1952-53	3,224,000
1953-54	1,905,000
1954-55	1,821,000
1955-56	3,597,000
1956-57	3,762,000
1957-58	4,945,000
1958-59	9,540,000
1959-60	9,458,000
1960-61	5,568,000
1961-62	8,554,000
1962-63	9,067,000
1963-64	5,687,000

2. In so far as the Department of National Defence is concerned:

Location	Estimated Cost
Abbotsford	$3,770,011
Cape St. James	55,000
Massett	50,000
Patricia Bay	7,081,453
Port Hardy (does not include buildings transferred to C.A.D.C. in 1944 and 1946)	6,733,423
Prince Rupert	2,100,000
Sandspit	100,514
Sea Island, Vancouver	5,419,294
Sumas	201,550
Tofino (does not include buildings transferred to C.A.D.C. in 1946 and 1949)	6,331,816

3. The facilities at station Comox are for military use and there has been no extension of these facilities to provide for civilian air travel. Landing and other fees are recovered in accordance with D.N.D. aerodrome fees regulations, PC 1962-70, 18 Jan. 62.

ROY FAIBISH

Question No. 1,691—**Mr. Francis:**

1. Does Mr. Roy Faibish hold any position at the present time with the C.B.C. or with any branch of the government, or any crown corporation and, if so, what is the nature of Mr. Faibish's duties and responsibility?

2. Did Mr. Roy Faibish appear as a witness before His Honour Judge Harold W. Pope acting as a commissioner under part 1 of the Inquiries Act?

3. Has Mr. Faibish issued any public statement in connection with the following statement in the report of His Honour Judge Pope's inquiry (page 45) "It is also rather difficult to justify the action of Mr. Faibish in ordering the payments to be made when he apparently had no knowledge of the information in the hands of the director which caused him to feel that any investigation should be made"?

Questions

4. If Mr. Faibish did issue a public statement in connection with the above findings of Judge Pope, when was it made and what is the text of it?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and the office of the privy council as follows:

1. Yes, Mr. Faibish is engaged on a term contract basis in the television service of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as a program researcher, script writer, film director, and interviewer.

2. Yes.

3. The government is not aware of any such public statement.

4. Answered by 3.

COMPLETION OF KINGSTON PENINSULA TRAIL, N.B.

Question No. 1,730—**Mr. Fairweather:**

1. What is the anticipated date of completion of the Kingston peninsula trail under the roads to resources program in the province of New Brunswick?

2. How many miles of road remain to be rebuilt?

3. How much money will it cost to complete this joint program?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): The planning and scheduling of all works under the roads to resources program is a responsibility of the provincial government. The agreement signed with the province calls for completion of all projects by March 31, 1969.

2. The total length of the Kingston peninsula loop is 40 miles. To date, 22 miles have been reconstructed and 16 miles have been paved. The province has not requested approval for any additional work and the only work outstanding is the completion of the Devon Construction Co. Contract for grading of a 10.8 mile section between Chapel Grove and Bayswater. This contract is 60 per cent complete.

3. The estimated cost of the work on this road is $2,000,000 and the total value of the claims which have so far been submitted and paid is $1,154,532. Of this amount, the federal government has paid $556,050.

IMMIGRATION OFFICES ABROAD

Question No. 1,734—**Mr. Dionne:**

1. How many immigration offices are maintained abroad by the Department of Citizenship and Immigration?

2. How many persons are employed in each office and what is the salary of each?

[Mr. Francis.]

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): 1. 33.

2. See attached schedule.

Location and salary of Canadian immigration staff abroad

Location	Number of staff		Annual salary per person
London, England	49	(Total)	
	1		$11,800
	1		7,860
	1		7,020
	2		6,720
	3		6,420
	1		6,090
	1		5,880
	4		5,700
	1		5,340
	3		5,100
	1		3,900
	1		3,975
	3		3,705
	1		3,570
	1		3,165
	1		3,030
	2		2,895
	6		2,490
	1		2,220
	1		2,310
	3		2,130
	2		2,625
	1		2,040
	1		1,950
	3		1,590
	2		1,500
	1		1,320
Bristol, England	5	(Total)	
	1		7,020
	1		5,700
	1		2,490
	2		1,590
Liverpool, England	12	(Total)	
	1		7,320
	1		5,880
	1		5,700
	1		5,340
	1		5,100
	1		2,760
	2		2,490
	1		1,770
	2		1,680
	1		1,860
Leeds, England	11	(Total)	
	1		6,720
	2		5,340
	1		5,100

Questions

Location	Number of staff	Annual salary per person
	2	2,895
	1	2,220
	1	2,040
	1	1,770
	2	1,590
Belfast, Ireland	5 (Total)	
	1	$ 7,020
	1	5,700
	1	2,490
	2	2,040
Glasgow, Scotland	17 (Total)	
	1	7,320
	2	7,020
	1	6,420
	1	5,760
	1	5,520
	1	5,100
	1	3,570
	1	3,030
	1	2,895
	1	2,490
	1	2,400
	1	1,770
	1	1,680
	3	1,590
Cologne, Germany	50 (Total)	
The Cologne establishment includes 10 employees who handle immigration matters originating in Stuttgart and Munich and surrounding areas where we have been authorized to operate on a part-time basis only.	1	8,730
	1	7,470
	1	7,320
	1	7,020
	1	6,420
	1	5,760
	2	5,700
	1	5,520
	2	5,340
	2	4,532
	1	4,336
	1	4,260
	1	3,554
	5	3,391
	1	3,326
	1	3,130
	3	3,065
	3	2,934
	1	2,869
	1	2,726
	2	2,690
	4	2,654
	1	2,618
	3	2,367
	1	2,331
	6	2,295
	1	946
	1	864
Berlin, Germany	4 (Total)	
	1	7,020
	1	3,326
	1	2,934
	1	2,869
Hamburg, Germany	7 (Total)	
	1	$7,320
	1	5,100
	1	3,391
	1	2,934
	1	2,582
	1	2,726
	1	2,295
Athens, Greece	10 (Total)	
	1	7,320
	1	5,520
	1	3,970
	1	3,683
	1	2,842
	1	2,795
	1	2,467
	1	2,420
	1	2,043
	1	1,694
Berne, Switzerland	4 (Total)	
	1	7,020
	1	3,152
	2	2,807
Brussels, Belgium	9 (Total)	
	1	7,020
	1	5,100
	1	4,200
	1	3,703
	1	2,940
	1	2,621
	2	2,523
	1	2,034
Copenhagen, Denmark	8 (Total)	
	1	7,320
	1	6,420
	1	5,520
	1	3,660
	1	3,397
	1	2,999
	1	2,821
	1	2,554
Helsinki, Finland	3 (Total)	
	1	6,420
	1	4,578
	1	3,606
Hong Kong, B.C.C.	22 (Total)	
	1	7,320
	1	7,020
	1	6,720

Location	Number of staff	Annual salary per person
	2	5,340
	1	5,520
	1	5,880
	1	5,730
	1	4,410
	2	2,401
	1	2,213
	1	2,213
	2	1,930
	3	1,836
	1	1,516
	1	1,742
	1	1,139
	1	1,459
Lisbon, Portugal	9 (Total)	
	1	7,320
	1	5,100
	1	4,200
	3	2,289
	1	2,018
	1	1,928
	1	969
New Delhi, India	10 (Total)	
	2	7,320
	1	3,900
	1	2,437
	1	2,301
	1	1,827
	1	1,420
	1	360
	1	336
	1	287
Oslo, Norway	3 (Total)	
	1	7,320
	1	4,518
	1	3,622
Paris, France	27 (Total)	
	2	8,040
	3	7,320
	1	6,720
	1	6,420
	2	5,520
	1	5,700
	1	4,410
	1	3,481
	1	3,018
	2	3,153
	1	2,690
	1	2,412
	1	2,875
	1	2,597
	1	2,351
	1	2,105
	2	1,796
	1	1,587
	1	1,957
	2	1,888
Madrid, Spain	5 (Total)	
	1	7,020
	1	4,710
	1	2,272
	1	1,725
	1	882
Rome, Italy	33 (Total)	
	2	7,320
	1	6,720
	3	5,700
	1	5,100
	1	5,340
	1	4,200
	1	3,640
	1	3,250
	1	2,899
	1	2,817
	1	2,605
	1	2,499
	1	2,923
	1	2,552
	1	2,501
	1	2,263
	1	2,644
	1	2,358
	1	2,263
	1	2,311
	1	2,120
	1	2,215
	1	2,172
	1	2,214
	1	2,000
	3	1,919
	1	1,877
	1	1,621
Stockholm, Sweden	4 (Total)	
	1	6,960
	1	4,123
	1	3,590
	1	2,657
Tel Aviv, Israel	6 (Total)	
	1	7,020
	1	3,900
	1	2,255
	1	1,955
	1	1,879
	1	1,303
The Hague, Holland	11 (Total)	
	1	7,320
	1	6,420

Location	Number of staff	Annual salary per person
	1	5,340
	1	5,314
	1	3,101
	1	2,467
	1	2,086
	1	2,593
	1	1,706
	1	1,326
	1	1,072
New York, U.S.A.	3 (Total)	
	1	7,680
	1	5,100
	1	3,900
Chicago, U.S.A.	3 (Total)	
	1	7,020
	1	5,340
	1	4,200
Denver, U.S.A.	3 (Total)	
	1	7,320
	1	5,340
	1	4,200
San Francisco U.S.A.	3 (Total)	
	2	6,420
	1	3,750
Vienna, Austria	10 (Total)	
	1	7,020
	1	5,700
	1	5,100
	1	3,296
	1	2,864
	2	2,720
	1	2,504
	1	2,360
	1	2,000
Cairo, Egypt	7 (Total)	
	1	6,420
	1	5,520
	1	4,200
	1	3,900
	2	1,577
	1	1,339

ARDA PROJECTS, BRUCE COUNTY, ONT.

Question No. 1,736—**Mr. Loney:**

What projects in the county of Bruce under the ARDA program are being considered at this date by the Department of Forestry?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): To date, the province of Ontario has submitted the following project proposal which involves both the counties of Bruce and Grey:

Project No. 6025, acquisition of 4,800 acres of a high wildlife potential area for the establishment of a managed hunting area for public use, located in the townships of Amabel and Albemarle.

NATIONAL DEFENCE STANDARDS FOR CONCRETE BLOCKS

Question No. 1,739—**Mr. Smith:**

1. What standards are required by the Department of National Defence for concrete blocks made by the autoclave method?
2. Are the same standards required for concrete blocks made by methods other than autoclave?
3. How many manufacturers of autoclave blocks are there in Canada known to the Department of National Defence?
4. What are the names and addresses of these companies?

Hon. Lucien Cardin (Associate Minister of National Defence): 1. The standards required by the Department of National Defence for concrete blocks cured by the autoclave method are those contained in American society for testing materials specifications C.90 and C.129 for load bearing and non-load bearing block respectively. In addition the maximum allowable shrinkage is 0.035 per cent and the moisture content on delivery is limited to 30 per cent of the total potential absorption of the blocks.

2. Yes.

3. Twelve.

4. (a) Canada Iron Foundries Ltd., Montreal, P.Q., (b) Capital Concrete Products Ltd., Iroquois, Ont.; (c) Cindercrete Products Ltd., Regina, Sask.; (d) Cooper Block Ltd., Toronto, Ont.; (e) Day & Campbell Ltd., Hamilton, Ont.; (f) Deeks-McBride Ltd., Vancouver, B.C.; (g) Edmonton Concrete Block Ltd., Edmonton, Alta.; (h) General Concrete Ltd., Hamilton, Ont.; (i) Hoffman Concrete Products Ltd., Gatineau Point, P.Q.; (j) Primeau-Argo Block Co. Ltd., Cooksville, Ont.; (k) Ocean Cement, Evco division, Vancouver, B.C.; (l) Schell Industries Ltd., Woodstock, Ont.

STRAY CATTLE, SUFFIELD EXPERIMENTAL STATION, ALBERTA

Question No. 1,741—**Mr. Horner (Acadia):**

1. How many men are employed by the army at the Suffield experimental station to control stray cattle in the main operating area?
2. How many head of livestock have been impounded each year from 1957 to 1963 by the army?
3. What is the pound fee charged and total amount of fees collected?

Hon. Lucien Cardin (Associate Minister of National Defence): 1. The number of civilians employed by defence research board at the Suffield experimental station during pounding period varies from 2 to 10.

Questions

2. 1957, 500; 1958, 125; 1959, 103; 1960, 101; 1961, 1,322; 1962, 1,588; 1963, 62.

3. The pound fee is now $1 per head per day. Total pound fees collected are $1,125.10.

LIGHTHOUSE DESTRUCTION, ADVOCATE HARBOUR, N.S.

Question No. 1,743—**Mr. Coates:**

Was the old light house and other buildings associated therewith at Advocate Harbour, N.S. destroyed by officials of the Department of Transport and, if so, for what reasons?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): The old wooden building became unsafe to continue to support the automatic light and, as it was beyond economical repair, it was replaced by a steel tower.

TRADE WITH JAPAN

Question No. 1,747—**Mr. Deachman:**

1. What was the total value of goods imported from Japan in 1963?
2. What was the total value of exports to Japan in 1963?
3. What was Canada's trading position or balance with Japan for 1963?

Mr. Jean-Luc Pepin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Trade and Commerce):

1. The total value of imports into Canada from Japan during the calendar year 1963 was: $130,471,048.

2. The total value of exports from Canada to Japan during the calendar year 1963 was:

Domestic	$296,009,645
Re-exports	$ 1,885,829
Total	$297,895,474

3. The balance of trade between Canada and Japan during the calendar year 1963 was: an export balance of $167,424,426.

DEPOSIT OF INCOME TAX DEDUCTIONS IN LOAN AND CREDIT INSTITUTIONS

Question No. 1,750—**Mr. Côté (Chicoutimi):**

With reference to an announcement by the Minister of National Revenue to the effect that 300,000 Canadian employers will now be able to deposit, at their local banks, their employees' monthly income tax deductions, will the government take steps to allow small and average employers who deal with the caisses populaires and the credit unions to deposit these income tax deductions in their savings and credit co-operatives?

2. Will an agreement to this effect be made with the federations of caisses populaires and credit unions?

[*Translation*]

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue): 1 and 2. This arrangement extends only to those organizations carrying on banking business under a federal charter and which have clearing facilities.

The caisses populaires, credit unions and others which extend checking privileges to their customers may arrange with the particular bank through which such cheques are cleared to process the remittances.

[*Text*]

GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT AND ANNUAL INVESTMENT

Question No. 1,752—**Mr. Latulippe:**

1. What was the gross national product in Canada for the years 1934, 1944, 1954 and 1964?
2. What was the total annual investment in Canada during the years 1934, 1944, 1954 and 1964?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Luc Pepin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Trade and Commerce):

1.

Gross national product at market prices:

	millions of dollars
1934	3,984
1944	11,850
1954	26,871
1963	43,007
1964	not available

2.

Total private and public investment in Canada:

	millions of dollars
1934	404
1944	1,343
1954	5,721
1963	9,312
1964	not available

[*Text*]

TRADE WITH RUSSIA AND CHINA

Question No. 1,753—**Mr. Mather:**

1. What was the total value of goods imported from Russia in 1963?
2. What was the total value of goods imported from China in 1963?
3. What was the total value of goods exported to Russia in 1963?
4. What was the total value of goods exported to China in 1963?

Mr. Jean-Luc Pepin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Trade and Commerce): 1. The total value of imports into Canada from Russia during the calendar year 1963 was $2,313,012.

2. The total value of imports into Canada from mainland China during the calendar year 1963 was $5,146,500.

3. The total value of exports from Canada to Russia during the calendar year 1963 was:

Domestic	$150,122,556
Re-exports	20,070
Total	$150,142,626

4. The total value of exports from Canada to mainland China during the calendar year 1963 was:

Domestic	$104,737,695
Re-exports	251
Total	$104,737,946

*IMPORTS OF NEW FLAGS FROM JAPAN

Question No. 1,754—**Mr. Valade:**

1. How many tri-leaf flags, such as the one suggested by the present government, have been imported into the country from Japan or elsewhere?
2. What is the name and the address of each of the importers?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Luc Pepin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Trade and Commerce): 1. Flags are not classified separately as such in import statistics, and hence no figures are available. Imports are recorded of the material, but this is not broken down into the use to which the material is put.

2. Unknown—see answer to part one.

[*Text*]

*IMPORTS OF NEW FLAGS

Question No. 1,756—**Mr. Crouse:**

Will the Minister of Trade and Commerce advise if quantities of the three maple leaf flag have been imported into Canada from (a) Japan (b) other countries and, if so, what are the numbers and value of imports referred to in (a) and (b) above respectively?

Mr. Jean-Luc Pepin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Trade and Commerce): Flags are not classified separately as such in import statistics, and hence no figures are available as to quantity or source. Imports are recorded of the material but this is not broken down into the use to which the material is put.

*PRICES OF GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS, OTTAWA

Question No. 1,759—**Mr. Fisher:**

1. Is the store which sells government publications in Ottawa retailing the main report of the Rowell-Sirois commission at $6.50 when its basic price is listed at $5 and, if so, for what reasons?
2. Is the Creighton study for the same commission selling at $2 when its marked price is 75 cents and, if so, for what reasons?
3. Is the first volume of the Glassco commission report selling at $7.75 when its marked price is $6 and, if so, for what reasons?

Questions

4. On whose authority are prices increased on government publications above the list price?

Mr. J. B. Stewart (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): 1. Effective January, 1963 a 30 per cent across the board increase in selling prices was applied to all government publications.

2. The selling price of the Creighton study was originally set at 75 cents per copy when printed in 1940. The price of $2 was set on the reprint made in 1963 based on higher printing costs and in line with the pricing policy.

3. Same as (1) above.

4. Approved by T.B. minute 604954 of January 17, 1963.

SHORE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM, YARMOUTH, N.S.

Question No. 1,769—**Mr. Crouse:**

Is the government giving consideration to carrying out an improvement program along the shore line between the new government wharf and the Bluenose ferry terminal at Yarmouth, Nova Scotia and, if so, when will this program be commenced?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): Yes, the matter is now under investigation but it is not yet known when the work will be carried out.

ELECTRIC LAMP TENDERS, SCARBOROUGH TOWNSHIP, ONT.

Question No. 1,770—**Mr. Scott:**

1. Has the government received representations from the township of Scarborough public utilities commission, or from the township of Scarborough, itself, regarding the possibilities of an infraction of the Combines Investigation Act concerning tenders for electric lamps and, if so, what was the nature of the response to them?
2. As a result of these representations, was an investigation ordered under the provisions of the Combines Investigation Act and, if not, what other action was taken by the government?
3. What are the results of the said investigation pursuant to the terms of the act?

Mr. D. S. Macdonald (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): 1, 2 and 3. Such representations have been received from the public utilities commission which has been advised of the position taken by the director of investigation and research under the Combines Investigation Act on the subject of identical tenders as set out at pages 23-24 of his annual report for the year ended March 31, 1961, and in his testimony before the standing committee on public accounts of the House of Commons on December 6 and 9, 1963. The general practice, however, is that no information is given out as to whether a

particular inquiry has been or is being pursued with respect to a particular group of companies or individuals unless and until a report is published.

CONSTRUCTION OF CAUSEWAY, LABRADOR-NEWFOUNDLAND

Question No. 1,777—**Mr. Côté (Chicoutimi):**

Does the government propose to study and carry out the construction of a causeway between Labrador and Newfoundland which would join this province to the continent and to build a section of the trans-Canada highway, railway lines and electric power installations there, at the same time improving the climate of the gulf, the St. Lawrence and the Saguenay river regions, all of which at lesser cost than the St. Lawrence seaway project?

[*Translation*]

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): No.

[*Text*]

*INSPECTION OF NORTH BY MEMBERS

Question No. 1,791—**Mr. Fairweather:**

Are plans being considered which would enable members of parliament to participate in an educational and fact finding inspection of the Yukon and Northwest Territories so that they can share the advantages derived from such an experience by the recent trip of ambassadors and senior government officials?

Mr. John N. Turner (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): The minister returned last night from a working, fact finding, nine day tour of the Yukon and Northwest Territories. He was accompanied by six foreign ambassadors to Canada, the president of the Canadian Labour Congress and seven leading Canadian businessmen, in addition to some of his departmental officials and advisers. The purpose of the trip was to engage their collective experience in appraising Canada's policy in the north and to acquaint them with northern problems. The minister is considering including members of parliament on such a trip in the future.

OWNERSHIP OF WHARF, YOUNG'S COVE, N.B.

Question No. 1,792—**Mr. Fairweather:**

1. Is the wharf at Young's cove, Grand lake, New Brunswick owned by the government of Canada or of New Brunswick?
2. If the wharf is owned by Canada is it available for purchase by private individuals?

Mr. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): 1. By the government of Canada.

2. This is under consideration.

*CIVIL DEFENCE POLICY

Question No. 1,797—**Mr. Fairweather:**

Will the Minister of Industry take an early opportunity on motions to make a statement about the government's current attitude toward civil defence and if the provincial and municipal responsibility in this regard has undergone any fundamental change recently?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): A statement regarding the government's current policy in regard to civil defence will be made at the time of the study of E.M.O. estimates by the house in committee of supply.

The provincial and municipal responsibility toward civil defence has not undergone any fundamental change recently. They are requested to continue planning with a greater emphasis, however, being placed on their capability to cope with peacetime disasters.

The hon. member may wish to refer to minutes of proceedings and evidence Nos. 7 and 8 of the special committee on defence which contain a detailed statement which I made to the committee as well as a considerable amount of information about various facets of the program.

REPORTS OF RESTRICTIVE TRADE PRACTICES COMMISSION

Question No. 1,800—**Mr. Prittie:**

What is the status of the several reports of the restrictive trade practices commission to the Minister of Justice for the year 1963-64?

Mr. D. S. Macdonald (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): Reports received from the restrictive trade practices commission during the period January 1, 1963, to August 31, 1964, the date on which each was submitted and action taken thereon are as follows:

Concerning the manufacture, distribution and sale of drugs	Jan. 24, 1963.

The recommendations contained in this report together with those in the recent report of the royal commission on health services are receiving careful study and any decisions will be made known in due course in the proper way.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Of an alleged combine in the matter of a call for tenders by the town of Duvernay for the construction of sewers and water mains	Dec. 16, 1963.	Informations have been laid and the date for the preliminary hearing has been fixed for October 20, 1964.
Concerning the sale of plumbing and heating supplies and related products in the city of Montreal and elsewhere in the province of Quebec	Feb. 7, 1964.	The report and evidence have been referred to counsel with instructions to proceed with the prosecution or other proceedings unless he comes to the conclusion that the evidence is insufficient.
On the production, distribution and supply of newspapers in the Sudbury-Copper Cliff area	Feb. 26, 1964.	The commission concluded that there had not been any reprehensible monopolistic practices and therefore no abuse of a monopoly position. After discussion with counsel to whom the evidence was referred, it was decided that no proceedings would be instituted.
Concerning the distribution, supply and sale of plumbing supplies and related products (Alberta)	June 24, 1964.	Preliminary discussions have been held with counsel who is being instructed to proceed with prosecution or other proceedings unless he comes to the conclusion that the evidence is insufficient.
Road surfacing in Ontario	July 13, 1964.	The report and evidence have been referred to counsel with instructions to proceed with prosecution or other proceedings unless he comes to the conclusion that the evidence is insufficient.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

REQUEST FOR ANSWER TO QUESTION ON ORDER PAPER

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege with regard to oral question No. 1,429 put on the order paper July 6 last concerning an inquiry announced by the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) about the interdependence of various areas of Canada.

I respectfully submit that the Prime Minister's office could easily answer this question and that there is no conceivable reason why no answer has yet been given.

[*Text*]

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Acting Prime Minister): I will be glad to bring the hon. gentleman's observations to the attention of the Prime Minister's office to see whether something can be done along the lines he has suggested.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

QUEBEC—ARRESTS IN CONNECTION WITH ATTEMPTED THEFT OF ARMS

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance in connection with reports in the press to the effect that over the week end in the Montreal area a group of individuals in search of arms met resistance. Can he say whether those who were apprehended were members of the F.L.Q.? Is he in a position to say what steps the federal government is taking in view of the apparent resurgence of subversive activity and the evidence of determined and well organized forces working against law and order? Is he able to say whether any of those arrested or being sought, if not already arrested, were allied with any subversive groups in the past?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): I know the right hon. gentleman made a lapsus. I must say I am pleased to note, in the interest of Canada, that I have not been promoted to minister of finance.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I apologize to both ministers.

Mr. Favreau: I have had occasion to discuss this matter this morning, and at this moment I am in a position to give the following information. This is a Montreal city police investigation, and assistance is being rendered by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. Four men have been arrested by the Montreal city police who have not as yet released the names of those individuals; the names will not be divulged before the coroner's inquest has taken place. Investigation is being continued toward the apprehension of the one man who escaped.

In view of the stage which the investigation has reached at this point I do not think I would be justified in divulging more than I have just said.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I was wondering what possible reasons there might be for the minister not being able to tell us whether those individuals who have been arrested are or have been members of any subversive organization. If they were, that would naturally bring them within the ambit of the right of the mounted police to investigate.

Mr. Favreau: One will readily understand that if a request is made, or was made, by the police authorities immediately responsible, that is the Montreal police—although, I repeat, the R.C.M.P. are lending all possible assistance—it would not be proper for me to release any information with respect to the persons arrested, especially as one arrest still has to be made. I would point out also that the names of the parties arrested have not yet been divulged.

VISIT TO OTTAWA BY NEW ZEALAND OMBUDSMAN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): My question is also directed to the Minister of Justice. It follows some three questions I have asked in the course of the past few weeks of either the minister or the Secretary of State and relates to a distinguished guest who is visiting Canada at the present time to speak to the bar association in Montreal. I am referring to Sir Guy Powles, the New Zealand ombudsman. Are arrangements being made for Sir Guy to meet with the committee on privileges and elections? Has an invitation been extended to him?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Sir Guy Powles has been communicated with, and I am pleased to advise that arrangements are being made for him to meet with members of the committee on privileges and elections on Wednesday, September 2, at 3 p.m. There is still some formal confirmation to be obtained from the New Zealand authorities, but tentatively the engagement is set for that date.

HAL BANKS—INQUIRY AS TO WHEREABOUTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. V. Pugh (Okanagan Boundary): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Revenue and perhaps in his absence the acting minister might reply. Hal C. Banks is still a Canadian, for income tax purposes, and as it now appears that Banks has no intention of returning to Canada, at least voluntarily, has the minister taken steps to see that the assets belonging to this man are not entirely removed from Canadian jurisdistion?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Acting Minister of National Revenue): I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if I could take this question as notice.

Mr. Pugh: In taking it as notice, Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the minister that time is of the essence, and these assets may well vanish out of Canada just as the body of Hal C. Banks has vanished.

Mr. McIlraith: I am quite appreciative of the hon. member's question and its implications, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Temiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question to the Minister of Justice on the same subject.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Justice have fresh news concerning Mr. Banks' whereabouts?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I must say I have no more news now than I had the last time I replied to questions in that connection. However, I have much more information about Mr. Banks' house, which has not yet disappeared from Canada, than I have about Mr. Banks himself.

Mr. Martineau: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister got in touch with the real estate agent who looks after selling Mr. Banks' property?

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, I am not personally in charge of the investigation, but I

will say that all necessary steps are being taken to ensure that Mr. Banks does not evade directly or indirectly our Canadian laws; we are doing all we can to prevent him from doing so.

[*Text*]

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): As part of the running account regarding Mr. Banks—

Mr. Nowlan: Who is running?

Mr. MacEwan: Mr. Banks.

Mr. Diefenbaker: —is the minister in a position to say whether after all this time the R.C.M.P. have been able to ascertain from the department of immigration of the United States if the ambulant Banks went to the United States; and if so, when?

Mr. Favreau: In relation to the running account on one who is running, I am not in a position to submit further information on the question which has just been put. As soon as some is obtained I will volunteer it to the house.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Does that answer mean that the government of Canada, with all the forces it has at its command, has not yet found out from the United States authorities whether Banks crossed the line into the United States? Is that what the minister means? Because if it is, it shows there is not very much anxiety as to the whereabouts of Banks.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to enter into debate with the right hon. gentleman, but there are limits to the information which is available about the number of persons crossing the border from Canada to the United States. It is quite plausible that this type of information is much more difficult to obtain in a definite fashion than on the surface would appear.

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Might I address a related question to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. I should like to ask the minister, now that it would appear that at long last Mr. Hal Banks has disappeared from within our borders, what steps, if any, is the minister taking to make sure that he never comes back again to Canada.

Mr. Pugh: They are taking every step.

[*Translation*]

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, as I have already mentioned it to the house, any American citizen can leave Canada without having to submit a report to the immigration authorities.

On the other hand, as Mr. Banks has the status of a Canadian resident, Canadian immigration officers have been instructed to ask him, when he returns to Canada, the reason why he left the country. We will then be in a position to know, from the answers given by Mr. Banks, how his leaving the country could affect his Canadian resident status.

Mr. Martineau: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister expect Mr. Banks to be back soon?

Mr. Tremblay: We all hope so, Mr. Speaker.

[*Text*]

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

REPORTED INVESTIGATION OF HON. M. J. COLDWELL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice. My question relates to a former member of this house who is esteemed by Canadians from coast to coast. I refer to Hon. M. J. Coldwell. Are the reports correct that the R.C.M.P. has investigated Mr. Coldwell? If so, when and why?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): In view of the interest which I knew the house would have in this matter I asked the Royal Canadian Mounted Police to look up their files. A thorough search has been made, and I am pleased to report that never has the R.C.M.P. investigated Mr. Coldwell or found cause to do so.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): All of us are delighted to hear that, because it looked to me like a form of slander on the part of the person who made the statement, of a nature beneath contempt.

I would ask the hon. gentleman this. Did Macdonald, at the time he was allegedly associated as an undercover man with the R.C.M.P., take an oath of secrecy?

Mr. Favreau: This, as the right hon. gentleman will agree, is a totally different question from the one which was just put to me by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. As far as this question is concerned, I must stand by the answer I gave last week; because whatever answer I might otherwise give would either expressly or implicitly confirm

or deny any allegation made by Mr. Macdonald.

ARTS, LETTERS AND SCIENCES

TORONTO—CANADA COUNCIL GRANT TO CREST THEATRE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): I have a question for the Secretary of State. In his absence perhaps I might address it to the acting minister. Has the Secretary of State made representation to the Canada Council toward continuing its grant to the Crest theatre, Toronto, the pioneer in modern Canadian theatre and the training ground for many of our stage and television personalities?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): I will be glad to bring this matter to the attention of the Secretary of State so that he in turn may bring it to the attention of the Canada Council. The hon. gentleman will realize that the constitution of the Canada Council is such that the government can do nothing except pass on representations.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

COMPLAINT RESPECTING CONDUCT OF PROTECTIVE STAFF

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. Chester MacRae (York-Sunbury): I wish to address a question to the Minister of Justice in his capacity as leader of the house. I would have preferred to address it to you, Mr. Speaker, but the rules forbid my doing so. It is in connection with a letter which appeared in the Saturday, August 29 edition of the Ottawa *Citizen* over the name of Mr. John Thompson, assistant editor of the Lake of Two Mountains *Gazette*. In this letter statements are made about the protective staff of the House of Commons. They are referred to as "pompous asses", as using threats and intimidation, abusive language, and so on.

In view of the fact that this staff deals with up to 15,000 people a day, and all of us who have been here for a number of years have found them to be competent and courteous, will the minister investigate these charges with a view to refuting them?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): I do not think I need make an investigation in order to refute these charges. I do so right now.

Mr. Speaker: I should like to make one statement of fact. The average attendance this summer has been in the neighbourhood of

6,000 a day. Frequently on week ends it has reached well over 15,000 a day, and the overall attendance has approached 700,000 tourists this year as compared with half a million last year.

INQUIRY AS TO ABSENCE OF MINISTERS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Acting Prime Minister. Would he tell the house how many of the 13 ministers absent today have gone to Charlottetown?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Acting Prime Minister): I think most of the absent ministers have gone to Japan. The Prime Minister has gone to Charlottetown and my hon. friend the Minister of Justice really should have gone with him, but his devotion to the house was such that he is not going until tomorrow.

Mr. Martineau: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister say where the other ministers who are absent have gone?

Mr. Pickersgill: I would be glad to take a census, Mr. Speaker, and let the hon. gentleman know tomorrow. Most of them are here.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether I might be permitted to supplement the answer I gave a few moments ago. I should have added that my hon. friend the Solicitor General did not go to Prince Edward Island with the Prime Minister. He is there to receive him, as I am sure all hon. members would consider appropriate in the circumstances.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

USE OF MAILS FOR DISSEMINATION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION LITERATURE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Postmaster General. Last week I addressed a question to the minister asking whether his department was giving consideration to making illegal the distribution of "hate" literature without the return address being on the outside of the envelope, and the minister said he would give a report to the house on this matter.

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, the investigation is not completed. In further reply to the hon. member, however I might say that there is a quasi-judicial investigation involved in all these

cases. You have to know the contents of letters before you can determine whether or not their contents are scurrilous or indecent in character. Since you cannot find out what is inside until the letter is open it is very difficult to legislate in this particular field. The matter is under careful consideration not only by my department but by the Department of Justice. However, since each case really has to be determined on its own merits, it is practically impossible to give any general answer to this problem.

AVAILABILITY OF STAMPS BEARING LIKENESS OF QUEEN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. A. Webb (Hastings-Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Postmaster General. Is there any reason why in various post offices the only 5 cent stamp available is the one with the three maple leaves on it, and customers cannot get stamps bearing the Queen's head?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member's question I can only say that the three maple leaves appear in the Canadian coat of arms, and I think it is proper that they should appear on a stamp. It is the emblem of Canada and the base on which our coat of arms rests. This issue has gone out as the first of a series of 13 which feature the floral designs of the provinces and the territories. The maple leaves design is the first of this series and we have already had the trillium of Ontario and the garden lily of Quebec.

An hon. Member: Don't forget B.C.

Mr. Nicholson: No, B.C. is on my list, as well as the violet of my native province of New Brunswick, the trailing arbutus—mayflower—of Nova Scotia and the dogwood of British Columbia. All post offices should have, in addition to three maple leaves stamps, a supply of stamps with the Queen's head on them, but I will certainly look into the matter as suggested by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. Webb: A supplementary question. I thank the Postmaster General for his answer, but he assured me similarly a couple of weeks ago. However, during the past couple of weeks the city of Hamilton has been flooded with the new stamp, and at the main post office and at two branch post offices there are no 5 cent stamps available except the ones bearing the maple leaves.

Mr. Nicholson: The hon. gentleman will remember that when he put the question some 10 or 12 days ago I said that if he or any other member of the house or any other person has information that stamps with the Queen's head on them are not available to let me know. To date I have received no such communication from any member of the house.

ISSUE OF NEW STAMP WITH INSCRIPTION "QUÉBEC LIBRE"

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question I should like to direct to the Postmaster General. A question was asked of the Postmaster General about the use of official mails in Quebec without the necessary stamps. I understood the minister at that time to say he was going to look into this situation and possibly report further.

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, so far as I know there is no free use being made of the mails, other than by franking privileges enjoyed by members of parliament and a right of use conferred by statute. There is a free mailing privilege given by statute to certain newspapers in respect of mailings within specific distances of their places of publication. I have had no notice of any situation such as that referred to by the hon. member, but if he will give me particulars I will be glad to look into it.

Hon. Théogène Ricard (St. Hyacinthe-Bagot): Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw to the attention of the hon. minister the fact that I gave him a sample of the situation the other day.

Mr. Nicholson: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member has read *Hansard* he should know that I gave him an answer.

TRADE

CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT—SALES TO RUSSIA BY CANADIAN SUBSIDIARIES OF U.S. COMPANIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I was intending to address my question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, but I trust I will get an answer from the appropriate minister here today. In view of the fact that American owned Canadian manufacturers of heavy construction equipment have been instructed by their United States parent companies not to sell the Soviet union any of their products which appear on the United States embargo list, which

action has also prevented this Canadian industry from being represented at Moscow's current exhibition of construction and building machinery, will the minister inform the house of the government's attitude toward this unwarranted interference in Canadian affairs, and whether a protest has been forwarded to Washington?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce): I think the attitude of the Canadian government is well known, namely that Canadian corporations should be free to sell around the world, governed by and in accordance with Canadian government policy; and that there is and will continue to be the most strenuous resistance to endeavours of outsiders to control the sales activities of manufacturers of Canadian products. I am not aware of the particular circumstances raised by the hon. gentleman and will be glad to have them looked into.

NON PARTICIPATION BY CANADA IN GHANA FAIR

On the orders of the day:

Hon. C. M. Drury (Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, a question was directed by the hon. member for Wellington South to the Minister of Trade and Commerce on August 26 relating to participation by Canada in the forthcoming trade fair at Accra.

In response to the question raised by the hon. member I wish to inform him that serious consideration was given to the invitation to participate in the trade fair to be held in Accra in February, 1965. A relevant consideration was that in February, 1962, the department held an all-Canadian trade exhibition in Accra on behalf of 87 Canadian manufacturing firms. In the light of this, and having in mind the need to ensure maximum results from our trade fair exhibits and the relative priorities of the Canadian export community in the Canadian trade fair program, it was not considered appropriate to participate in this particular fair.

GRAIN

ESTABLISHMENT OF PRICES FOR WHEAT AND COARSE GRAINS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. C. M. Drury (Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, on August 25 the hon. member for Melville asked how soon the Canadian wheat board might release the purchase prices for wheat and coarse grains. I am glad to be able to say that the Canadian wheat board have advised that information on prices has been forwarded to the elevator companies, and this information should be in the hands of all elevator agents at the beginning of this week. Agents will make payment to producers for quantities of grain in storage since the beginning of the crop year as soon as the information on prices is received.

PUBLIC SERVICE

PROTESTS RESPECTING RECENT SALARY INCREASES

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rémi Paul (Berthier-Maskinongé-Delanaudière): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Acting Prime Minister. Does he know if the Prime Minister received, last Friday, from the national association of employees of the unemployment insurance commission, in convention in Toronto, a telegram of protest against the recent salary increases granted civil servants? If so, can he tell the house if the government intends to do something about the request of that important group of civil servants?

[*Text*]

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to look at that question and see what reply can be made tomorrow.

AGRICULTURE

CHATHAM, ONT.—PROPOSED CLOSING OF ENTOMOLOGICAL LABORATORY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent, Ont.): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture, but in his absence perhaps the parliamentary secretary will take it as notice. My question is based on local reports of last week concerning the proposed closing of the dominion entomological laboratory at Chatham, Ontario, by the Department of Agriculture. My question is, will the minister assure the house that no firm decision will be made by his department in this regard until ample opportunity has been given to the local agricultural groups affected to present to the minister the reasons for their opposition to the closing of this laboratory?

Mr. B. S. Beer (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the hon. member for his question. I will bring it to the attention of the minister on his return.

ATTENDANCE OF FORESTRY MINISTER AT RURAL REDEVELOPMENT MEETING

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Hon. Théogène Ricard (St. Hyacinthe-Bagot): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Forestry.

Could he tell the house whether he attended during the last week end an organization meeting of a rural redevelopment committee?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): Mr. Speaker, Saturday and Sunday I was in Gaspé to attend the first general conference of the regional council of economic development for the Gaspé peninsula and the Magdalen islands.

[*Text*]

BRIDGES

SAINT JOHN, N.B.—ASSISTANCE FROM ATLANTIC DEVELOPMENT BOARD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Albert): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Acting Prime Minister in his capacity as spokesman for the Atlantic development board. Since Saint John has an application before the board for assistance for a harbour bridge, and since we learned today that Halifax has decided in favour of a second bridge, would the minister check on the Saint John application and see whether grants for second bridges could not be made to both these major cities? I ask this because the board, although Conservative formed, is becoming more liberal every day in its distribution of contracts.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I do not need to make any check; I know quite well the status of the matter. The Atlantic development board has made certain recommendations to the government which are under active consideration at this very moment. That is with respect to Saint John; there has been no application with respect to a second bridge in Halifax.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

TORONTO, ONT.—DENIAL OF BENEFITS TO STRIKING NEWSPAPER EMPLOYEES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, I had a question for the Minister of Labour but I notice that neither he nor his parliamentary secretary is in the chamber at the moment. Perhaps the Acting Prime Minister would ask the minister to give the house an explanation as to why the members of the international typographical union now on strike in Toronto are being refused eligibility for unemployment insurance benefits.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I could not answer that offhand, but I will be glad to draw the matter to the attention of the minister.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

TRAINING IN CANADA OF TROOPS OF NATO COUNTRIES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of National Defence whether arrangements have been made, or are being made, for special training for troops from Germany or others of our NATO allies at Camp Shilo, Manitoba.

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, there are no arrangements that I know of. There are some negotiations, however, in respect to the possible testing of some equipment in a winter environment.

Mr. Churchill: May I ask by whom?

Mr. Hellyer: By the German army.

REPORTED DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION TO COMMUNIST AGENCY

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Associate Minister of National Defence. Will he make inquiries about a statement made by a Mr. Macdonald to the effect that a wireless operator in his department would have given secret information to a communist agency in this country?

Hon. Lucien Cardin (Associate Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I have not seen Mr. Macdonald's statement, but I shall be glad to investigate.

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*Text*]

CANADIAN FLAG

OPPORTUNITY FOR AMENDMENTS RESPECTING ALTERNATIVE DESIGNS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question either to the house leader or to the Acting Prime Minister. Will the government consider giving the house the assurance, when the votes on the subamendment and the amendment which are now before the house have been taken, that there will be no motion, on the government side at any rate, for the previous question before the various parties have had an opportunity by amendment to test the house on alternative designs? I have in mind such proposals as those from the hon. member for Nicolet-Yamaska, the hon. member for Danforth, and so on. I ask my question in the belief that if there were this kind of assurance there might be a willingness to let some of the votes take place.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that the hon. gentleman has put a hypothetical question which normally would not be answered at all, but the hon. gentleman had the assurance of the Prime Minister before this debate began that there would be an opportunity for all hon. members to express the views they wish to express. It is a fact—a notorious fact—that some of the hon. gentleman's friends wish to propose a design different from the design proposed by my right hon. friend. I would not like to think that a Liberal government would want to deny them the chance of doing so, any more than a Liberal government would want to deny to any hon. member in any part of the house the chance to express in a vote his views on this matter.

IMMIGRATION

ITALY—IMPRISONMENT OF CANADIAN CITIZENS REFUSING MILITARY SERVICE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. Has the minister been informed that Canadian citizens of Italian origin of military age, who on occasion return to Italy for a holiday, have been thrown in "chokey" if they did not answer the call for military service in Italy?

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): No. Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of that, but I will make an inquiry and report to the hon. member.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

CALVIN MACDONALD—REPORTED LISTING AS COMMUNIST

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. Chester MacRae (York-Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Veterans Affairs. Has the minister's attention been drawn to a statement made by Mr. Calvin Macdonald that the Department of Veterans Affairs has listed him as a communist and because of this he has been unable to obtain work for two years? I ask this question of the minister because this is completely foreign to this department and its objectives.

Hon. Roger Teillet (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge of the circumstances, but I will certainly make an inquiry into them.

SHIPPING

REMOVAL OF WRECKS FROM WATERS NEAR BRUCE PENINSULA

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I should like in my capacity as Minister of Transport to reply to a question the hon. member for Bruce asked me a few days ago—which will be found at pages 7062 and 7063 of *Hansard*—about the *Maitland Clipper,* which the hon. member said was removing antique wrecks of historic value from the waters off the shores of the Bruce peninsula.

I am informed that this ship is under charter to Treasure and Salvage Divers Limited, and that they have been informed that the Canada Shipping Act does not enable the department to grant or withhold permission to engage in salvaging, but any wreck recovered must be delivered to the receiver so that it may be disposed of in accordance with the Canada Shipping Act. I am also informed that the activities of the vessel are under careful surveillance.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION OF IMMIGRATION AND JUSTICE ESTIMATES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Justice in his position as

house leader. Will he consider bringing forward the estimates of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration and the Department of Justice at an early date so we may look into matters of major importance concerning new Canadians, in the light of certain policies of the government that in my view put us on the verge of being a police state? Would he arrange for early discussion of these estimates?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, the estimates of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration have been called already and they have been discussed. I think it is in the interests of the country that I should pursue the policy I have begun to apply of calling a new department each Friday so that members will have the chance to deal with important and urgent questions with respect to each of the departments at least for one day, pending such time as we finally dispose of the estimates.

Mr. Winch: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister call his own department?

Mr. Favreau: I am afraid my own department is not entered yet, and the supply motion in this respect has not been presented to the house. I should like my estimates to be included, and as soon as the next supply motion comes forward I think they will be.

CANADIAN FLAG

OFFICIAL ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW DESIGN

The house resumed, from Thursday, August 27, consideration of the motion of Mr. Pearson:

> 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 the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Diefenbaker, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. More.

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in this marathon debate in the sure and certain knowledge that many of the points I wish to make have already been made, and that some of my brilliant ideas may have already been committed to the permanent record; but I think my ideas on this subject should be placed on record. I shall be using half an hour of parliament's time, whatever that represents in money, and as repetition has always been rather abhorrent to me I hope I shall not say again many of the things that have already been said. Yet I am not completely out of sympathy with the prolongation of this debate until some semblance of sanity takes command of the situation.

For those who are not completely satisfied or not satisfied at all with the proposed flag, what other alternative is there but to continue to raise objections to the form in which this flag is proposed and to indicate that one more member at least has very strong views in this regard? I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that there is a certain amount of impatience in the country, in the press and even among members of the house with the extension of this debate beyond what seems to be a reasonable time, and on an issue that has nothing to do with our economic or social problems. I share this impatience, but the alternative of total surrender appeals to me even less.

The Prime Minister, who achieved public notice originally for his diplomatic ability, seems to have found one issue which he cannot or will not negotiate. I can understand his fears with regard to giving in a little and then a little more and finally becoming overwhelmed with objections to his plan. I see the position of the Prime Minister at the moment as somewhat like that of the driver of a team of runaway horses, hanging onto the reins with both hands and afraid to let go one hand so he can pull on the brake which would save him. This is a simile which is familiar in many stagecoach westerns, but it strikes me that it represents the present situation exactly. The brake in this case is a better procedure for establishing a distinctive Canadian flag than by a simple majority vote in the House of Commons on a single flag design. I hope the brake will be found before the whole stagecoach overturns.

All of us, I believe, are affected by our racial and historical backgrounds in our approach to the question of a flag. My ancesters came to this country from northern Ireland 115 years ago. They brought with them at that time a strong loyalty to the crown and to the empire, as it then was. That loyalty has continued to be strong in the subsequent generations, and is strong in the riding which I represent. It is not unanimous in my riding but it is a strong feeling, and I find myself in the rather fortunate position, which some other hon. members do not seem to enjoy, of being able to speak for my riding in one voice as my constituents would have me speak. I am thinking particularly of other

hon. members who feel they should speak as they think the decision should be made regardless of whether it is in agreement with the feelings of their own people or their own personal beliefs.

In spite of the backgrounds that all of us have brought to Canada, I think I speak for everyone when I say there is only one ultimate loyalty, and can only be one ultimate loyalty, and that is to Canada. I am sure I speak for all my constituents and for a good many, if not all, Canadians when I say that.

Most of our people have come to accept the red ensign as the flag of Canada, not because it bears the union jack but because it is our flag. The difference may seem to be subtle but it is very real. I believe this is where a lot of the problem originates; not because it is a flag with the union jack, or whatever there might have been on the flag we learned to respect in school and later, but because it is our flag. That is one of the reasons it is difficult to get a change of opinion among many people as to what the new flag should be or whether we should have one.

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that most of the people I represent would accept another flag, in spite of their personal preferences, if it had general acceptance and would unite our country in its goals. That is my own position. It must by now be apparent that the proposed new flag in the main resolution does not carry the general support either of the house or of the public. From what I have heard it carries the majority in the house, at least if the votes that have been indicated are correct, but that does not mean that it carries general acceptance. The majority is not enough in this country, and it never has been.

The rights of the minorities were strongly protected at the time of confederation. They were protected to the point where it was one of the basic tenets of Canadian confederation that the majority should never be able to overrule the minority on any of the questions which concerned the person, the individual. This is the basis of confederation; therefore in this particular issue the question of a flag which affects each one in a personal way cannot be settled by a simple majority vote.

The best evidence of the fact that the flag does not command a great and overwhelming enthusiasm in Canada is the effort of the Minister without Portfolio to drum up support for it. It has been very obvious in the last few days, from the questions and the answers received to them, that there is not the acceptance in Canada of the flag the government would like to see, particularly if the minister has to go out and sell it after it has been flown in so many places. I have seen it on car aerials; everyone has seen it. Surely it does not have to be sold. If it has to be sold then I cannot see that it has any general acceptance.

It is my own personal view that Canada should have a new, distinctive flag, and that before 1967. Furthermore, I am confident that a design can be found which will be generally acceptable. I have seen several proposals and I really believe some of these have the strength, the design, the purpose, and the historic symbols which would be acceptable. I only mention in passing the type of proposal made by the hon. member for Nicolet-Yamaska. Perhaps it is not completely acceptable as it stands, yet it represents something that could join us together. There are others also. I have seen several designs, and I am not picking one or the other. However, I do believe that such a design exists, a design which would satisfy those who want to retain the elements of the British background, and those who want a new flag. I think it can be found, and I am going to propose how it should be done.

To speak for a moment of the Canadian red ensign, I have taken a consistent view throughout this debate and in my public statements that unless and until some other acceptable design is found, the red ensign must remain and continue as the flag of Canada. We have to do this. We cannot exchange, as has already been stated by several hon. members, one group of dissatisfied Canadians with another. There is no future in that.

I have one other belief which I want to state. Some may believe it heresy, but I do not believe that our boys in the services fought and died for a flag. I believe they fought and died for their country, and I stood beside enough of them to know. However, I know they did fight under the red ensign, and there is no reason to haul it down unless it can be replaced by something which will give us what they died for, and that is a greater and better country.

I would like to make a few comments about what I believe to be the real and fundamental cause of our differences and difficulties in connection with the flag. I want to ask first whether all this fuss over a flag is over the flag alone, or does it represent something deeper? I believe the hard core of the difficulties in this matter is exactly the same as it was at confederation 100 years ago, and 100 years before that. It is exemplified in the views of those people who see the development of Canada as a struggle for the

ascendancy of one racial group over the other; and in spite of 100 years of partnership there has been precious little willingness or ability to bridge our differences. The proof of this belief is that the presence or absence of the union jack in a new flag is the real point of difference. Unless there is some unanimity of thought and some great desire to build a better nation, I do not think we can get together on this problem.

It has been said earlier in this debate that Canadian unity is an objective of this new flag. I ask, where are we to find this unity? Certainly it is not in forcing the choice of a majority upon an unwilling minority by a parliamentary vote. Neither is it in asking the people to make a decision on one or two designs chosen by political parties. Neither is it to be found by forcing the view of the majority on a minority by means of a plebiscite on stated questions or on stated flags. I believe we should first find out whether Canadians generally want a new flag. If so, then parliament will have to set up a committee to make an irrevocable decision. I believe such a committee should be an extraordinary one set up to deal with an extraordinary situation. It should be broadly based, and it should represent the many conflicting views held across this country. A time limit would have to be set upon the deliberations of such a committee—

Mr. Godin: Would the hon. member permit a question? Does he not realize that this was done 20 years ago, when a committee sat for two years on this question of a national flag?

Mr. Aiken: Yes, I realize that; and I realize that after it had sat, the Liberal government of that day decided to take no action on the recommendation. I think that answers the question. The committee voted 23 to 1 in favour of a certain flag but the government would not accept it. The wrong approach was taken; there was no prior agreement to accept the decision of that committee. I would ask the hon. member, if he has not already made his contribution to the debate, to make it after I have sat down.

Mr. Godin: On a question of privilege I must advise the hon. member that I had occasion to make a speech on this issue, but I do not wish to take part in the filibuster.

Mr. Churchill: How many years ago? Twenty years ago?

An hon. Member: In this debate.

Mr. Aiken: The hon. member has used the word "filibuster". That expression was used on several occasions by the Minister of Trade and Commerce when he made his speech recently. I took the trouble to look up "filibuster" in the dictionary to find out what it really meant. I was considering using the same word myself; because if we are conducting a filibuster I think we should admit it. But we are not. This is not a filibuster. I intend to read to the hon. member the definition of "filibuster" and perhaps he will understand that he is using the word incorrectly. As described in Webster's third edition it means "the use of extreme dilatory tactics by individuals or groups in an attempt to delay action by a majority in an assembly".

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

An hon. Member: Precisely.

Mr. Aiken: I disagree entirely with the hon. member about that. I say there have not been extreme dilatory tactics used. Some members opposite do not want to have a debate on the flag. They wish us to simply vote on it. But I think this is one of the most important issues to have come before this parliament for many years.

Mr. Godin: Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Aiken: I do not intend to get into a debate with the hon. member. He will have a chance to make his contribution when I sit down.

Mr. Godin: It might be helpful to the hon. member if he were to listen to me. It might shorten his speech.

Mr. Aiken: I did not hear that last comment, but I assume I did not miss very much.

An hon. Member: Nor did anybody else.

Mr. Godin: Why refuse to hear it?

Mr. Aiken: I shall continue by saying this. I know some of my colleagues in this chamber are anxious to have a new flag. They will say that a committee would merely cause delay and result in no action being taken. They are looking back, as is the hon. member for Nickel Belt, to a previous Liberal administration 20 years ago.

Mr. Godin: On a question of privilege.

Mr. Aiken: There is no question of privilege.

Mr. Godin: I think the truth should be known. The committee which sat 20 years ago was not a Liberal committee.

Mr. Aiken: I should like to know what kind of a government it was, then. Other words have been used to describe it, but I thought it was headed by a Liberal prime minister.

Mr. Godin: To be completely truthful about this, the committee referred to by the hon. member was not a Liberal committee; it was a house committee composed of members of all parties.

Mr. Herridge: As a member of that committee I must inform the house that it had a Liberal majority.

Mr. Aiken: I thank the hon. member for Kootenay West. Not only did the committee have a Liberal majority, but so did the house. I only wish to say to those who think nothing would happen, that it would be much better if two years from now we were to have a unified country than it would be to have a divided country with a new flag. I think that is the essence of the problem now. Furthermore, if the fear of delay is so great, is that not an admission that there is something to be lost and that there are arguments against the adoption of a new flag?

I wish to conclude my remarks by outlining my views on the vote which will take place when the debate on the subamendment is completed. In order to do this I will have to express my views on the main motion and the amendment, not in detail but in summary. As I stated, I do not believe the proposed new flag has the general support of the people of Canada, and I shall be obliged to oppose the main motion. I can support the amendment because it is broad enough to include my proposition that we should determine the single question whether or not a new flag is wanted by the people of Canada.

The subamendment contains four proposed questions, none of which include the question I should like to see proposed, that is, the alternative that another flag may be considered and another design substituted. The four questions which are there relate only to the proposed flag and to the retention of the red ensign. However, the wording of the subamendment reads "that among the questions to be placed before the people" shall be the four which are detailed. I think this does not exclude the suggestion I have made, and I shall be able to support it. I should, of course, like if possible to support the subamendment moved by my hon. friend from Regina City.

In conclusion may I say we are engaged in a debate. The hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate at the end of the question period repeated words which the Prime Minister had used earlier. He said he wanted every member of the house to have an opportunity to express his views on this subject. If this is the case, Mr. Speaker, how on earth can it be called a filibuster? I do not believe I am engaging in a filibuster; but if it is a filibuster, and if it will produce some change in the obstinate stand the Prime Minister has taken on his three maple leaf flag, then I am privileged to have been a part of it.

Mr. John Loney (Bruce): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in support of the subamendment before the house I do so as an elected representative whose responsibility is, I feel, to convey to this parliament the consensus within the riding and on behalf of the people within that riding. It is my intention to vote in favour of the subamendment moved by the hon. member for Regina City and seconded by the hon. member for Selkirk, the subamendment being that the amendment be amended by adding thereto the words:

> And that in any such plebiscite, among the questions to be placed before the people should be the following:
>
> 1. Are you in favour of the Canadian red ensign?
> 2. Are you in favour of the Canadian red ensign with changes made thereon to show the main heritage of both founding races?
> 3. Are you in favour of the three maple leaves design?
> 4. Are you in favour of a one maple leaf design?

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this motion I will endeavour on behalf of my constituents to convey not only their feeling of support for the Canadian red enstign, but I will also strive to assure them of their rightful opportunity to declare their choice, whatever it may be, concerning a national flag.

In addressing myself to this motion I would refer to a statement reported in the Canadian edition of *Time* of March 15, 1963, which states that the Prime Minister at a press conference for foreign language editors in Toronto, when replying to the question "What would happen if the Liberals failed to achieve a majority", had this to say; "In that very unlikely event, all good men will have to come to the aid of the country". I repeat that statement made by the leader of a minority government, that in the unlikely event of that result all good men would have to come to the aid of the country, and I say that statement was never more applicable than it is today.

If the Prime Minister was sincere in his concern for all good men and women; if he was sincere in his desire to maintain unity and shape the destiny of our great nation for

generations to come, then I say the Prime Minister should heed his own words and let the people come to the aid of the country and voice their opinion concerning a national flag. Never before in the history of Canada has such an issue affected so many people. Never before has an issue become so emotional, and never have so many people expressed their opinions pro and con, or actively taken a stand or engaged in a campaign to support the issue, which is the choice of a new, distinctive Canadian flag.

I contend, Mr. Speaker, that the flag which flies over the Canadian people, whatever that flag may be, should be a flag chosen by the people, a flag that the people respect, a flag that the people consider represents our democratic freedoms and our way of life; a distinctive flag, representative of the history and heritage which we cherish; not a flag chosen by a political leader, a flag purported, rightly or wrongly, to be the personal choice of one man, a flag which is now considered to be merely a political pennant; not a design accepted, mistakenly, as a tangible form of appeasement to a group who desire only, and with justification, to attain recognition of their culture and heritage and who strive to attain national unity which will afford them the respect and recognition they so justly deserve as one of the two founding races in early Canada. Mr. Speaker, I quote an excerpt from the Amherst *Daily News* of Friday, December 29, 1961:

Q. You say the Liberals are working on a design.

Mr. Pearson replied:

Oh, there are hundreds of designs. But it would be the responsibility of government to make up its mind which design it would submit to parliament.

Q. How would you poll the people on this?

To this question the Prime Minister replied:

We would poll the people when we have a general election. And if they don't like the idea of a distinctive Canadian flag which can't be mistaken for that of any other country, they'll let us know in no uncertain terms.

If the government would agree to this method I am sure the Prime Ministers words would be very well justified. The people are desirous of making known their feelings in no uncertain terms. At the outset of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I stated that it was my intention to assure the constituents in my riding that they will have their rightful opportunity to declare their choice concerning a national flag. This opportunity can only be afforded through a national plebiscite. To vote in support of the motion I feel is the only democratic procedure this parliament can follow to determine the right action which will legislate for time to come a flag emblazoned by accepted symbols, a Canadian flag of the people and chosen by the people.

In urging that this issue be placed before the people for their decision I wish to present certain communications from the riding I represent, that will substantiate the stand I have taken in support of this motion. The first communication states:

I wish to register my plea with you to uphold the red ensign as Canada's flag.

Please do all in your power to give everyone a chance to voice their wishes by voting on this issue.

I would repeat that request, Mr. Speaker:

Please do all in your power to give everyone a chance to voice their wishes by voting on this issue.

The following letter is from the Cape Croker Indian reserve:

As a member of the Cape Croker L.O.B.A. 1132, in your riding, I wish to state my stand in defence of our Canadian ensign.

Our flag, the ensign, is a truly distinctive Canadian flag. The red background challenges any country in the world to try to better our freedom, equality and democracy. The union jack in the honour position honours all treaties, alliances and pacts up to the present day, and the Canadian coat of arms flying freely in the field signifies the freedom and equality of all people in this great country.

We do have a democracy. We do have the right to vote. No one man or one man's parliament can decide Canada's future or fate. The fact that Mr. Pearson does not choose to accept this Canadian way of life is certainly sufficient reason for knowing that his choice of a flag would not be fit for democratic, freedom loving Canadians.

I reiterate what has been said before. We do have a democracy. We do have the right to vote. No one man or one man's parliament can decide Canada's future or fate. A veteran who wrote this letter to me had this to say:

As a Canadian citizen and a resident of Bruce county, I feel it my duty to write to you and express my feelings, and my family's feelings, regarding all the "bunk" and "ballyhoo" about a Canadian flag. We already have a Canadian flag, a copy of which I enclose.

It is recognized as well as any flag as the "Canadian flag". When our convoy arrived in Scotland in November, 1941 the first thing I noticed in the harbour was a green maple leaf on the funnel of a ship and our Canadian flag, the red ensign, at the mast. Long may she fly.

Are we to deny this veteran the right to vote in support of his choice of a national flag, a right for which he fought, served and sacrificed during the last war? Many Canadians will never be persuaded or convinced

to accept a flag other than the flag which now flies proudly over our land. For many, such as the mother who wrote this next letter, there must be the opportunity to confirm their opinion at the polls:

I feel very strongly that the Canadian red ensign represents so much common sacrifice that we cannot sit idly by and see some other flag forced on us by any minority group. Therefore we trust that you, our elected representative, will use your good influence to bring this matter to the attention of those concerned. One of my sons sacrificed his life under this flag of ours and I feel I want no other.

No personal political pennant would ever be accepted by this proud mother.

By conducting a plebiscite we will give to those Canadians other than the descendants of the two founding races the opportunity to exercise the freedoms and rights which are theirs; the freedom to make their own decision and the right to endorse the same, either as native born Canadians or as new Canadians who have attained citizenship in the land of their choice.

One group of Canadians, Mr. Speaker, which must be heard and considered by the administration of this country is the Indians. I represent two Indian reserves in my riding, and they feel that the flag proposed by the Prime Minister completely ignores the flag under which their treaties and pacts were signed. Vernon Jones, a former chief of the Cape Croker band, thinks all Canadians should have an opportunity to accept or reject it. This Indian constituent has been most adamant in expressing his feelings. He says:

We are looking forward to retaining our flag the red ensign. We are natives of this country and have great respect for the flag which we went through two world wars under, so I say hands off the red ensign. We are known as the red men or red race, so I feel we are represented on the ensign. So I am writing you hoping that French flag will never fly because we are not represented anywhere on it. We have not yet surrendered and that is all the white flag means to me.

So we are asking you to ask Mr. Pearson to forget about his flag, because we don't see how he can fly it without some bloodshed. Some of us are willing to fight and die for our flag and Mr. Pearson wouldn't want discontent in this country.

Another letter which I have received from an Indian reserve sets out in some detail the concern of the Indian for the retention of the red ensign and the union jack. This letter says:

Dear Sir:

It is with great concern that I view what I call the Pearson flag. Looking back in history, the Indians of Canada have, with good reason, fought for the union jack and the red ensign.

[Mr. Loney.]

In the war of 1812 we fought for the British. The world war of 1914-18. The last world war of 1939-45. In the above mentioned wars many of our people did not come back. The transition of the independence of Canada was not felt by our white neighbour as it was by the Indian. As an example, while the supreme tribunal was the privy council of England, we felt secure that an independent tribunal was or had the guardianship of our treaties.

Since the Supreme Court of Canada became the final court, the Indian has lost the right given him under the Jay treaty, agreed upon by the British crown, the United States and the Indians of North America (treaty No. 166).

When this treaty was presented to the Supreme Court of Canada, it was nullified, on the grounds that the war of 1812 nullified all treaties between the U.S.A. and Canada.

Although that war did not directly concern the Indians they are the ones who paid the penalty.

All or most of our treaties end with: these provisions are to hold good, as long as grass grows, the water flows and as long as the British government is in existence. If the union jack is deleted from the Canadian ensign it may be disastrous to the rights guaranteed the Indian by that flag.

The people will not accept a flag without voicing their opinions either by a vote or through the representations of their member of parliament. Yet we had been told at one time by the Prime Minister that we must accept his flag or he would take this issue to the country. Why, if the government are not afraid to face an election over this issue, do they endeavour to suppress the representations made by members on behalf of constituents who favour other than the three maple leaves design? If they are confident that this is the design favoured by a majority of Canadians, why then do they fear expressions of support for another flag by members from this side of the house and label them as filibustering? I have had letters from constituents stating that the writer will not respect in any way a flag considered to have been rammed down the throats of the people.

If we are a true democracy, then we must have the mandate of the people. If we have a parliamentary government, then we must place this issue before those who sent us here. If there is to be justice and tolerance, then all Canadians must be allowed equal opportunity to their opinions. And if there is freedom of the individual then we who sit in this house must ensure that freedom will be upheld.

Like my colleagues I have received many letters and petitions with regard to this issue. Are the Prime Minister and those who sit on the other side of the house going to ignore these expressions of public opinion, such as those voiced by the Royal Canadian Legion and the Legion women's auxiliary, organizations like the I.O.D.E., women's institutes and other church groups? Will the protests of the

Canadian corps, the Canadian patriotic association and ethnic groups go unheeded? What reply will be given to those who express personal opinions or actively support a flag other than the three leaves design?

I refer now to the many individuals who have seen fit to contact their member of parliament: the elderly in the nursing home, the war widow, the farmer, the new Canadian and ministers of the church. Many of these communications, such as the following, are brief and to the point:

Dear Sir:

I am not one of those ungrateful Canadians of British ancestry who would care to dump the red ensign, rather I would like to retain it as our national flag.

Communications such as I have read at this time have continued to come in as this debate has progressed, and they run to many pages. Of the many petitions, letters and resolutions among them, there is a common expression for the retention of the red ensign and a desire for the opportunity of expressing opinions at the polls. This resolution of the ladies auxiliary says:

We the members of the ladies auxiliary of the Canadian Legion would like to voice our opinion of our flag.

We would like the red ensign flown over Canada for our flag, always.

I have a copy of a letter which was addressed to the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) which reads:

The undersigned lodge of the ladies Orange benevolent association duly moved and resolved, we petition you Mr. Prime Minister, and the government of the dominion of Canada in respect to Canada's flag.

We do petition herewith, and desire it to be known it is our firm desire to keep the union jack as the flag of Canada. If a distinctive flag must be adopted, let the Canadian ensign, which has already become known around the world, be the one chosen.

The ladies Orange benevolent association continues to loyally support Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, Queen of Canada and the flag of our empire, our beloved union jack.

Requesting your due consideration to the above resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I have endeavoured to convey the feelings in the riding of Bruce. Speaking personally, I would repeat in this chamber what I said recently in a speech regarding the flag—for those who served under this flag I have respect and appreciation for their sacrifice in defence of our country. This is the flag under which I myself would be proud to serve, and as a father I would be proud to see my sons serve under the flag which is recognized as being symbolic of the Dominion of Canada since 1867.

Mr. Speaker, I stand firm in my support of the Canadian red ensign. However, if the Canadian people see fit to choose another flag I will recognize and respect that flag as a patriotic Canadian. I ask, though, that this choice of a flag be given to the people of Canada.

In closing I say to the Prime Minister, all good men will have to come to the aid of the country.

Thank you.

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Queens): Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I have participated in any of the debates relative to the proposed adoption of a new flag for Canada. I should like to say to my colleague from Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken) that I think he was far too modest in his opening remarks when he somewhat deprecated the kind of contribution he was going to make. I found his points, as usual, extremely well taken, carefully thought out and helpful, and the kind that a good parliamentarian should make from time to time.

I had the same reaction to the speech of my colleague the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Loney), which was also thoughtful, positive and helpful.

Mr. Speaker, it is an unfortunate thing that we have a development in Canada, much of which is the responsibility of a press which probably writes its material a little too quickly, and is over conscientious and concerned about deadlines, which has led them to believe that any item discussed for any length of time by the people's representatives is in some way an indication of obstruction or delay. One gets the same reaction from the press comments about the speech from the throne; it is said that it drones on and that all members go over the same sort of things. Such writers are forgetting that before our assembly was an assembly of responsible government, it was a representative assembly in existence to represent the people of the country. When we have these things developing which stir and stimulate public opinion it would be strange indeed if the public's representatives passed their days in silence. I think it is extremely useful to have the kind of contributions which have been made to this debate. I am proud of the fact it is colleagues of mine who have carried the major burden of this debate, and who have led the public in the discussion of this very important question. I am proud of them.

In the main, the contributions that have been made have been helpful and have sought to minimize an unfortunate action and

an unwise decision of the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) and the government, which has clearly endangered the unity of the country. We have always had this problem in Canada. Always we have had to have wise and good leadership which could prevent the cleavages from becoming so deep that they could not be healed.

It is appropriate that this House of Commons be directed along the lines which the two hon. gentlemen have suggested, and on this day, when we come prepared to turn our thoughts to the anniversary of the great Charlottetown conference which took place 100 years ago tomorrow, and which the Prime Minister is very properly attending as the representative of this house and his government.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time unity has been threatened. The situation was not easy 100 years ago. Many times since we have had problems that have created grave danger. I think it is incumbent upon us to make sure that no utterances of ours will do anything to pit one Canadian or group of Canadians against another so as to weaken the always frail fabric of confederation which binds this great but heterogeneous country together.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp) was kind enough to express concern about the party to which I belong, and to give us advice. I am not one of those who are considered excessively partisan. Sometimes I am told that I am not sufficiently partisan; but as he was advising us I was thinking of an even greater danger. I would hope that his party would not contribute to the kind of thing that the great Sir John Thompson spoke about as the greatest threat which could befall the political life of a country such as ours. Sir John Thompson, one of the three great Nova Scotians who became prime minister of Canada, said something that strikes me as being extremely apropos at this very moment. He said:

> "The one calamity above all others which stands before this country is that political divisions should follow the division of race or the division of religion. The one danger which menaces the future of this country and the union of this country, now so happily being accomplished, is that men should stand arrayed against each other on the question of government, because they differ with regard to religion, because they differ with regard to race.

Mr. Speaker, I refer to this situation as one which we must all avoid.

I thought too that a colleague of mine, the hon. lady from Grenville-Dundas (Mrs. Wadds), not long ago picked up the very same theme that one of our great statesmen of the 1890's enunciated, when she said:

> Let us clarify what we mean by unity—not rigidity, not force physical, or legislative, but understanding, a concentration on our common purpose, not on petty irritations, hurts and pride.
>
> We speak of national unity as if it were a building we have to construct quickly, preferably cheaply, and certainly without aching muscles and red-rimmed eyes. A building which once constructed will shelter us from all modern harm.
>
> Unity is only partly physical, mostly mental and emotional, ever changing, ever demanding, but so worth while.

We today, Mr. Speaker, are striving for a measure of unity. We are trying to reach a solution that will not irritate, that will not cut deeper the wounds that might have been made. That is a big part of the effort which is being made by the opposition party, the oldest party which Canada has and the party which was founded and based on a great understanding, a co-operative working arrangement between the leaders of the two founding races of this country. This is what we are seeking. This is the kind of suggestion that we have in the subamendment in our efforts to come to a decision on this matter, and if we have to discuss the matter at great length let it be discussed at great length, because it is a very important matter.

The higher value of a parliamentary institution is not speed and efficiency. The higher values by far are democracy, compromise, consensus and the proper serving of the people we represent. I believe that the party of Macdonald and Cartier, the party which took the lead in confederation 100 years ago tomorrow, was wise in its suggestion that once the error was made by the Prime Minister the whole matter should be put to a plebiscite. I believe that a plebiscite has become a good and useful thing, an important contribution to salvaging all that we can from a situation that was created by the government and especially, I am sorry to say, by the Prime Minister, a man for whose career and personality I have always had the highest regard. It is unfortunate that he, who in a long and fruitful career was so successful in reconciling differences, so adept, so skilled, so devoted in finding solutions among opposing suggestions, should be the very man in this year 1964 who has interposed one of the great divisive factors in Canadian politics. It is all the more regrettable because it was all so unnecessary, so unfortunate in its timing and so damaging in its method.

The house is naturally having difficulty in following the lead of the government in this matter. I am one of those who in happier,

calmer times would have sought to suggest to his people that perhaps our country could well do with a distinctive flag. I am one of those who would be prepared to say that the symbols which are dear to me could be retained by me and my people without necessarily being retained on a flag. We would all do much by way of compromise. But faced with the situation that was presented to the house and the country, even those who belong to that school had no other choice but to oppose, and I can do nothing more than oppose with voice and vote resolutions A and B.

There is something more to a plebiscite than a mere effort to find a consensus which the house is not able to produce, although that is surely a part of it. The house is clearly divided, deeply divided on this measure which has been brought before us. There is something more to a plebiscite than the fact that the people of the country should have the most thorough and complete participation in the adoption of a symbol—and the flag is a symbol. That is a big part of it. But there is something else. It is an unfortunate thing that we have seen political partisanship develop about the design, and throughout the country we hear the expression "Pearson's pennant". It is an expression I have never used, nor do I intend to use it. I do not think we improve our public life by such remarks any more than we did much for Canada by the expression "Diefendollar", something which I think is now very hard to obtain for reasons which we shall not discuss in this debate.

But the selection of a symbol for the country is not the kind of thing which a minority government does, and when it is succeeded by another government, either majority or minority, then has its choice set to one side. It would be ridiculous to have various prime ministers and various parties with their flags. We do not want a Liberal flag or a Conservative flag or a Pearson flag or a Douglas flag. We want a Canadian flag. So I think that on this important matter we should do that which other countries do in a constitutional way—entrench a decision once taken by a parliament. And to bring the decision of parliament to the people for their vote will give to it the greatest permanency, because we know that no parliament can bind its successor and a mere resolution on the order paper followed by a vote would not give that permanency which a plebiscite would.

I am one of those who believe that in this instance advocacy of a plebiscite is extremely apropos and is essential to a proper solution of the problem which is before us, because we want a flag upon which there is not only a consensus but with regard to which there is a realization that it is going to be ours for a long, long time. I agree with the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Loney) that we should honour any flag which is adopted. I avoid expressing my artistic reaction to the flag envisaged in the resolution before us because it contains symbols that could conceivably be used in a flag which would be adopted. I am convinced in my heart of hearts or, to use an old expression, I have a feeling in my bones that the flag set out in the resolution will never fly officially in this country. I believe this is in the cards. But I am not convinced that in the decent processes of democracy, along the avenues of compromise and down the paths of good will and understanding, some sort of new flag may not emerge. If it is adopted properly, honourably, democratically and fairly I am prepared to honour it and to encourage my children to do so. To find a method we have suggested the plebiscite, and I commend my colleague from Regina City for the suggestions which he has put forward. The four choices have been read. There are those who believe a plebiscite should contain more, but I would be a little happier if there were fewer choices.

The question, "Are you in favour of the Canadian red ensign?" is a very appropriate selection for the first question. I have never understood those who maintain that the Canadian red ensign is not a distinctively Canadian flag. I have had some few opportunities to be abroad, to attend the United Nations and other places, serving this country in some small way. Never have I seen the slightest hesitation that the Canadian ensign was in fact the symbolic representation of our country. Therefore I believe that whatever happens—and I am going to talk about the suggestion of the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken)—the Canadian red ensign cannot and should not pass from use in this country until the people of this country have had a right to express themselves thereon.

It is unfortunate that sometimes we have allowed ourselves to get into that frame of mind whereby we have no flag at all. Of course we have had a flag, and it has had legal status. It has had recognition, and it is ill advised to suggest otherwise. If it is unsatisfactory, that is a different matter. Let us

find avenues to explore that question; but we get nowhere by presuming that the Canadian red ensign is not in fact and in law the flag of this country. I personally find it a rich and colourful flag. I thought the beauty of this parliament hill on Dominion day, with 66 flags flying, was most impressive.

The Canadian red ensign is rich and appealing. It has history, but perhaps to some it has things which bring a negative response. Perhaps some people find there things which point to a period in their ancestors' history which was disturbing. If I thought only of the days of Culloden I would not think too much of the union jack either, because never was there more butchery than was practised by the arrogant Sassenachs of the south against my ancestors of the north. But I do not see that in the ensign. I see in the ensign an evolution of one of the greatest political communities the world has ever seen.

I see there this country which led the world in the evolution of dominion status. I recall too, and it was only proper that it should be, that French speaking subjects of the crown many years ago were given civil and political liberty that English speaking subjects of the crown in England itself were not given. I see there the struggles of Robert Borden against some pretty thick-headed people in the colonial office. I see through the years the evolution of the commonwealth, where Borden pressed the case for equality among the members of the commonwealth, and where one of Borden's successors, our own Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker), in another stage, successfully pressed the case for equality of peoples within the commonwealth.

These are things we can see, and perhaps we Canadians have failed in not becoming a little bit more emotional about the symbols of our existence. I heard the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) say the other day that the young people of this country, the vast majority of the younger generation, sought a distinctive Canadian flag. That may well be. Possibly we have failed, especially those of us who were educators, to point out to them the distinctiveness of the flag we have. Certainly our American cousins are not remiss in expressive nationalism, if we might call it that, and we may have failed in this through neglect.

It should be to the young that the national symbol means the most. Like the hon. and gallant member for Calgary North (Mr. Harkness) who spoke the other day, we express our personal preferences; we then move on to pledge ourselves to support a solution which is arrived at by ourselves and our colleagues in the proper way.

I would suggest that when we arrive at a distinctive flag, either through the means suggested by the hon. member for Regina City (Mr. More) or through a simpler or more elaborate plebiscite, we will be able to pour upon that symbol the emotional affection which many Canadians feel for the Canadian red ensign and for other symbols which have been used in this country.

I think the suggestion made by the hon. member for Calgary North, the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt), the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Hamilton) and others, and referred to a little while ago by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka, of referring the matter to a committee for serious, careful study is an excellent one, a committee which would function while the House of Commons, its parent, would deal with other matters of equal but different urgency. I would hope that that committee would be able to make preparation so that it would overcome some of the mistakes which were made by the Prime Minister and the government in his and their exercise in flag unfolding.

I would think if this committee would call to its aid as counsel—if I may use the American expression—two heraldists, two historians and two artists we would avoid the terrible shock which many artistic people felt when they saw the symbol before the house in the main resolution. If this were done it would be a useful step. I would hope that, after careful deliberation and thoughtful consideration, such committee would come out with a pretty widely accepted design, and the next step would be for that design and the Canadian red ensign to be submitted to the Canadian people in the next general election.

If that were done the Prime Minister would have fulfilled his commitment in having brought forward the matter of a distinctive flag. The House of Commons would have fulfilled its duty by bringing order out of confusion, unity out of division and agreement out of bitterness, and then the people of Canada who are the ones who must have the final voice would be able to express their opinions. This I think would be something of which Canadians could be proud. This would be a fine preparation for 1967. It was recognized that a mistake had been made. It is a mark of greatness to recognize errors and I think the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) has

made a profound one. I believe there is a widespread feeling in this country—I was about to say "in his party", but I would not presume to go as far as that; I do not know—to this effect. But, I would be greatly surprised if this deep feeling had not permeated his party as well.

I can see a committee of this house doing useful work. I would hope it would be selected with the best of intentions; that it would have a vice chairman from the Conservative party. I would think that a distinguished gentleman such as the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Balcer) might be given the second place on such a committee and I am sure the government could nominate some distinguished member from its own side, such as the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough (Mr. Stewart) or the hon. member for Brant-Haldimand (Mr. Pennell) who could give leadership to such a group in considering some of the ideas put forward. We have witnessed, I think, a real expression of serious concern among the Canadian people that this matter should be dealt with, that it should be dealt with properly, and that there should be no surrender to political expediency and no excursion into partisan, racial or religious bitterness. We want no part of any of this. No member can be accused of failing in his duty if he stands up and makes clear his opposition to some of the efforts which have been made in this chamber with regard to the flag proposal. I think the House of Commons can come out of this with its reputation enhanced as the great forum for the expression of Canadian opinion. Is there division here? Is there disagreement? Of course there is, because this is what we find among the Canadian people.

The best thing would have been for the Prime Minister never to have made his move. Better he had done other things. Better he should have moved to bring us into the organization of American states. I would have followed him in that, by voice and vote regardless of what any of my colleagues chose to do. Better he had found some way of reforming the Senate, as was promised in 1893. That is a long standing promise. But this action having been taken, there is still room for a little reaction, a little reconsideration, much give and take. I can see at the moment no better arena for this than the microcosm of the house itself, which is a house committee. Such a committee, untrammelled by rigid time limits—I believe there would be a sufficient sense of seriousness among its members that it would not be necessary to lay down an arbitrary time limit—would, in my opinion, be well qualified to find a solution to this problem. I think there is a feeling among our people that a solution should be found but that it should not be a partisan solution, a mere rushing to a vote in the House of Commons. I cannot help recall a saying by Sir Robert Borden 50 years ago that some who were most anxious for votes in the house were least anxious for them in the country.

The Prime Minister is not here—he is in Charlottetown where, to tell the truth, I should like to be myself. But I do appeal to him to retrace his steps as far as necessary, because otherwise he will leave a record which will mar a great contribution to Canada. He is a diplomat. He is a man who, I still believe, is a great Canadian. The little series of bunglings among various cabinet ministers is unfortunate and regrettable. And seemingly it is eternal. But what is more important is something which strikes at the very vitals of the country, namely national unity. And if the Prime Minister could come out of this with his genius for compromise, retrace his steps and accede to the pleas of those who are sincere in their submissions, then out of this unfortunate division may come another example of Canada's ability to work together when the chips are down, party with party, race with race and creed with creed. If so, the flag debate was well taken up and, if so, we shall have proven ourselves. I think, Mr. Speaker, we can do it.

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington South): Before I proceed with my remarks in this historic flag debate I should be remiss if I did not draw the attention of the hon. members of this assembly to the very fine, scholarly, academic and thought-provoking speech we have just heard from the hon. member for Queens (Mr. Macquarrie).

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Hales: It is regrettable that a man with his vision and foresight could not be in that great city of Charlottetown today with other members of the house.

Mr. Churchill: Duty comes first.

Mr. Hales: I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that in making this contribution to the debate I will be brief. I spoke on July 3 in this house. At that time we were engaged in a flag debate which was to terminate at the end of five days. I spoke on July 3, just two

days after Canada celebrated its 97th birthday. The subject of the flag was very much in the thoughts of all Canadians at that time. We had portrayed to us on the front lawns of this building a memorable display of 66 Canadian red ensigns. I said then that I would vote in favour of the Canadian red ensign but at the same time I realized there were many Canadians who had other views on this matter and that I would be in favour of a referendum to try to settle the problem. I also said on that occasion—and if I might be pardoned for quoting what I said:

> It would be very simple and inexpensive to hold a plebiscite. It could be held at the time of the next federal election at little expense. You would simply walk in to vote, be given a ballot with the names of the candidates on it and you would be given another slip of paper with three or four flag designs in colour and you would simply mark an X opposite the one you preferred. I believe the method adopted in the province of Alberta, which is referred to as the transferable vote, could be adopted whereby you mark your choices first, second and third. There would be no problem in that regard. I know each Canadian would say, "I will be loyal to the flag which the majority of Canadians choose."

And later in my speech I said:

> I suggest to the Prime Minister that if he is bound to bring in a new flag he should start over again with a clean sheet. He should set up a non-partisan committee to represent Canada and introduce a new design for parliamentary approval, not a government design. If he does not want to do that, he should withdraw the resolution that is before the house now. This is the last day of debate, at the moment. He should allow the members to reassess the whole issue during a summer recess. Let us go home to our constituencies; let us think about this very serious matter. Let it simmer a bit and then come back and decide where we go from there.

As I read those words again, Mr. Speaker, I think how much better it might have been had we taken the recess and come back here to reassess this very important problem. What has happened since? Many hon. members have spoken in this house. We have heard many very thought-provoking speeches. I think of the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Starr), the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Hamilton), the hon. member for Royal (Mr. Fairweather), the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Doucett); and, yes, even the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) and many others. These men spoke with sincerity, with beliefs, with ideas, with feeling in their hearts, and gave suggestions to this honourable chamber as to what they thought ought to be done with regard to selecting a distinctive flag for this country. This is the seventeenth day of the flag debate. I hear it said—it is said to me quite often—"Why is this flag debate going on so long?" I would remind hon. members and the people of this country that the United States recently debated the American civil rights bill for 72 days. I am sure our debate is every bit as important to Canada as that debate was to the citizens of the United States. We should endeavour to maintain unity, bring our peoples closer together and give to all a greater feeling of national identity and purpose. These, Mr. Speaker, are the things we have to try to bring about in this debate.

Much has been said about the cost to the taxpayer of continuing parliament while this debate is in progress. May I remind you, sir, that most of the costs of this house are on a yearly basis, so whether the house sits or does not sit adds little to the cost of its operation. I would agree that those who are employed on a sessional basis represent an added cost. This may involve secretaries. However, Mr. Speaker, over the past few years parliament has been sitting so continuously that they have been on a yearly basis anyway. Therefore, it is a minor cost to the country for such sessional help as the page boys and the cleaning staff. There may be a small extra cost in connection with paper for *Hansard*, and printing; but apart from that I can see no additional cost to the operation of this house in discussing such an important subject as we now have before us.

Members are here because they are sincere in their purpose; they are here to debate this great cause and this important subject that is before us. So, Mr. Speaker, the debate has continued. We have heard briefly from some hon. members of the other parties. The hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas) favours a new flag. In his case it is the Pearson tri-leaf if necessary but not necessarily the Pearson tri-leaf; he would prefer a single leaf because this, he says, would symbolize unity. For the Social Crediters, the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. Leboe) says flatly that a minority government has no mandate to impose any flag upon the people of Canada, and he demands a referendum. Then there are the members of the all-Quebec group, the Creditistes. The hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) has pledged support to the Pearson design. Again there is contradiction and dissatisfaction, because he says, "We are not satisfied with the proposed design; we would prefer another. Anyway, the flag will not strengthen unity".

Then even the Prime Minister himself has doubts on this matter. I wish to refer to just one of the many contradictions in his

speech, when he said, "When the house has come to a decision members will abide by it and do all they can to obtain its universal acceptance". In other words, "Accept or face an election; and having accepted, help sell it to the country". What a flag—conceived in secrecy, sired in coercion and born to be sold. On the subject of being born to be sold, we heard all about this the other day when the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Dupuis) was questioned about the sale of thousands of tri-maple leaf bumper stickers. He took it upon himself to circulate from his own government office, with his own government help, an advertisement asking his supporters to buy these maple leaf bumper stickers by the thousands. So it was certainly born to be sold. To realize this we only need look at the great promotion that has been brought about in the sale of this flag from newsstands and other places of business; how they have been flown on the aerials of cars, and so on. There has been a great promotion in order to put this tri-maple leaf design before the people of Canada.

We have had a subamendment put before the house by the hon. member for Regina City (Mr. More). This subamendment was simply introduced in his good thinking to bring to the attention of the house how a plebiscite could be held. Among other things, what would be on this plebiscite or this ballot which the people would receive when they went to vote? I do not like to take up the time of the house, but the four points included in this subamendment were:

1. Are you in favour of the Canadian red ensign?
2. Are you in favour of the Canadian red ensign with changes made thereon to show the main heritage of both founding races?
3. Are you in favour of the three maple leaves design?
4. Are you in favour of a one maple leaf design?

These suggestions, amongst other things, were included in the subamendment he put before the house. Public opinion in regard to this matter has crystallized in the last few weeks, Mr. Speaker. I would humbly suggest that there is no argument whatsoever as to whether Canada should have a distinctive national flag. I believe this is practically universally accepted. We should certainly have it for our centennial, which is just a few years away—our 100th birthday in 1967. Indeed, we should have had it many years ago, and it is regrettable that the Right Hon. Mackenzie King in 1945 when he, by order in council, said that the Canadian red ensign would be the official flag of Canada, did not stop there; but he went on to say "to be flown from government buildings either within or without Canada". If he had left out of his statement that last little clause this matter would have fortunately been settled in 1945.

I think we have failed badly in our educational and training fields. We have not taught the children in our schools about Canada's flag, how to draw it, and the history behind it. This has been forgotten and overlooked, possibly because it was never officially declared to be Canada's flag. This minority government and its appointed Prime Minister saw fit to introduce the flag resolution that is now before this parliament, and rightly or wrongly they must bear the full responsibility, because the parties on this side of the chamber did not bring it in.

The government of the day saw fit to bring this resolution before the house and I should like to quote what the Prime Minister had to say in this introductory remarks on June 15, as reported on page 4318 of *Hansard*. He said this:

> The government's responsibility is to decide on policy, to present that policy to parliament for consideration, and they hope support, and to stand and 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.

So that point was made quite clear in the introduction of this flag resolution.

I commend the Prime Minister for his aspirations and desires in this regard. We have only to note one paragraph a little later on, when he said:

> Mr. Speaker, I believe that a national flag of the kind described in this resolution, that will be exclusively Canadian, will bring us closer together; give us a greater feeling of a national identity and unity. Today especially, as Mr. Massey has reminded us, we need faith and confidence in ourselves as Canadians, with pride in Canada, devotion to our country. I believe that the adoption of this resolution will help to produce that result. If I did not deeply and sincerely so believe, I would not be introducing it into this House of Commons.

However, more and more each day his aspirations, goals and desires are not achieved. If his goal in this case is that of national unity and if that is what he wanted, it is abundantly clear without a shadow of doubt that some other method to achieve this aim must be sought.

The problem seems to arise from two sources, as I see it. As I said before, there is no doubt but that people do want a distinctive Canadian flag. However the problem which confronts this parliament is, first of all, how this resolution was introduced, and

second the particular choice of the proposed flag.

With regard to how the resolution was introduced, I think that if a poll were taken it would bring out the fact that practically everybody disagrees with the method of introduction of this resolution. Let hon. members opposite ask some of their sincere and loyal supporters, or the members of their own party, whether they agree with the method of introduction of this resolution. The hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) had this to say on August 24, as reported at page 7180 of *Hansard*:

> I would point out that we never saw any details of this flag until *Votes and Proceedings* of May 26 were issued on May 27. The opposition saw this design as soon as we did. If this denotes that the Liberal party caucus has given its approval to the design in question, I would like to know when it did so. I attended all the caucus meetings and the design was not shown and, as I say, we did not see it until *Votes and Proceedings* appeared on May 27.

I cannot understand why or how a party would expect to have unanimity and support for the introduction of a flag resolution even before its own members were consulted. The same hon. member also said that at many of their meetings the Liberal party never discussed the question of a new flag. It was never an election issue in many parts of Canada. In my own riding the flag was never an issue in the election campaign, and I am sure there are many hon. members here who were never asked to declare themselves on the flag issue; nor was it an issue in their election platforms. There is plenty of evidence to show that this resolution does not have the support of the members of the party which introduced it.

This brings me back to the same point, that it was not so much the problem of the flag as its method of introduction, this take it or leave it attitude: This is for Canada, this is what we are giving you and this is what we want you to accept. It seems to be a known fact that the Prime Minister has received thousands of letters pointing out that he has gone about this in the wrong way. I think there is no doubt but that this is the way this great problem has arisen, namely the method by which the resolution was introduced, and second, the choice of the flag itself. I sincerely believe that if a more attractive flag had been chosen, one with a more artistic design or with more history and tradition behind it, it would have been more acceptable. At the same time I realize there is a difference of opinion over the choice which was made. There may be many who like it, but there are many more who do not like it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how is parliament to deal with this problem? What must be done? A very important matter has to be decided. I say it is up to the Prime Minister, who is the leader of the government, to make the move and to decide what he feels is best in this regard. I was very happy to hear the Prime Minister say that a free vote would be taken among his members. This is a reversal of his previous stand, but I commend him for it. On May 19 last the Prime Minister made it clearly understood that the life of this government depended on the outcome of the flag question. He said, as reported at page 3337 of *Hansard*:

> 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.

However, three months later he came before this house with an entirely different position and said that any vote on the flag question would not be considered by the government as being against party discipline and there would be no question of an election, whatever the result of the votes. So the whips are off; the way is clear. It is a free vote.

On July 3 I challenged many of my good friends on the Liberal side of the house to rise in their places and express their views on this very important matter. I challenged the hon. members for Durham (Mr. Honey), Brantford (Mr. Brown), Renfrew South (Mr. Greene), Carleton (Mr. Francis), Wentworth (Mr. Morison), Halton (Mr. Harley) and Hastings South (Mr. Temple) to rise in their places and give their views. I now challenge them again to get up in the house and make a speech on the flag, because as I say the whips are off and the way is clear. I know that, sure as I am standing here, the constituents in their ridings want to hear from them.

I suggest it is not enough that you be a spectator; your constituents want you to declare yourselves and take a stand. I know what my constituents would think of me if I did not make some observations during this debate. Being aware of the fact that the vote is to be a free vote they would ask what is stopping me from expressing my views and why I do not declare myself. They would say: Now that you are being allowed to vote freely, we want to hear from you and know your stand on this matter.

Mr. Speaker, we have only heard from 27 members out of 128 in the Liberal party. There are 101 members on the government side of this house who have not declared their stand on this flag issue.

Mr. Roxburgh: Mr. Speaker, may I interject? That is perhaps slightly untrue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. May I direct the attention of the hon. member for Norfolk to the fact that the hon. member for Wellington South has the floor, and he should first seek permission of that hon. member before interrupting to ask a question.

Mr. Hales: I will give him that permission, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Roxburgh: Thank you. The hon. member stated that the constituents of the members on this side of the house do not know anything about the stand we take. It so happens, and I speak for myself, that I have written my constituents personally, and that letter has appeared on the front page of all the newspapers in my area. The people know exactly how I stand and why I take that stand. I direct the hon. member's attention to that fact. Thank you ever so much.

Mr. Hales: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that interjection on the part of my hon. friend from the town of Simcoe. He and I are graduates from the same alma mater, and I have great respect for him and appreciate what he said. However I should like to ask him why he has left it to the press to make his stand known rather than voice his opinion here in the House of Commons where it will be recorded in *Hansard* so that everyone will know exactly his position?

Mr. Speaker, we have heard from only 27 Liberal members. There are 101 Liberal members from whom we have yet to hear. We have heard from only one cabinet minister, plus the Prime Minister of course, in his introduction. In respect of a major historical debate on an issue of such importance to the people of Canada why do we not hear from members on the front benches, and from more members supporting them on the government side? I do not understand why there is such a delay in their expression of opinion, now that the vote has been declared a free vote.

I feel it is my duty, as a member of Her Majesty's loyal opposition, to recommend any procedure which, if followed, may aid us in solving the impasse which confronts this parliament. The people of this country are tired of hearing about the flag debate. They want the debate concluded, and we should do everything we can to suggest ways of solving the difficulty. I might say that we have already done so. The leader of this party has moved an amendment to the main motion, proposing a plebiscite. I have heard the pros and cons in respect of such a plebiscite, but I must say that the only democratic way of deciding such an important issue as this is by a national referendum. Many views and ideas are held by the people of this country, and even families are split on this issue. The provinces are also divided on it. Therefore I feel the only democratic way of handling the problem is by allowing the people themselves to decide by plebiscite. The people could go into a quiet booth, mark their ballots and make their own choice.

Mr. Speaker, I realize there are arguments against holding a plebiscite. I have suggested that a plebiscite be held, and have heard people say that we are the elected representatives sent to Ottawa to take a stand and to make a decision. I think the answer to that argument is that this is a very important issue, involving a moral and personal choice, which 265 people out of 20 million could not decide. How are we going to have unity in this country if the decision is made in that way? This choice, once made, is not one that can be changed every two to five years, or as the government changes. Once this issue has been decided the resulting flag will remain as Canada's flag for all time. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that we must allow the people of Canada to settle this important issue by means of a plebiscite.

Many people suggest that by holding a national referendum we will divide the country. I think this whole matter must be taken out of the political arena. I do not think a choice by plebiscite would be as divisive as a choice by 265 representatives here in the House of Commons. I think if a committee is formed to decide on the designs from which a distinctive flag is chosen by plebiscite, there will be very little division. I think the committee, as suggested by many members, would be of great potential value, and perhaps should be composed of seven members from the Liberal party, five members from the Conservative party, and one from each of the N.D.P., Social Credit and Creditiste parties, making a total of 15. I do not think it would be necessary, but perhaps a similar arrangement could be made in respect of senators, making the membership of the committee 30 instead of 15.

Mr. Speaker, I think the whole flag issue should be sent to that proposed committee for consideration and report to parliament within a reasonable time, perhaps three to six months. If that committee after its consideration could report unanimously back to this house, the debate could perhaps be limited to five days. If the report to the house was based on a committee majority of 80 or 85 per cent I think that report would receive the support of all parties. If that committee was unable to come to a unanimous decision, or a decision of an 80 or 85 per cent majority, this matter should then be referred to the people in the form of a plebiscite. The duty of the committee would then involve a decision in respect to the flag designs which would appear on the ballot for the plebiscite.

I would go one step further and suggest that once the plebiscite had been held and all ballots been cast the ballots should not be counted on a regional basis, but sent to Ottawa and counted on a national basis, so that no area or province in Canada could be associated with a choice in respect of a specific design. The decision would have been made on a national basis only.

As a member of the opposition, Mr. Speaker, I have done my best to make some recommendations and suggestions which I feel it is my responsibility to present to the house. We are at an impasse. We are at a point where parliament must make some decision. After talking to the people of my riding, other members of the house and friends, and having done a little soul searching on my own part, I think these are the best recommendations I can make to the leader of the government whose responsibility it is first and foremost to make a move so that the impasse will be broken.

I must make it clear to the Prime Minister and his supporters that, above all, members of the official opposition want a strong Canada made strong by each province, Quebec being one of them. As a member of Her Majesty's loyal opposition it is my responsibility to try to suggest some way for the government to get out of the impasse. An explosive situation it is. The people of Canada want the flag debate ended and pressing legislation attended to. Therefore I beg the Prime Minister to accept the ideas, the compromises, the suggestions that have been made to him not only by myself but by many other hon. members. I appeal to him to take them to heart so that his record will not be marred for all time.

[Mr. Hales.]

Mr. Hahn: May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Hales: Yes.

Mr. Hahn: I am asking this question purely for information. The hon. member suggests it would be possible to have a plebiscite with all the ballots being sent to one central point so that no one would know how any part of the country had voted. Would it not be necessary to identify the ballot boxes right back to the polls so that you could ensure the validity of each of the ballots, and carry out a check with regard to ballots issued, ballots used and so on? In other words, does the hon. member really think it is possible to send all the ballots to Ottawa as he suggested and still ensure the ballot count?

Mr. Hales: I think that is just a technical problem that can be overcome. I am sure it could be worked out, in the same way as all the ballots being sent to one central point in a province. They could all be sent to Ottawa. My thought is that we want to get away from the regional idea because we do not want to know what part of Canada voted for one flag and what part voted for another.

Hon. H. J. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak on the amendment to the amendment which deals specifically with the question of designs to be submitted to the Canadian people in a plebiscite. Before making any remarks in this connection I should like to refer to the fact that when I spoke on August 13 I was not allowed to finish the remarks I had planned to make, and since the subject matter is quite pertinent at the present time I should like to conclude what I had intended to say then. I wish to refer to a suggestion I was going to make on August 13 to the Prime Minister and which I assure you, Mr. Speaker, is intended to be helpful.

I want to say to the house, to the Prime Minister and to the government that I believe this matter can still be settled. In my opinion the procedure would be to appoint a committee which would be entrusted with the selection of designs for reference to parliament, with parliament then being asked to approve a flag on the basis of a two thirds majority vote. I do not know whether anyone remembers what I said at that time, but simply to remind the house may I say it was my suggestion that no decision of parliament on a question as important as a change in the flag, which is tantamount to changing the constitution and certainly of equal importance,

should be made on the basis of a bare majority but rather on the basis of at least a two thirds majority. I was about to say at that time that the matter could then be completely removed from the partisan political realm. From time to time the committee would bring designs to parliament until one was found which was acceptable to two thirds of the members. Those views which I had intended to express at that time are applicable to the situation which exists now.

It could be argued that this would be tantamount to a Conservative party veto, and I acknowledge that it is. But I do say to the house categorically that the Conservative party does not yield to anyone, certainly not to any other party, in its desire to do any and every necessary thing to contribute to the unity of this country. That is the question which I believe is before us at least to a certain degree—the unity of the country.

Many other developments have taken place in the period of a little over two weeks since I last spoke and I am going to refer to them later. Just before I resumed my seat two weeks ago I had been expressing disappointment over the fact that more ministers had not participated in this debate. I wondered why they had not spoken in defence of their position as members of a government that has submitted a resolution to the house which, from every point of view except urgency, is the most important resolution submitted to the house since I have had the honour to be a member.

Important, yes; urgent, no. It is important because it represents much to many Canadians. To some it represents their participation in two world wars. To some it represents their participation in the first world war and their recollection of that war. It brings to mind the betrayal of treaties. It brings to mind the rejection of the proposition that the pledged word of nations is of no account. It brings to mind the rejection of the principle enunciated by the German chancellor of that day that a treaty was merely a scrap of paper. I would remind the house that Britain and France fought hand in hand in that war, that France was invaded and Britain honoured her commitment and rushed to her defence.

To some people it represents memories of the second world war. It represents the recollection of a long period of training and then the events of D-day and subsequent events. To some citizens it represents the sacrifice of life itself by a member of their family. In the shire town of my native county a man and woman live today who lost two of their three boys in the battle of Britain, when Britain stood alone. They wish to keep alive the symbol of sacrifice contained in the union jack.

My mail continues to contain many messages urging reconsideration by the government of its apparent desire to discard and destroy our present distinctive flag, the red ensign. With all the conviction of which I am capable, I urge the government to reconsider. I am, however, not hopeful that they will. But letters are continuing to come to me and I believe they will go on. Many people found it difficult to believe that the union jack would be completely eliminated from the government submitted design.

As I said, this is the most important resolution to be brought before the house since I have been here. I do, however, deny the urgency of it. As a matter of fact in my opinion it is not urgent. It is something that should be carefully considered by everyone within the sound of my voice now and who may be in this chamber at any other time.

I repeat it is most astonishing, most disturbing and most astounding that ministers of the crown have not taken part to a greater extent than they have in this debate. This debate has been boycotted by ministers. It is a matter of the throwing away of symbols which have been used for many years; it is one of the most serious things, and I for one am not able to understand or comprehend it. Every minister should get up and explain this. It is our duty to demand that they do, and it is their duty to do it. This they have not done, and I state here and now they should have the courage to speak in this debate and make an attempt to justify their position.

One minister has spoken, one in 25. In my opinion he is one of the best known ministers, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp). He spoke relative to the subamendment and I have some comments to make regarding his remarks. The particular paragraph, among others, to which I refer and take exception, is in that portion of the minister's remarks found on page 6963 of *Hansard* for August 18. These are the words:

> 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—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): If you get any consolation out of that you are welcome to it.

—and for that reason to the country, and join with the Prime Minister in achieving another great step forward in our development as a nation.

I have not neglected to quote the last phrase, since it obviously is his own biased and prejudiced opinion. I might have done so, but I do not care to quote the minister out of context. I now refer to his argument. I take exception to his statement that the role of the opposition is negative, especially in this subamendment. That is not the case.

In support of this contention I quote the subamendment. It is positive, very positive. It is most definite. It makes concrete suggestions relative to the designs to be considered by the Canadian people in a plebiscite. It enumerates them, a, b, c and d, and it leaves room for more. For information and emphasis I quote the subamendment:

That the amendment be amended by adding thereto the words:

"and that in such a plebiscite among the questions to be placed before the people should be the following:

1. Are you in favour of the Canadian red ensign?

2. Are you in favour of the Canadian red ensign with changes made thereon to show the main heritages of both founding races?

3. Are you in favour of the three maple leaves design?

4. Are you in favour of a one maple leaf design?

That is the subamendment referred to by the Minister of Trade and Commerce as being negative. I ask this house and I ask you, sir, is that not positive? It includes the so-called Pearson flag as one design. It includes the red ensign. It includes a modified version of the ensign. It includes a one maple leaf design. What could be more positive? What could be more explicit? I draw the attention of the house to the use of the words, "among the questions to be placed before the people should be the following;" in other words the subamendment is not restricted to the four choices that are indicated. More may be added if in the opinion of the government there should be more. I would rather expect that there might be more designs which it would be considered advisable to submit to the Canadian people, and ask for an indication of their preference.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce also referred to the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition that a more distinct and more prominent fleur-de-lis might be contained in a modified version of the ensign, and I quote his words as found at page 6960 of *Hansard*:

To the people of Quebec this suggestion by the Leader of the Opposition—and I have heard it echoed by a number of speakers on the other side, none of them French Canadians—must have appeared as a clumsy and gratuitous piece of appeasement; it must have appeared to my French Canadian friends as a bone thrown out to a troublesome minority to keep them quiet.

I resent the suggestion of the minister that this constitutes appeasement. It does nothing of the sort. It constitutes a recognition of the facts of history, history that has been recorded not for 100 years, 200 years or 300 years, but for 400 years. That is the recognition that this accords. The minister said that this is a question of appeasement. The only thing I am going to give him credit for is making a speech and stating his view. He is far ahead of most of his colleagues in that respect, because that is more than any other minister of the government, excluding the Prime Minister, has done in this debate.

What is the cause of this silence, which might properly be considered a filibuster of silence?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): There is one thing about this: They are listening to me a lot more attentively than they do to the hon. gentleman with his back to the wall over there. Is it because they cannot justify their position? Is it because they were not consulted? Is it because they are afraid of the next general election that they do not wish to have their views recorded on *Hansard* and then be obliged to face the people? Are they afraid to explain and justify their stand?

Those are the questions which they might properly answer, and if they disagree with these assertions let them get up and say so in this debate. Some of them are noted for their vocal ability, and some for very little else. Let us hear what they say and see how they look.

In a previous speech I referred to the fact that there was little if any record of any commitment by the government during the last election to bring in a distinctive flag. The hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan), himself a Liberal, has confirmed my assertion. No Liberal has disputed him, no Liberal has answered him. Therefore I submit that what they should have done, if they wanted to bring in a design different from the one we have been using, was to go back and see what there was by way of examination and investigation of this particular thing.

I find that in the years 1945 and 1946 a committee studied the whole question of a flag. We have men in this chamber who were sitting here when the debate on setting up that committee took place. We have men in this chamber who were members of the committee itself. We have men who were members when the committee reported. I have indulged in some research on the subject, and I am going to give the house the facts which have come to light in my examination.

First of all I want to give the names of the committee members, and I quote from page 256 of *Hansard* for March 26, 1946. The hon. members of that committee were:

Messrs. Beaudoin, Blanchette, Castleden, Emmerson, Gingues, Gladstone, Hackett, Hansell, Harris (Grey-Bruce), Herridge, LaCroix, Lafontaine, Macdonnell (Muskoka-Ontario), MacNicol, Martin, Matthews (Brandon), McCulloch (Pictou), McIvor, Reid, Smith (Calgary West), Stanfield, Stirling, Thatcher, Warren, Zaplitny.

Those were the members of the committee. And I should like to point out respectfully to the house, because it is of some interest, that there are two members of the present parliament who were members of that committee—the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Martin) and the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Herridge). This brings me right to the question I was discussing two weeks ago when objection from certain Liberal members in a certain quarter of this house caused the Acting Speaker to rule I did not have unanimous consent to continue. I find that the hon. gentleman was a member of the 1945 committee, an extremely good reason for asking the Secretary of State for External Affairs why he has not given us the benefit of the information he must have secured as a member of the flag committee in those years. Why has he not been impelled to contribute to this debate and tell us about the findings of that committee? Why has he not given this house some idea of the points raised by the various people who appeared before that committee? I fail to comprehend his silence. Surely, he will speak up before this debate closes and tell the house the determining factors which led to the selection of a design for a national flag at that time. We shall await with interest the remarks of the hon. gentleman on this subject.

But we are fortunate in one respect. The hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Herridge) is a member of this parliament and he was a member of that committee in 1945-46. He has not been compelled to maintain silence, and he has not maintained silence. He has spoken in this debate, and hon. members will find his remarks recorded at the beginning of page 4888 of *Hansard* for Tuesday, June 30, 1964. The part of the speech to which I refer will be found beginning in the second paragraph of the second column at page 4890, and I can do no better than refer to those remarks. He stated that no single party which has placed a proposal in its program for a distinctive flag for Canada had ever defined what it meant by a distinctive flag. So far as I am concerned, we are using a distinctive national flag at the present time. It is the Canadian red ensign. I acknowledge that everyone does not agree with this proposition. The hon. member for Kootenay West suggested that this had added to the confusion and to the division which exists even within parties with regard to this matter. He suggested that the situation emphasized the need for adoption of unusual procedures so that the final result may be satisfactory to the people of Canada. There is nothing wrong with that. He then mentioned that he was a member of the committee whose job it was to bring in a design, and he proceeded to discuss other matters which I think are of great interest. He told us that the committee heard many people, including representatives of the college of heralds, or persons informed about the procedure of the college of heralds. He told us that after all those who appeared had been heard, the committee considered 2,700 designs submitted by various people. There was a great deal of interest in the question. Now I will pass on to the house the recommendations of the committee of that day:

That this committee recommend that the national flag of Canada should be the Canadian red ensign with a maple leaf in autumn golden colours in a bordered background of white replacing the coat of arms in the fly, the whole design to be so proportioned that the size and position of the maple leaf in relation to the union jack in the canton will identify it as a symbol distinctive of Canada as a nation.

That was the recommendation of this committee after the examination of 2,700 designs. Here was a committee, composed as I have stated, which brought in its decision by a virtually unanimous vote. To make this clear, I might tell hon. members that the committee reached this conclusion by a vote of 23 to 1. That, without question, constitutes virtual unanimity. At least, that is my considered opinion on the point. Among the members of that committee were representatives from all the provinces of Canada and from both founding races of this country. They were people whose background is similar to the backgrounds of many hon. members of this

house today. They constituted a cross-section of the membership of the house at that time and I believe they can be considered, as far as their various interests were concerned, to reflect a cross-section of the parliament of today. I cannot understand why the recommendations of that committee were not implemented. That would have solved this question for all time.

Well, I suppose it might be said that 19 years have made a difference and that the reason which justified the committee's conclusions then do not exist now. I do not agree. I believe the reasons which brought about the conclusion in 1946 were present then and are present today. There is no reason why a flag based on the committee's recommendations should not be put forward as the flag of Canada. This is one of the recommendations of the subamendment.

I stress the need for permanency. It has been referred to by my hon. friend from Queens (Mr. Macquarrie) this afternoon. We in this parliament surely do not want the recognition of a symbol which we think another government might discard. This selection would conform to the second choice mentioned in the subamendment. I would advance the idea that since this design was considered 18 years ago as being appropriate, surely it is appropriate now. Was it ever considered, I wonder? No one seems to know. It is a question we should like to have answered. Again I wonder why some ministers have not spoken. I wonder why the Postmaster General (Mr. Nicholson) and the minister of northern affairs (Mr. Laing) who represent British Columbia, have not spoken. Will they get up in this house and say that British Columbia approves the so-called three leaf Pearson flag design?

Incidentally, the President of the Privy Council (Mr. McIlraith) was a member of this house in 1946 and I presume he had knowledge of the report of the committee at that time; I am unable to find any record of his disagreeing with the report. However, 18 years after, apparently he does not agree with it. I should like to have him explain to the house the reason for his change of mind and change of heart. There are other members here who were members of the house at that time, but they do not need to do any explaining. One is my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Cardiff) who spoke, and spoke well, in this house a few days ago. He advocated the setting up of the committee 18 years ago and he was undoubtedly in favour of the report of the committee when presented. He still favours the adoption of the flag design which that committee recommended. The hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Harkness) was a member of the committee then. He undoubtedly supported the acceptance of the committee's report which brought in the recommendation to which I have referred. He too has spoken in this debate, expressing the same opinion as he held 18 or 19 years ago. That is not all. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) was a member of the house at that time.

He undoubtedly favoured the design recommended by the committee. But he did more than that: He moved a second amendment to the motion to set up the committee at the outset, in which he proposed that they be instructed to include the union jack in a prominent place in the design of the flag recommended to parliament. The Speaker of the day ruled that amendment out of order. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we know that the right hon. Leader of the Opposition has not changed his mind; he has no explanations to make.

A further examination of the record of the parliament of 1945-46 reveals the name of Mr. Benidickson, the man who I presume is my hon. friend the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys. So apparently he has had a change of heart, because he is now against something which he supported 18 years ago. It would be interesting to have him get to his feet and explain the reasons for this. Then we have the hon. member for Ottawa East (Mr. Richard). Presumably he favoured acceptance of the report also. As I said before, that included the design as given in the speech of the hon. member of Kootenay West, which I have just quoted. The hon. member for Ottawa East might properly explain his change of mind also. Last but not least we have the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), who has not participated in this debate. Rumour has it that he will be voting for the design of the Prime Minister, the government and the Liberal party. He voted for the setting up of the committee in 1945-46; he voted to accept the report of the committee. But now, according to rumour, he has changed his mind and is going to vote for the design submitted in the name of the Prime Minister. I wonder whether he would like to explain to the house why he has changed his mind, or does he wish to deny that he is going to vote for the Prime Minister's design, and declare that he will vote for the subamendment?

I do not wish to overlook many people, Mr. Speaker, so I should like to have the

Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) take part in the debate. Since coming to this house I heard him at one time, when he was on this side of the chamber, declare unequivocally his preference for the flag which floats over the peace tower of this building. That was within the last four years. He has apparently changed his mind. It would be of interest to all hon. members if he were to give his reasons; and I am sure it would be of special interest to the premier of Newfoundland.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): Last, but certainly not least, there is the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss LaMarsh). Where does she stand? I am one of those who expect much from her. Surely changing the flag of a country is important enough that she should contribute to the debate and explain to the house and the people of this country her reasons for wanting it changed. Let us hear what these people are going to say, if anything.

Some time, Mr. Speaker—I will not say when—there will be a vote on this subamendment. It provides for a reference of the matter to the people of Canada and, as I stated previously, it leaves room for the inclusion of other designs. Let the people decide. That, surely, is non-contentious. What is wrong with that? If our hon. friends opposite think they are right, why do they not let the people decide? They say, "It is our duty to do it". Nothing could be further from the truth. In the apparent arrogant refusal of most members on the government side of the house to participate in this debate we see the ultimate in political irresponsibility.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): The people of this country may not remember much of what we say there, but they will never forget that most hon. members opposite said nothing. A few days ago we listened with attention and respect to the speech of the hon. member for York East (Mr. Otto). His speech placed emphasis on this particular point. Among other things, he said:

> We on this side have wondered how it is that so many people in Canada are staunchly entrenched behind the red ensign, a fact we did not expect, people who would otherwise have fondly and readily welcomed a new distinctive flag. It is because they are afraid, and have gathered under the ensign in fear and apprehension of one thing—the division of this nation. They fear the division and separatism about which they have heard.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for York East expresses as a fact that they fear and apprehend a division of the nation. I say that the hon. member has brought to the attention of this house a most important point and one that deserves a tremendous amount of thought and consideration by every responsible member, because it suggests in its language that when people are fearful and apprehensive about their nation, and subsequently about themselves, their families and the future of their families, they seek comfort and protection in something that has come down through the years, because it is one of those things they need in the circumstances I have just described.

So what do they do? They reach for the red ensign. Those are the words of the hon. member for York East and they are also my sentiments, Mr. Speaker. I emphasize that they are the words that hon. member uttered in this chamber, because he said that when people fear something and are afraid the country will be divided, they reach for the red ensign—which means something to them and is an emblem that has come down through the years.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): And Mr. Speaker, this is the symbol this government proposes to scrap, discard, and destroy. Yet the hon. member for York East very properly points out that in his opinion the symbol for which people reach is the red ensign. Where could you find a better, more potent argument for the retention of the red ensign and the things for which it stands? It has been many times tried, never denied, and willing to be tried again.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member deserves the commendation of this house for the point he has brought out and the opinion he has expressed concerning the unity of the nation, even though I find it difficult to believe in his conclusion, which was that he would support the government sponsored design. Yet I recognize his concern for national unity and express my own similar concern. Where we differ to a tremendous extent is with regard to the means we think are necessary to bring about that unity.

So we have the union jack as one of the symbols with regard to which we seek authority to vote, and I do not need to emphasize its significance.

It is the emblem of liberty, truth and justice. Who is there here willing to do away with his rights to justice as a citizen

of this country? No one. Liberty and truth are also important words in the lives of each and every one of us.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on but my time is nearly up. My last words in these few remarks are simply these. It seems to me that this question may and can be solved if only it is approached in a proper state of mind and with a proper attitude. Let us forget what constitutes a political advantage of a temporary nature and remember that the eyes of Canada are on what this parliament does in connection with this most important matter. If we have a few days on other business and then return, this might be a proper course to consider. But in my concluding remarks I deny once more the urgency of the matter. This matter is not urgent. It would be much better to resolve it in a proper way, so that this nation will go forward united, in the years to come, than to tell us that we must resolve it in a week or two and in the wrong way. Those, Mr. Speaker, are my concluding remarks.

Mr. R. A. Webb (Hastings-Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, in rising today to take part in this debate, may I say that, like the hon. member for Wellington South (Mr. Hales) I too spoke on July 3 and at that time expressed my personal views on this resolution. However I feel it would be proper that I put on record the views and opinions of many of the people who have written me in regard to this subject.

Before commencing to put these views on record I would again emphasize that the statement by the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) on behalf of the government, that the reason the government are trying to expedite this issue is because of an election promise is ridiculous. It only proves once more the inefficiency of the government in planning and preparing legislation. In this way they are trying to conceal their inability and inefficiency. To prove that the Prime Minister said the reason for this issue being brought up at this time is that it was an election promise. I should like to refer back to last August 25, when a question was asked of the Postmaster General with regard to a statement attributed to the minister of northern affairs in the last election campaign. The Postmaster General replied that these statements were just election promises and did not carry any authenticity—in other words, that they would not hold any water. I might add that this promise was only made in chosen spots in Canada.

[Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton).]

For no other reason than to persuade the government to turn down the resolution, I would invite them to visit the city of Peterborough. In front of the J. J. Turner works, manufacturers of flags, there are three flags, the union jack, the red ensign and the proposed maple leaf flag. These flags were mounted at the same time, and I would invite any hon. member of this house or any citizen to go to Peterborough and observe the three flags flying there today. Sir, the new proposed flag is a filthy, dirty brownish colour.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Webb: Hon. members can say "oh, oh", but if they are interested they can drive down to Peterborough, where they can see it for themselves. The other flags have retained their beauty.

Mr. Moreau: Made by another manufacturer.

Mr. Webb: I should like to refer to a statement by the Rev. Gordon Smyth in a sermon delivered in the Parkdale United Church in Ottawa. He said:

> It is impossible to cut symbolism out of the affairs of men and nations; the roots go too deep. If a man were to resolve never to use a symbol again he could not shake hands with a friend, put a ring on the finger of his bride, kiss his child or take the sacrament. Human nature requires symbols. The heart craves after some tangible expression of the intangible. The mind is ill at ease until it casts into a material form something of the mysterious emotions of the soul.

May I call it six o'clock?

At six o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Webb: Mr. Speaker, when we adjourned at the dinner hour I was endeavouring to put on record the views of many Canadians from all walks of life who have written to me. However, during the supper hour I could not help thinking how grateful and appreciative many members on the opposite side of the house are, or should be, to this party for taking the stand that we have not or will not let the Prime Minister or government railroad or bulldoze this legislation through.

Having known personally many of the members on the opposite side of the house I am aware of some of their views and opinions. Sir, many of them are of the same opinion

as we are on this side. However, Mr. Speaker, those members have been lucky. They are not muzzled because they are vicious, but because the front benchers know of their views and what the outcome would be if they expressed themselves. They know that the outcome would be detrimental to the government. Time and time again our members have requested members opposite to speak on this resolution.

Mr. Habel: Oh, oh.

Mr. Webb: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member says "oh". I would class him in the same category as that hon. member who announced today in Montreal that he is not going to attend the House of Commons again, but will boycott it until such time as the flag resolution is passed.

Mr. Habel: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I would not like the hon. member to classify me in any way, except as a real Canadian who wants to have a flag as soon as possible.

Mr. Webb: Mr. Speaker, I was classifying the hon. member with one of the members of his party who made a statement in Montreal today. I am glad to hear the hon. member say that he is a real Canadian. We are all looking forward to hearing his speech on this issue.

Mr. Habel: You have asked me a question and I will answer it right away.

Mr. Webb: Mr. Speaker, I should like to refer again to the hon. member who made a statement in Montreal today, and suggest that he is neglecting his duty, which is to be in attendance in this house to present his views on the flag issue rather than to make statements to the press to the effect he is going to stay home and boycott the House of Commons.

Mr. Speaker, you will remember the embarrassing position in which many members were placed when this resolution was introduced. I well remember the week end that members were instructed to scurry back to their ridings and attempt to pacify their constituents. I also remember when they returned to this house they did so with their tails between their legs, because the constituents had told them what they thought. Since that time they have been embarrassed.

Mr. Moreau: I know where you come from.

Mr. Webb: The hon. member is making his usual contribution to this house.

Mr. Habel: I can make a better contribution than that, which you will be able to understand.

An hon. Member: Give them hell, Moe.

Mr. Knowles: Is this one of those high level debates?

Mr. Webb: The hon. member says he knows where I come from, Mr. Speaker. God only knows that there is no one any more proud of his heritage than I, and that is something the hon. member cannot say.

Mr. Speaker, at six o'clock I was quoting from a statement by the Rev. Gordon Smyth. I should now like to carry on with that statement, which reads as follows:

> Why, then, is the issue of our national symbols so explosive? Because it has not been set in the context of the significance of religion, alike in history and modern life. The fundamental importance of religion in the development of the human race may be more clearly recognized if we consider certain possible divergences from history... Let us suppose that Christianity had remained a racial sect. Let us suppose that Charles Martel had failed against the Mohammedans at the Battle of the Pyrenees. Let us suppose that French missionaries had not shared the lot of settlers along the shores of the St. Lawrence. Let us suppose that saddle-bag ministers of the gospel had not helped to bring law and order, education and courage to English speaking Upper Canada. Let us suppose that the Fathers of Confederation had brought to their conferences only shrewd, practical, bargaining points, with no spirit touched by common allegiance to the founder of Christianity...
>
> And yet Canadians cannot afford to be either smug or complacent. Too many spurn the lessons of the past. Too many echo the pernicious sentiment that "whatever is, is right." Too many fail to realize that to believe in "the easy buck" or "the mood of the voters" is a disastrous philosophy which, in the long run, catches up with them. Too many are unable to accept the facts of history because, unlike citizens of other nations, they no longer know those facts.
>
> Such a statement from a child just may be understandable. But what of a deputy minister of citizenship and immigration who recently referred me to his office since he was not sure what Victoria day is called nowadays?
>
> All this has a bearing on the explosive issue of national symbols. It would appear that anything goes, provided it goes. That is just a point. Anything just does not go from the long term point of view. The Americans learned this the hard way in the civil war over the federal power versus state rights 100 years ago. Shades of trends in Canada. Latterly I have been discussing the matter with numerous English speaking members of parliament.

I would commend this to many members opposite.

> They are practically of one accord. They are frustrated. They are pessimistic. They privately resent the fact that while French Canadians vigorously assert their right to symbols of their own, they would seemingly deny a similar right to

meaningful symbols for the nation as a whole by seeking to rub the federal slate clean of 'the British connection'. They keenly resent all this privately and yet most of them publicly proclaim "peace, peace" when actually there is less and less peace. "The voice of English Canada is silent", they say sadly. They fail to add that this includes their own voices. This is not healthy. It is the symptom of a dread disease.

This is a major lesson out of the past. The past! Permit me to quote from a statement by Dr. Eugene Forsey who requires no introduction to people acquainted with public affairs. Exclaims Dr. Forsey:

"This government is firmly committed to the basically bicultural character of our country, yet it proposes a flag which contains not the slightest reference to any culture whatever, even agriculture. If the country is basically bicultural, then the flag should be basically bicultural too. Everything human, every vestige of our history, everything distinctively Canadian, except a piece of vegetation, has been carefully excluded."

Of course, it is realized that Canadians have carried the insignia of the maple leaf on their uniforms in time of war. However, this has been played up out of all proportion. The Royal Canadian Legion knows this. What segment of the population is in a better position to know? What segment deserves as much respect? Those whom we call veterans wore the maple leaf but they did not follow the maple leaf into battle. They followed ideals symbolized by the union jack and the Canadian red ensign. I have a notion that if they have gone on record as favouring the parliamentary definition of the ensign as the national flag this is not to rub the noses of French Canadians in the victory of General James Wolfe on the plains of Abraham but rather to affirm those precious elements in both cultures which we have in common.

What is the common denominator? Not something taken from nature, but from human nature. Not just maple leaves from trees found on this continent outside of Canada as well as inside our borders, but a human, living symbol unique in our particular part of the western hemisphere. I refer to the monarchy. I have in mind the crown. I have in mind that crown which Sir Georges Etienne Cartier extolled as the protector of the rights of French Canadians and which Sir Wilfrid Laurier extolled time and again. Are there English Canadians who feel that this symbol is outmoded? Are there French Canadians who feel that this symbol is merely an Anglo-Saxon emblem of superiority?

I do not doubt it. Unfortunately it would appear so. I have even been told by a parliamentary expert in heraldry that a crown above the cluster of maple leaves on the proposed flag would not be suitable from the heraldic standpoint. This expert stated that by the same standard the stars and stripes would fail to get a pass mark. Tell that to the average American! Moreover, the broadcast indication that a special banner may be prepared, with the union jack and the crown for commonwealth occasions, is little more than a sop. It would wither on the public vine if even given a chance to grow in the first place. Look at what has happened to the 24th of May. This used to be regarded as empire day. It should have evolved into commonwealth day. However, what is it now? I have already indicated that a deputy minister of citizenship and immigration had to refer me to his office and to the list of statutory holidays to find out what the occasion was. At any rate, it certainly is not commonwealth day.

Mr. Pickersgill: It is not empire day either, and never was.

Mr. Webb: You had a request this afternoon to make a speech, so your turn is coming.

Never was there a juncture in national affairs like the present crisis to spark a grasp of what the Right Hon. Vincent Massey said out of his far flung knowledge of this land in the capacity of governor general. In his book entitled "On Being Canadian" Mr. Massey has written: "The supreme contribution to the cause of our unity is made by the crown. Nothing else with us stands above all controversy, represents equally all the elements which make up the state and preserves the vital factor of continuity in our national life." The wisdom of these words should be superimposed above the popularity of maple leaves on our proposed national flag. The alternative is even greater division. The omission of this symbol will result in the sort of natural protest and feeling of injustice in many parts of Canada which many in Quebec still manifest toward a certain political party over the conscription issue of 1917.

May I say in passing that at lunch hour a gentleman spoke to me who had just returned last evening from a tour through Quebec. He said he had seen as many red ensigns flying in Quebec as any other flag and I say, thank God for that.

The omission of this symbol will cause the Canadian red ensign to continue to be flown over the legislative buildings and institutions of a majority of the provinces from Newfoundland to British Columbia.

It is with this prediction, this warning, in mind that I quote from the Kingston *Whig-Standard*. The *Whig-Standard* can hardly be branded as either a Progressive Conservative or socialist newspaper. The fact of the matter is that its president, Hon. W. Rupert Davies, is a Liberal senator in the upper house. A recent editorial in that newspaper dealt in no uncertain terms with the flag issue. This editorial was bluntly captioned, "Sold Out!" It said in part, as follows: "There is one thing sure: Nobody is forced to recognize a flag or symbol and this new, synthetic product will be refused recognition by many millions of Canadians. Mr. Pearson has issued a challenge to Canadians. He is betting on the weakness of parliament to sustain him in his decision to sell us out. This is a bitter day for Canada."

What an indictment! May it be reversed by a strong parliament fearless of the shocking threat of an election held over its head. May parliament remember that at the time of the coronation Right Hon. Louis St. Laurent explained why Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II of Canada was officially acclaimed on capital hill as defender of the faith in these words: "Because this is a Christian country."

May parliament recall the vision of Hon. George Brown, a Father of Confederation and a prophetic Grit, which he referred to in these famous words: "Our scheme is to establish a government that will endeavour to maintain liberty, and justice, and Christianity throughout the land."

Not long ago, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Matheson) had a letter printed in many papers across Canada. I would like to read one of the replies to his letter:

Sir: As a very ordinary and old Canadian, may I reply to John R. Matheson, M.P. for Leeds, in your columns.

Though I was not born in the U.K. or Canada, I have Canadian citizenship papers; and, along with over 43,000 Canadian volunteers, I saw active service, against the Kaiser in France and at sea, and against Hitler, in France and other countries and at sea...

Seemingly the Liberal spokesmen are trying, by half truths, to justify a complete break with the founders of the Canadian nation...

Surely this repudiation of the past is also breaking the fifth commandment: "Honour thy father and thy mother that thy days may be long in the land which the Lord thy God has given thee."

Here is another editorial headed:

Our Lord was sold for 30 pieces of silver: our flag—the emblem of our relationship to Him—for 75 Quebec votes.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Webb:

Thus one more symbol of our Christian and British heritage—

I am not ashamed.

Mr. Habel: You should be.

Mr. Webb: If you want to see who should be ashamed, take a look in the mirror.

Thus one more symbol of our Christian and British heritage is being taken from us. Will the throne be next?

To millions of Canadians the union jack is a symbol of everything worth while in life. In it our history, our traditions, and all our hopes for the future are enshrined and, in it, too, are embodied all those intangible things of the spirit which are more precious than life itself. Of even more importance, is the fact that it is the true banner of the cross—the emblem of Jesus, the Christ, our Savior and Lord who died on the cross, for us.

Now, for party advantage and by political chicanery, this sacred symbol is to be taken from us. This is a grievous wrong which will bring sorrow and heartbreak to millions.

The result of this action may not be long in coming.

An hon. Member: You are a good reader.

Mr. Webb: I would rather read than have unreliable words spout from my mouth all the time.

Few nations, and certainly not Canada, can survive such a drastic break with its past. The resentment against Quebec is deep and bitter and steadily mounting.

Even more serious is the fact that, in rejecting the union jack, we are rejecting the symbol of that special relationship to God given to nations which officially acknowledge Him by using His Cross as their emblem. Further, in a world of turmoil and aggression, we lose the protection which that relationship provides.

The three crosses, as arranged on the union jack, form the first and the last letters of the ancient Hebrew alphabet (Sinai script). As such, they correspond to Alpha and Omega which is the name of God as it appears in the book of the revelation. Thus, in ancient Hebrew letters, the union jack is the monogram or name of God. Any nation having that name is safe from invasion or destruction under God's promise "No weapon that is turned against thee shall prosper."

Thus, by rejecting the union jack we are not only repudiating that special relationship to God which is our birthright, but are taking ourselves out from under the protection of His name into the appalling dangers of the coming Armageddon.

Only Satan can gain anything from such incredible folly.

Mr. Orlikow: Who is the author of that?

Mr. Webb: The Toronto district branch of the Canadian British-Israel association.

Mr. Fisher: Your friends, Bert.

Mr. Webb: I only wish hon. members opposite were as concerned about the future of their country as are the authors of these articles.

An hon. Member: You are more concerned about Great Britain than Canada.

Mr. Webb: Here is a letter from another gentleman, Mr. Aylsworth, who wrote to the Prime Minister as follows:

I earnestly desire to retain the red ensign as the official flag of Canada....It is conceivable to me that those who wish to remove the union jack from the flag of Canada also wish to secede from the commonwealth. I am opposed to any institution or ideology operating within the commonwealth which is unfriendly to the commonwealth as a whole.

Here is another by Mr. Hughes:

Keeping the jack in Canada's flag is definitely our job, our obligation. As a first world war veteran, I prefer the red ensign, but will settle for the jack and one maple leaf.

Here is a petition signed by a family in Tamworth:

The three maple leaves has no meaning to the Canadian people.

Mr. Deschatelets: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to prevent the hon. member reading these letters but under the rules he should provide us with the names of the people who sent them, and also the addresses.

Mr. Webb: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I thought I had.

Mr. Deschatelets: You said a family.

Mr. Webb: The Lockhead family in Tamworth, Ontario.

An hon. Member: What about Mr. Hughes?

Mr. Webb: Of Verona, Ontario.

The three maple leaves has no meaning to the Canadian people. It is a flag we feel the Canadian people will never accept. Let the people have a vote and speak for themselves. ...We want to see a united Canada.

Mr. R. A. Dean of Norwood, Ontario wrote:

For the life of me, I cannot even imagine changing the red ensign...It is rather sickening to think that sane people should be compelled to even consider something so blank in its entirety.

Mr. William Young of Tamworth wrote:

Regardless of what the government brings out as Canada's new flag, I still will recognize but one flag, and that is the red ensign. ...

Mr. Stanley Ball of Verona wrote:

It is our opinion there should be a plebiscite at the next election in order to give the people a chance to express their wishes on the flag question.

Mrs. A. Wilkes of Denbigh wrote:

I am a mother who lost her son in world war II and had four boys who served in the war. I would like to say I do hope you try very hard to retain the red ensign as our flag. Everyone with whom I have talked say they don't want the flag changed. Who wants three maple leaves? It looks like something made in Japan. If the red ensign was good enough for our forefathers and for the thousands who fought and died in two world wars it's still good enough to fly over Canada.

Mr. and Mrs. Carleton Potts of Stirling wrote:

I protest vehemently the idea that a few ambitious representatives of Canada's millions can speak for me on the flag issue. I protest that even a majority vote will change my flag and I loathe the situation whereby political expediency can dare to challenge our historical standard. I am not pro-British, anti-Quebec nor have I an axe to grind. I am a Canadian of mongrel blood perhaps, but if you can take my personal tax cheque, if you can take my son to fight for you, if you can name the ways I may forfeit my freedom for breaking the laws of the country, you can damned well listen to my opinion. Can anyone be asinine enough to believe that we Canadians are so limp that we will accept the silly little school-girl pennant as our flag? This pennant will never be my flag, Mr. Webb. Multiply me by hundreds of thousands and tell your cohorts to look to their jobs.

Here is another letter from John Starke of Norwood:

The red ensign is the flag we have loved and used for many long years and I hope we will for many more.

It is heartening to note that the representation we are receiving from our people in favour of our stand for the red ensign is increasing daily. Speaking as one who represents these voters in this house, I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that we will speak many more times on the subject if we have to.

Finally, I wish to quote part of a letter I have just received from Mr. J. Edward Armand of Picton, Ontario:

The reason I know the cross-sectional ferment among the people over the flag, and the disgust and discouragement with parliament, guilty or innocent, is because my professional income must be supplemented by wide commercial travel.

Not long ago, when this flag issue was introduced, one of the members opposite came into the house wearing a large flag on his garment displaying the Prime Minister's proposed flag on a plastic or metal pin. It is interesting to find out that when this same member goes back to his riding, the flag disappears. I ask hon. members: What kind of attitude is this?

In closing, may I say we know that the Prime Minister has been misled. We realize that he has been misled by some of his advisers; but it is not too late for him to change his ways. Responsibility for this debate rests with the other side of the house. All they have to do, over there, is withdraw their resolution and the debate will be at an end. One more retraction would not mean anything to this government, because already the government will go down in history as the donkey government; they have taken more steps backward than forward. Their sole objective since they came to power has been to create one carrot after another to hold in front of the voters. Like the hon. member for Wellington South (Mr. Hales) I intend to vote in favour of a plebiscite which would enable the Canadian people to decide this issue. I think it would be only right and proper that all the ballots should be sent to a headquarters either here in Ottawa or in some designated city. If this were done, no one would know how anyone in a certain section of the country had voted, or how the majority of votes had gone in a particular area. We do not want to know how people in a particular part of the country voted. We want to know how Canadians as a whole voted. We want a united Canada, and that is what we are fighting for.

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): It had not been my intention to take part in this debate, but I think the house will be interested in a few observations at this point from one who takes an objective view of contentious issues.

I have just returned from a ten day visit to my constituency where I had the opportunity to meet a good number of my constituents. I am always interested in finding out what the average person is thinking in relation to what is happening in parliament. I have discussed this flag issue with a good many people. I must say that my conversations clearly indicated that the soundest way in which to settle this matter would be by means of a plebiscite.

I wanted to find out how public opinion was reflected in other ways, so I went into a number of stores and asked: Are you selling the Prime Minister's flag? And on every occasion they said: What do you think; do you think I want to go bankrupt? I cannot find this design being sold anywhere. That is the situation as I found it in my constituency.

I returned to Ottawa during the latter part of last week and I must say I was somewhat surprised, after a little investigation, to find a situation existing here in Ottawa which further confirmed the opinion I have expressed previously in this debate, that the only fair way to settle this matter was through a national plebiscite. I suggest that such a plebiscite could be held at the time of the next general election at which point persons would have an opportunity to express their opinions on this matter. I suggest that if it were put to them at such a plebiscite the great majority of the Canadian people would willingly accept the decision. We are all democrats, although at times when I look across the other side of the house I have my doubts.

Some two months ago, when this flag was first introduced and the model first flown on parliament hill and on the flagstaff of the Prime Minister's residence, naturally there were persons who were interested in purchasing flags and selling them. At that time, the sale price in Ottawa was $1. That was the general price. I went and inquired of the joke shop on Bank street, which was selling quite a few. Now that the debate has gone on for some while, and people have had an opportunity to think this matter over, what has happened? Since my return, I have inquired how the flags are selling and I find that the price had dropped to 79 cents. Then, later they dropped to 59 cents. At the conclusion of the exhibition, I found that a gentleman who had a store there was trying to get rid of them for 19 cents. Mr. Speaker, I think this clearly indicates a growing lack of interest in the flag proposed by the Prime Minister even in the capital city.

I respect anyone's point of view, but I say this is a good indication of the necessity for giving the Canadian people the opportunity to express opinions on this matter. After all, in the capital city a great deal has been done to support the Prime Minister's flag. I believe he has had the support of a good many individuals in more or less indirect ways. I think persons prominent in the government have done what they could to arouse interest in this flag. But now we find that the price has dropped from $1 to 19 cents. I have always found from experience that when an article begins to drop in price it is because there is no demand for it. That is just what is happening at the present time.

That is all I wish to bring to the attention of the house. This is concrete and conclusive evidence that support for the Prime Minister's flag is dropping rapidly, even in the capital city of Ottawa. On this account I would urge the right hon. gentleman to accept the proposal put forward by the opposition, that a national plebiscite be held so that the Canadian people may themselves decide this important issue which goes beyond the realm of economics and beyond the realm of legislation of other types; it strikes to the roots of the people's loyalties and sentiments. The Canadian people should be given the opportunity to decide for themselves the Canadian flag they wish to have in the years ahead.

Mr. J. E. Madill (Dufferin-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in this debate at the invitation of the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) I make no apology. Had the flag been an election issue and a plank in the Liberal platform during the election of 1963, whereby the people of Canada could have expressed their views, I would have taken a different viewpoint. Since it was not, except, as one would surmise, that possibly a different front was presented to our French speaking Canadians in Quebec than was presented to the other nine provinces in Canada, I feel it my duty to speak on behalf of the constituents of my riding and express their views and ardent desire to maintain the red ensign.

The introduction of the amendment and subamendment are the only possible opportunities accorded members to voice their opinions. I have a letter sent by the dean of Mount Royal College, Calgary, Alberta, to the hon. member for London (Mr. Irvine), and I am going to read a short excerpt from it:

> While I was in New York this summer, I was asked to address a group on "Education in Canada". In order to refresh my memory I went down to

the Canadian consul's office at 680 Fifth avenue, (9th floor, I believe) for a bit of information. They gave me an envelope which they call a teacher's kit. This contains a large political map of Canada; speeches of prominent Canadians, (e.g. Lester Pearson, Paul Martin, Paul Hellyer, Walter Gordon);—

I do not see the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp) or the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) listed here:

—a booklet, summarizing the geography, climate, etc., of Canada; and a thicker booklet giving all sorts of facts about the country; and a Canadian flag (enclosed). It is to be noted that this is described as "distinctive of Canada".

The brochure enclosed with the letter is entitled "The Canadian Red Ensign" and it says:

The flag now used as distinctive of Canada is properly described as the red ensign with the shield of the coat of arms of Canada in the fly. The flag consists of a red field, with the union jack in the first quarter, next to the staff. The inclusion of the union jack signifies Canada's association with the other members of the British commonwealth of nations. The coat of arms bears the emblems of the four countries from which the original settlers of Canada were chiefly drawn—the three lions of England, the lilies of France, the lion rampant of Scotland and the harp of Ireland—together with a branch carrying three maple leaves, the special emblem of Canada.

The Canadian red ensign may be flown from buildings owned or occupied by the Canadian government within or without Canada.

It is also appropriate for the Canadian ensign to be flown within or without Canada wherever place or occasion may make it desirable to fly a distinctive Canadian flag.

It is indication enough, when this kind of brochure is put out in the United States, that this government did think the red ensign was a distinctive Canadian flag. I have received all kinds of petitions, copies of which have been sent to the Secretary of State (Mr. Lamontagne). They are addressed to the Secretary of State of Canada and are headed:

We the undersigned respectfully request the Canadian red ensign, which has been authorized by four governments of Canada during the past 70 years by order in council P.C. 5888 and signed by the Governor General on September 5, 1945, be retained as the flag of Canada.

It is very interesting to look over the names that appear on the petitions. Evidence that this was not an election promise in my riding during the last election campaign is clearly indicated by a signature here of one of the nominees at the Liberal convention, and another name is that of one of the Liberal organizers in my area. There are also a good many other names which indicate that these people did not expect this issue to be initiated by the government.

The announcement—or, I should say, the political speech—made by the Prime Minister at the dominion Legion convention at Winnipeg was very ill advised and controversial, being given in the memorial ritual opening ceremonies. I happened to be in Winnipeg for that convention and my personal feeling was that he was very ill advised to make a political speech and try to choke the Legion members with the new proposed flag. Had it been debated on the floor of the convention the legionnaires would have taken a much different attitude. One thing this government has failed to recognize, I would say, being a veteran myself, is that 70 per cent of the supporters of this government are legionnaires; and not only that, but the armed services are pretty strong supporters of the government. It is very surprising to me that they would consider killing the hen that laid the golden egg.

I have many telegrams here. To mention only a few, there is one from C. C. Sparling, the dominion president of the Legion. This telegram reads:

The Royal Canadian Legion at its 20th biennial convention in Winnipeg overwhelmingly endorses the Canadian red ensign and asks your unqualified support of its stand.

I also have a telegram from the outgoing provincial president of the Ontario command of the Legion, which reads:

Dominion convention Royal Canadian Legion Winnipeg May 21st approved Canadian red ensign as Legion's official flag to be flown over all Legion branches and commands now and in future. Ontario command 525 branches and 86,000 members request your consideration in support of Canadian red ensign at time of vote in parliament on flag question.

That is signed by A. H. Adams, president, Ontario command, Royal Canadian Legion.

I also have a telegram from the zone commander in my own district, J. H. Hackett, which reads:

Zone II wishes your support in maintaining red ensign.

I also have a letter from practically every branch in the riding of the ladies auxiliary and the Canadian corps, all asking for support of the red ensign. I have letters from the women's auxiliaries, the I.O.D.E., the Canadian-British Israel association of Ontario, and women's institutes. This represents a large voice of the people of Canada, and their feeling is that the Canadian red ensign should be maintained.

I should like to quote a letter from a nationally known figure, a veteran of the last war and a man who has done a great deal

for crippled children in Canada. I am sure he is known by all hon. members. I refer to Conn Smythe of Toronto. He says:

The enclosed article is both interesting and informative.

The article to which he refers is entitled "Symbol of Unity" and is taken from the *Veterans Advocate* of August, 1963. The letter continues:

The red ensign has been authorized as our flag by four governments of Canada during the past 70 years, the latest being by order in council (P.C. 5888) September 5, 1945.

The statement that our flag is not distinctive is, to say the least, erroneous. There can be no doubt in the minds of the Cypriots, Greeks and Turks, when they see the Van Doos and the red ensign, as to where these troops come from.

In the Olympic games the whole world is represented and when Canada sometimes wins a gold medal everybody knows, when the red ensign is raised to the masthead, that Canada has won a world's championship.

With the continued world-wide success of Canada as a country, and the extraordinary individual feats of Canadians under this flag, it might not be amiss to wonder who or what is behind this movement to haul down our flag. We should be on our guard that we as Canadians are not being led up the garden path.

I will read part of this statement entitled "Symbol of Unity", but may I first mention the editor's footnote. The article is by Brigadier Ian S. Johnston, C.B.E., D.S.O., E.D.; chevalier, legion of honour; croix de guerre, and the footnote is: "Here is the most mature and thoughtful presentation on a Canadian flag which has appeared during the prolonged, needless controversy. It is worth reading no matter what personal views you hold". This statement reads, in part:

Canada now has 19 million people, but over two million of them are not native born. It means a serious leavening problem for the assimilation is complicated by our growing pains, but Canada is in fact a country with an honourable past where the problems of religious and racial differences have already been resolved. Canadians have developed a greater tolerance than we perhaps ourselves realize.

Few factors could be more effective in fostering and enhancing this than a thoughtful appraisal of the elements embodied in the Canadian ensign, which has played the role of our official Canadian flag since before the Kaiser war.

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 our varied traditions and cultures, but 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 proclaim it as our symbol of unity, the ideal flag for a country like ours....

A flag should be emblematic of its people, and this is clearly achieved....

Why is this group of devices called an "ensign" rather than a flag? A flag is a piece of cloth used for signalling or other purposes such as denoting danger, surrender, pestilence or all clear. An ensign may be a flag or other device, but it has the special function of denoting identity and is a rallying point. In our case it is interesting to note that the word is derived through the French word "enseigne".

The very complexity of our flag is a virtue. It represents ideals, and ideals are not simple matters. Here is a flag that has wealth of meaning and inspiration for each one of us according to our bent. A true student of heraldry can discover in it far more than is suggested above.

The people who own to this flag are the independant sons of the partnership of great peoples. The religious and racial tolerances we represent were achieved only at great cost.

While we negotiate, we do so only with honour and remain loyal to the death to our ideals. If civilization is to survive Canada must cherish her spirit of brotherhood, and lead the way against narrow nationalism.

Twice, without hesitation, our young men have fought under this flag and given their lives for the righteous cause against narrow nationalism.

Our interest is the common good, the brotherhood of man—a modern concept to be achieved only in a country held in reserve by the Creator for just such a people.

This is what we are—that is what our ensign proclaims us to be.

I should now like to place on record a clipping from the Victoria *Daily Colonist* dated August 8, 1964. It is entitled "Feet of Clay".

Mr. Pickersgill: You have already read that page.

Mr. Madill: You probably would not know the difference anyway.

Mr. Pickersgill: Nor would you.

Mr. Madill: This article reads:

The Commons summer recess has gone the way that seems to afflict Victoria's summer weather; there won't be any. Having got its interim supply bill through at last, and for three months instead of two, parliament will sit well into the fall.

The assumption is that the Commons will then recess 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 petulance 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 the dilemma is offered him.

Where does the blame for the present parliamentary stalemate lie? Solely in Mr. Pearson's obduracy over the flag issue. This is the core that keeps parliament sitting and the normal business of the country held back from speedy progression.

This has been evident ever since he introduced the flag resolution. To begin with he held the threat of an election over M.P.'s heads, did they fail to pass the flag measure, which was tantamount to holding a gun at their heads and depriving them of unbiased decision.

In fact, the long sitting hours are just another indication of the same thing.

He refused a free vote on the subject. While blaming Mr. Diefenbaker for non-compliance he has now prevented the compromise suggestion that would delay the contentious flag bill to a fall session by insisting on an unacceptable time limit to its debate.

It is not obstructionism on the part of Mr. Diefenbaker that is at fault but the Prime Minister's insistence on having his own way.

Mr. Pearson says he is not prepared to call an election on any of the current issues facing parliament, the flag of course being the main one. Is he afraid of the result? This would probably be the quickest and most salutary solution to a parliamentary stalemate that grows worse with each passing day.

The country has been told that an election would split it and create national disunity. The lack of unity presently so evident in relation to Quebec dissidence and to the question of a new flag could not be greater. An election in fact would clear the air by either giving Mr. Pearson a majority mandate, and thus enabling national acceptance of his policies, the flag included, or rejecting his regime in toto.

But Mr. Pearson is bent on following his own stubborn course, although one wonders how much longer the smaller opposition groups can abide such intractability and the debilitating and unsatisfactory situation thus forced on parliament. The former U.N. diplomat of high repute certainly reveals his feet of clay. Stubbornship is no substitute for statesmanship.

This is a democratic country and the only way it can continue to be democratic is by our exercising our freedom of speech in this house. I hear the word "filibuster" used continually lately, but I think it dates back quite a bit to before the commencement of the flag debate. I have a little item here contributed by the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Beer) and which appeared in the Orangeville *Banner*. I see he is in the house so perhaps he will not mind if I give him a little publicity. The article is headed: "Peel representative explains filibuster", and I will only put on record a short extract:

Flaws in Canada's parliamentary system came to light early last week when one opposition party proved it could bring parliament to a standstill. In an obvious move to delay debate on the flag issue, it entered into a speech making marathon on the type of business that does not call for a vote on specific issues: interim supply.

I could not help but notice that when the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp) made his speech it reeked of the word "filibuster".

Mr. Speaker, at a time just before we normally would have taken Easter recess, simply because the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Nugent) stood for his rights in this house and objected to a bill involving $140 million being passed without debate, three of our hon. friends to the left in the New Democratic party spoke continuously. I do not know why that was not classed as a filibuster. In fact, I noticed in the next week some of those hon. members were absent.

Mr. Godin: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question? Would he explain to the house why the Conservatives are speaking at a time when we are waiting to settle two Conservative amendments?

Mr. Madill: For one reason, we are waiting to hear your speeches. If you were listening to my earlier remarks you would have heard me say that we are speaking at the invitation of the Prime Minister.

Getting back to the subamendment, Mr. Speaker, I should like to quote a portion of an article written by Charles Lynch which appeared in the Ottawa *Citizen* on August 22. You probably will not want to hear this either, but Mr. Lynch states:

The red ensign is now stronger than ever.

If not above the battle, it at least flew over the battlefield—and its position seems considerably stronger at summer's end than it was at the beginning.

Mr. Pearson is ready to throw the design of a new flag back into committee—a far cry from hopes that it could be flying by July 1, or for the royal visit in October.

The only thing that has happened to the ensign during the summer, apart from the fact that its sales have boomed, is that the government is reportedly ready to substitute it for the union jack as the symbol of Queen and commonwealth, with perhaps a crown substituted for the coat of arms in the fly.

Say what you like about the Tory filibuster led by Mr. Diefenbaker, it has taken its toll of the government's position on the three-leaf flag, as is evident by Mr. Pearson's willingness to compromise.

In terms of the House of Commons, it has been an effective political manoeuvre.

Whether it has been as effective in terms of the country remains to be seen.

The filibuster was aimed at the three-leaf flag, and the three-leaf flag is in trouble.

Mr. Speaker, had the flag been sent to a committee at the beginning and a free vote given to hon. members I am reasonably sure the flag debate would have been concluded. This is another occasion of the cart being placed before the horse or, shall I say, another case of trial and error.

The hon. member for London (Mr. Irvine) offered constructive criticism the other day, and I think he made a worth-while contribution when he suggested that a committee should select several flags and present them to the country for a choice, and that no government would stand or fall on this issue. This flag issue is now beyond the depths of understanding of a great number of people, and we would not want this type of debate to take place every time a controversial issue is raised. We certainly would not want this type of debate to commence every time the government changed.

As a veteran I feel strongly in support of the red ensign, and I intend to maintain that position even though I would compromise in order to maintain the unity in this country which is vital to each and every one of us sent here by our constituents.

An article appeared in the Toronto *Telegram* on August 22, which sums up the situation very well, and I think it is worth quoting for the record. The article begins:

Ask the people.

The Canadian ensign must not be lowered without the consent of the people.

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.

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.

Here is a matter that touches the hearts, the emotions, the loyalties of virtually all Canadians. A parliamentary vote that would destroy the country's flag would leave deep and festering scars for years to come.

Too big for compromise.

It is far too important to be settled by parliamentary compromise.

Though Prime Minister Pearson has given extraordinary priority to the flag legislation, he did not make it a central part of his campaign when he was seeking election. True, he promised a new flag within two years.

There was no suggestion that parliament would be presented with a single, peculiar pennant design and be told that this must be our flag.

If there had been such a proposition, it is quite possible that Mr. Pearson's minority representation in the House of Commons would have been considerably smaller.

It has been said that a plebiscite would be divisive. This is nonsense. Nothing could have been more divisive than the Prime Minister's introduction of the issue as a matter of high priority.

By doing so, he has made the national flag a partisan political issue. If he succeeds in forcing it on the country, it will be looked upon by thousands of Canadians as a political badge. It will fail to receive the honour and respect that belongs now to the ensign.

Mr. Pearson, as an act of compromise, has announced that he would allow a free vote; that is, individual members would be allowed to vote as they like outside the discipline of their parties.

This is a move in the right direction—or, it would have been had it been made earlier.

Vote can't be free.

At this stage, with party lines hardened, it is difficult to conceive of a truly free vote.

Having shown, belatedly, a willingness to retreat from his earlier stubborn demands for the banner of his choice, he now should go one step further and measure public sentiment by plebiscite.

Perhaps Mr. Pearson fears the outcome of such a testing of public opinion. Letters and petitions expressing determination to retain the ensign have been impressive.

There is no reason why this obstructive and divisive bill should not be shelved pending a reference to the people. There is no urgency. Most Canadians outside Quebec appear to be quite satisfied with the flag we have now. In Quebec, the matter is of little importance as there they fly the Laurentian flag with its white cross and fleur-de-lis.

Mr. Godin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member has been reading for the last four or five minutes an editorial in toto. I suggest hon. members may make references to editorials but should make their own speeches in this effort at filibuster.

Mr. Madill: I could do that, but I think perhaps what I am doing is hurting the hon. members' toes worse than if I made my own speech. Mr. Speaker, I am almost finished, and I will then be glad to listen to that hon. member read or make a speech, however distasteful.

The article I was reading continues:

Until Mr. Pearson softens his stand, the opposition is justified in continuing a modified filibuster. As distasteful as such devices are in parliament, no other method seems practical in the face of Mr. Pearson's stubbornness.

The way out of the parliamentary impasse is clear; a plebiscite to end the long debate and to allow parliament to get on with more important legislation.

Canadian Flag

I have one further comment to make, Mr. Speaker. I hope a Canadian flag means more to that hon. member sitting on the opposite side than a symbol on a bathing skirt, or a sticker on a bumper. The Canadian flag means something more than that to me, and I hope it means more to the hon. member. Thank you.

Mr. Fred F. Stenson (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to bring before this house the feeling of the majority of people in my constituency. This is the first time I have spoken during the flag debate, and I have no apology to make for taking up the time of this house. I feel that every member of this house should speak during this debate.

I should like to say a word or two about the speech made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp). I feel he should be congratulated because he is the first cabinet minister to speak on the flag issue. I think we should hear more from cabinet ministers if they feel so strongly about the three maple leaves design. The minister accused the Conservative party of carrying on a filibuster, and I should like to read from the beginning of his remarks. As found on page 6956 of *Hansard* he said:

> Mr. Speaker, I have hestitated to take part in this debate, not from any lack of conviction but because no one with respect for our parliamentary institutions would wish to contribute to the filibuster now under way.

I do not believe this was his true feeling, for later in his speech he said, as found on page 6961:

> During the last few days I have made a point of listening to the speeches made in this debate both on the subamendment and on the amendment which is still before the house... I must say that all those to whom I listened spoke with great sincerity. They stated with sincerity their convictions about a Canadian flag, and this is as it should be. I have no quarrel with that.

Why did he start his speech by accusing this party of a filibuster? I feel he was sincere in his speech and I believe that everybody who has spoken in this debate has been sincere. Everyone knows that when the Prime Minister introduced the flag resolution he expressed the hope that everyone wishing to speak on it would be able to do so. Yet every time he comes in the house he accuses us of a filibuster. The majority of the people in nine of the provinces do not feel it is a filibuster, nor do I think the people in the province of Quebec feel it is a filibuster.

I agree that no party should obstruct the business of the house. I also agree that no one man should tell this country what flag we are going to fly for the next generation, for our children and their children. I do not think that one man should get up in the house, as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) did, and criticize any other member and any other party. Since I have been a member of the house I think he and his party have certainly used more of parliament's time than the party I represent.

I do not believe that any member of the house should ask for closure, as the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency (Mr. Marcoux) did several days ago. I should like to ask the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) if he supports this view, but I see he is not in the house at present. I should also like to ask the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. Leboe) whether he supports closure. In this regard I should like to quote from a memorandum that he sent to his constituents in which he said:

> The people of Canada have never been asked nor have the people said they want a new flag other than the red ensign. The chief electoral officer should be notified that the opinion of the people is necessary to settle the matter and, therefore, should proceed to have a vote taken by way of a transferable ballot on which a number of choice designs, including the red ensign, are manifest.

It is a two page memorandum and it is very interesting. I wonder whether the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency read it before he made his speech.

To go back to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, I should like to compliment him because he said he would not support closure or any action of that type in the house. But I should like to point out the fact that he claimed it made his blood boil when people spoke disparagingly about the three maple leaves. How does he think the people who support the red ensign feel when they see the Liberal government trying to tear down the red ensign? The minister says we need a spirit of tolerance, and I say to the minister that is what the Conservative party is asking the government for. We are asking them to show tolerance in choosing a flag for Canada. While the minister was speaking he left me with the impression that he felt only the Liberal government could bring in a flag for Canada. I say that if the flag resolution had been presented to the house properly the country would never have been divided on this issue.

The Ottawa *Journal* summed up the question of the flag in an editorial in today's issue when it said that the real task is to produce

a flag that will unite the nation, and that whether this takes a month or four months is relatively unimportant. My correspondence has consisted of several hundred letters in favour of the retention of the red ensign and only six letters in favour of the new maple leaf flag. I have a letter here from a lady who has asked me to support the three maple leaves. She lost her only son in the last war and her brother in the first war. I appreciate letters of this type, but for this one letter I have received 100 letters asking for the retention of the red ensign. Many of the letters I have received supporting the red ensign intimate that the writers would be willing to accept a modified version of the ensign, if this is what is needed to unite Canada; but in most cases they point out very emphatically that they cannot accept the new flag proposed by the Prime Minister. This is a good reason why we should have a plebiscite or a committee set up to consider the flag.

Since the flag resolution was proposed to the house we find that all across the nation people are showing an interest in the Canadian red ensign that has never been shown before. Red ensigns are now being flown from private homes, factories and other places of business, and cottages. When I go home on the week end I sometimes have a chance to go to the lake and every cottage is flying a red ensign or a maple leaf flag. There is another member in the house who has a cottage on the lake and he has been flying the one maple leaf flag. Two or three weeks ago the flag was taken down, but when I went there last Sunday he had it flying at half mast. So I do not know what to expect next week. It might be the red ensign, and I hope it will be.

The hon. member for Hastings-Frontenac (Mr. Webb) referred earlier this evening to the flag manufacturer in Peterborough. This is an old, established firm which has been doing business throughout the dominion for years. In the last four months this firm has sold as many red ensigns and union jacks as it did in the previous five or six years. This is further proof that the house should be very careful before it selects a national emblem. We need an emblem that will unite us. We need an emblem that will evoke respect, loyalty, affection, an emblem of which all Canadians will be proud. Most Canadians feel that the red ensign has accomplished this, but I know these people are willing to compromise in order to have unity in the country. If the majority of members of the house feel that we need a new distinctive Canadian flag I believe that if they are sincere they will ask for a plebiscite or for the setting up of a committee to design a flag acceptable to all.

Speaking in this house last week the hon. member for Nicolet-Yamaska (Mr. Vincent) asked the government to consider a design that would represent the English and French population as well as the rest of Canada. Designs of this type should be considered. The house must come up with a design that will unite the country, not one that is going to divide it. His was a very interesting speech and I would like to quote one paragraph from it:

> That is why we are exerting so much pressure and making these requests. We beg our colleagues of the Liberal party to exert pressure on the Prime Minister to set up a committee to choose a design which, as I said, would, unite and not divide the country, in short, knit together into one unit all the elements of our country.

I believe this is the feeling of the people in Quebec today. The flag proposed by the Prime Minister is certainly not acceptable to the majority of people in Canada. If Quebec chooses to be represented by the maple leaf or fleur-de-lis, and I respect them for that, the rest of Canada should have a choice as to their symbol. As confederation approaches its 100th birthday we realize across the country that we need Quebec and that the province of Quebec needs the rest of Canada if each province is to prosper and progress.

Last week I had a family from Detroit, Michigan, visit me in the house and they listened to the flag debate. Later on in my office their nine year old son said to me, "Mr. Stenson, we could solve the flag debate for you. You join our country and we will put another star on our flag for you". If this should ever come to pass, and I hope it never does, it will wipe out all the tradition and culture of our country. Canada certainly does not want to give up its heritage and traditions, for if it does confederation would be meaningless.

As we approach the centennial year and the world fair in Montreal, we find we have a selling job on our hands, to sell this fair across our country. But if the Prime Minister thinks the new flag will promote unity and sell the fair to Canada, he is very much mistaken. This feeling has been growing in the last few months. Let's not let it get out of hand because it is not fair to the province of Quebec: it is not fair to the rest of Canada. Let the house set up a committee which could bring forward suggestions for a flag—four or five designs—and then let the people

pick their flag by a plebiscite so that they will feel they have had a part in picking their design, as is proper in a democracy.

Our Prime Minister has turned a deaf ear on the Royal Canadian Legion of Canada. Although not a veteran myself I feel I have a responsibility to the veterans in my constituency and to every Legion branch across Canada. Can we forget so easily that since 1914 over one million men and women fought to preserve our democratic way of life, fought to preserve the red ensign? How can our Prime Minister turn a deaf ear on their pleas to retain the flag which they fought for, when over 100,000 men and women made the supreme sacrifice? The majority of veterans in Canada and their families, who account for several million of our total population, will be very bitter toward any government that scraps the red ensign completely.

I would like to read a short letter published in the Peterborough *Examiner*, sent to me from an adjoining riding represented by the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Honey). He asked me to use this in my speech if I spoke in the house on the flag. I feel it is a little too strong so I shall only read part of it:

> Our government will, beyond a shadow of doubt, break faith with all who sacrificed so much during the two world wars if it takes away our flag. The idea of parliament not allowing the Canadian people the right to choose their own flag is nothing but dictatorship—
>
> If a new flag is chosen it will have to have a name. If the one with three maple leaves is chosen it will have to be called "The Triple D."
>
> The first leaf will be called dictator because of the way the flag is being introduced.
>
> The second leaf will be called division because it has already divided the nation.
>
> The third leaf will be called destroyer because our freedom and rights will be destroyed.

I feel this design and the way it was brought out is creating a division in our country today, and I would like to say a word to the Prime Minister, that he is not being fair to our veterans. Who else in our dominion have more right to give their opinions about the flag than those people who fought our wars for us? This is another reason why we should have a plebiscite.

I am sorry the hon. member for Northumberland (Miss Jewett) is not in the house this evening because I wish to mention some parts of her speech. She had this to say:

> I think we, as members of parliament, should look at this whole question, regardless of our personal feelings in the matter, regardless even of what we think the majority of our constituents want.

She is taking the same attitude as our Prime Minister. It is quite evident that what their constituents want is unimportant to them. The hon. lady also stated:

> A referendum, Mr. Speaker, is only really suitable in a culturally and socially homogeneous society.

I consider this utter nonsense. A person is either in favour or not in favour of the flag, regardless of his cultural or social level. Every Canadian is worthy of a vote in this plebiscite.

I would like to refer the hon. lady to an article in the Peterborough *Examiner* headed, "Incensed Legion Writes Pearson About New Flag".

> Cobourg Legion, branch 133 with 500 members, is "incensed" over the possible plight of Canada's war memorials with the advent of Prime Minister Lester Pearson's maple leaf flag.

A letter in the same newspaper states:

> The Cobourg branch of the Royal Canadian Legion has written to the president of the dominion command asking that some thought be given to the matter of the position that the many war memorials throughout Canada would be placed in should this proposed flag be forced upon us, who do not feel the desire to have the change.
>
> For our protection and for those who feel alike it is suggested that the dominion government enter into some guarantee to the general public that all memorials, wherever placed retain the same scheme of draping that they at present have.
>
> That places designated as a gift of the government or as a war memorial—people that now fly the Canadian ensign or the union jack be so authorized to continue.
>
> That the next of kin of those whose names feature upon roles of honour in churches, public halls and such places be asked their respective opinions on a majority basis before any change of drape is allowed.
>
> This letter is written, at the wish of more than 500 members, who feel that they have given some of the years of their lifetime in the service of their country and who now continue in the service of the Royal Canadian Legion as true sons of Canada, sworn to obey the laws of our country and to protect the servicemen and their families to the best of their abilities.
>
> Yours very truly,
>
> J. M. Gaiger,
> Public Relations Officer,
> Branch 133, Cobourg, Ont.

I would like to ask the hon. member if she feels she has a better right to pick a flag for Canada than these veterans she represents in the house? With all due respect to the hon. lady the veterans and their families were not mentioned in her speech. They were bypassed completely and they are the people who should be making the decision—not a political party.

Scores of organizations in Canada representing millions of Canadians have passed resolutions and are sending them to the

government. They are requesting the retention of the red ensign as Canada's national flag. These signatures come from people in every province in Canada but they are being ignored by our Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson). The right hon. gentleman stated that if the government were forced into an election he would make the flag an issue. I disagree with this. I believe our flag should never become a political football. I believe it should be kept free of politics. In my opinion, the free vote which was announced came too late because members of the Liberal party had been whipped into shape before the free vote was ever announced.

The Prime Minister realizes that every member has received letters and telegrams from Canadian Legion branches all across Canada. I know that these Legion branches and their members would be very fair with the government if they were approached in a proper manner and asked to sit down and help decide on a new emblem which would help bring about unity in our country. I also feel that every province would be fair about this if approached in the proper way. The English speaking people do not want a flag forced on them and I know that after listening to this debate the people of Quebec would not want to force an emblem on the people of this country which the majority of them cannot accept.

The members of the Canadian Legion are not the only ones whose opinions have been disregarded. I have here a letter which I think has been put on record several times before. It is from 12 people. One of them is Mr. D. G. Creighton, professor of history at the University of Toronto. Another, Mrs. Dyde, of Edmonton. Another signatory is Dr. Eugene Forsey, director of research, Canadian Labour Congress. Three of the signatories come from Peterborough, and this is why I am mentioning this letter. They are Mr. T. H. B. Symons, president of Trent University which will be opening in Peterborough this fall. Another is his assistant, Mr. Denis Smith. The third is a former member of this house, Mr. Walter Pitman, head of the history department of Kenner Collegiate. Mr. Pitman is a man very well regarded both in this house and in the city of Peterborough. This letter was sent to the Prime Minister on May 27. I will read two or three paragraphs from it. It begins:

> 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.

Later on, the letter says:

> We are not in the position of a country with a revolutionary tradition, creating itself anew; we exist because we have inherited the past without a revolutionary upheaval. It is false and dispiriting to adopt a flag which subtly ignores the truth of our own nature. This is not the kind of symbol to rally a bewildered and demoralized nation.
>
> We respectfully suggest that you withdraw the maple leaf design for the time being, and that you convoke at once a private meeting of the parliamentary leaders of all parties to agree upon a new design which asserts our history. We profoundly believe that the present proposal will only deepen the spiritual malaise of Canada.

If the Prime Minister had sat down with these gentlemen or with the leaders of the parties to consider this question further we should not now be engaged in this long debate which is doing this country no good.

I have another letter here, this one from a young man. I do not believe the young people are supporting a new flag in the way the Liberal party would suggest. It says:

> I am proud of your stand on the flag issue. I have never voted Conservative, but I assure you you will have my full support in any national referendum, or should Pearson shove it through parliament in the dictatorial manner which he proposes, I would stand behind you to the fullest.
>
> I am in my early twenties. I speak for the young people of this community when I say: Keep the red ensign.

May I say that before this debate concludes I should like to hear more from supporters of the Liberal party. I should like to hear from cabinet ministers. I should like to hear from members representing Newfoundland and Nova Scotia. I should like to hear from more members from Ontario.

An hon. Member: Do not forget British Columbia.

Mr. Stenson: I should like to hear, also, from more members representing Quebec constituencies. My deskmate has spoken on the subject, and I have referred to that speech. As I say, I would appreciate hearing more speakers from Quebec. I cannot help but feel that their constituents are interested in a referendum or in having this issue sent to a parliamentary committee where there would be both representation from this house and from the Senate. In this way a national symbol could be chosen which would not be labelled a political pennant. It would be one fairly chosen by the people of this country, one which would link us together for the next hundred years, one we shall be proud of when we open our fair in the centennial year.

I feel that if this flag resolution is settled properly this country will remain united and become even stronger in the future.

Mr. O. W. Weichel (Waterloo North): On June 17, 1964, I spoke on the resolution concerning a distinctive Canadian flag. At that time I gave many reasons why we should continue with the Canadian red ensign. As a 100 per cent Canadian of German descent 125 years ago, I felt that in accordance with our democratic way of life I should express my views according to the dictates of my conscience, regardless of political leanings, and other pressures so prominent during the debate of such an important question.

In talking over this question with many of my constituents during the odd week end, I found support for the new flag as well as for the Canadian red ensign, and for that reason I came to the conclusion that a plebiscite or referendum should be held during the next election so that each and every Canadian could express his own opinion. Such a vote in my estimation is just as important now as was the referendum on conscription years ago. I am sure we all realize that when such a vote is taken we as sound and loyal Canadians will abide by such a decision and bring unity to our country, probably to an extent we have never seen before.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) said in this house that every member should have the opportunity to express his views on this important question. Up to the present time most hon. members on the other side, many of them in the government, have not done so. Why? Because it is my sincere belief that the flag they have chosen fails to express anything significant. In other words it is not an emblem or representation of anything real. So far, when any one of our members rises to speak on this issue all we hear from across the floor are the familiar words "Carried" and "Question". By making such remarks hon. members opposite are going contrary to the wishes of their own leader, who said all members in the house should be heard. It is their obligation to rise and make themselves heard so that the people in their constituencies may know what their opinions are on this important question. Then if a referendum should be held we could be guided by their suggestions or expressions of opinion.

The vote of the people is by far the fairest way in which to settle this problem once and for all. Millions of people in Canada believe this is the only way of seeing as far as possible that this is not made a partisan issue. It has been suggested in certain quarters that a free vote of members or senators should be allowed. But as I explained in my previous address to this house, there would be a natural tendency, human nature being what it is, for government supporters to vote for their government's own design, and it is far from certain that a vote in the house on any issue of this nature would really reflect the feelings of the people of Canada. No doubt the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) had the following words in mind when he brought in an amendment in favour of holding a plebiscite. The May issue of the Royal Canadian Legion journal had this to say:

> 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.

I was impressed with the remarks made by my good friend the hon. member for Regina City (Mr. More), as I was by many other speeches that have been delivered since this debate was brought forward. Like the hon. member for Regina City, I believe that his subamendment has a great deal of merit, because we need to have further clarification. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we need to know what the plebiscite would be on. Let us look over this subamendment and carefully scrutinize its important points:

1. Are you in favour of the Canadian red ensign?
2. Are you in favour of the Canadian red ensign with changes made thereon to show the main heritages of both founding races?
3. Are you in favour of the three maple leaves design?
4. Are you in favour of a one maple leaf design?

The hon. member for Regina City has given the voters a wide scope for their choice, and I believe it is the most democratic way of solving this problem. No matter how we look at this great flag issue, we are reminded of the Gardens of the Dead. The commonwealth war graves commission annual report, so well prepared by this wonderful group of men, deals in considerable detail with the commission's work in all parts of the world where members of the armed forces of the British commonwealth are buried. How many Canadians realize that no less than 1,106,380 men from commonwealth countries fell in the first great war and are buried in 15,386 different cemeteries. In world

war II, 580,058 men from commonwealth nations made the supreme sacrifice and are buried in 15,551 cemeteries which also contain, however, 7,220 1914-1918 war graves.

I mention this fact, Mr. Speaker, "Lest we forget", and second so that we do not forget the many Silver Cross women whose hearts are still bleeding for these men who have been gone now for almost 50 years. I mention the Gardens of the Dead for the simple reason that they refer to men who fell in the first great war and in the second great war from commonwealth countries, of which we are proud to be one. With this in mind I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I was terrifically impressed with the flags floating outside the west block, where the third commonwealth education conference is being held at the present time. The red ensign, representing Canada, stands out above and beyond all other flags, having beauty and distinction.

An hon. Member: And you can't mistake it.

Mr. Weichel: And, as one hon. member has said, you cannot mistake it for any other flag, even at two miles or four miles distance. May I ask all those who wish to tear down the red ensign to give serious consideration to the part it has played in the growth of this great nation of ours. At the turn of this century thousands of immigrants left their homes in Europe with the hope of making a new life in Canada, and after the first world war another great immigration wave gave our population another tremendous lift. Then once again after the second world upheaval, Canada again became a haven of refuge and a chance for a new life.

Hon. members, I say to you that the magnet, the beacon, the beckoning light that brought those people to our shores was the red ensign. Hopeless and discouraged by conditions in their own lands, these new Canadians recognized in the union jack, an integral part of our flag, a promise of justice, freedom and opportunity for all men. We must never in any way appear to repudiate the part that the Magna Carta and the British parliamentary system have played in our development as a nation. As I said in my previous speech, Mr. Speaker, when I was wounded in the first great war the greatest people in the world to me at that time were the English, the Scots and the Irish. I was taken to hospital, and after four years of war I was treated in just the same manner as any man who was wounded in the 1914-18 war. From the bottom of my heart I say that the English, the Irish and the Scots are amongst the greatest people in the world.

As I left the parliamentary restaurant tonight my eyes wandered over the framed portraits in the adjacent gallery. I looked at the portraits of Gladstone, Pitt, Churchill and all those other great British prime ministers. If we are determined to uproot all our traditions and symbols, we should consider turning the faces of these men to the wall. Mr. Speaker, it might be well to remember that of Canada's male population of 30 or more years of age there are 25.6 per cent, or 1,056,768 veterans, according to the 1961 census. If we included the dependants of these men it would make these figures look quite impressive. The total of veterans includes all males who reported service in world war I, world war II, and the Korean operation, whether or not their service was with the Canadian forces.

Lest we forget, these men represented every province in Canada from Quebec, the maritimes and all across this country to British Columbia. The unity and co-operation of these men brought success to the army, the air force and the navy. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe for a minute that all these fine men are in favour of the continuance of the Canadian red ensign; but I assure you that a great majority will show how they stand if a plebiscite is forthcoming. Let us not be deceived, as facts always tell the truth in regard to such an important question.

Remembrance day is just around the corner. It plays a big part in such an important issue, as we should remember in these few hours before the flag is settled once and for all. It would be well to reflect on what Frederick E. Elmslie says in his circular for poppy day and Remembrance day, namely that Canada was not built in a straightforward, cut and dried manner, but rather has suffered cuts and bruises in its growing up. We are not a new country without a flag. Many countries have taken centuries to accomplish what we have done in 97 years—strangely enough, much of it under the red ensign—and during these years of growth, Canada has always tried to make the world—as her men are today, serving in many parts of the globe—a better place for all of us in which to live.

It seems to me that abolishing the Canadian red ensign is as if one were to propose a bill to abolish the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, because the musical ride originated from men riding as a pastime on Sunday afternoons. Yes, and how would the suggested new flag represent the thousands of people who reside in hundreds of square

miles in our country where there are no maple trees? Nearly all the speeches in this house have explained the red ensign and what it stands for. Why design a new flag when the ensign already has on it three leaves on a white background?

Mr. Speaker, it is rather hard to make a speech when there are so many others going on over there.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Weichel: Surely not all suggestions which are made are improvements or represent progress.

What surely could be more uniting than the fact that working side by side to build this great country in one century have been Indians, French, English, Negroes, ethnics and Jews, people who fought, shed their blood and immortalized the bloody beaches, trenches and battlefields of the world so that we might have what we now possess? I could bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker—a fact which you already know—that at the battle of Ypres 50 years ago green Canadian troops attacked, and later many of them choked and died as a yellowish-green fog of poisonous chlorine filled the trenches. I can recall many battles waged under similar circumstances, all of which demonstrate the terrific sacrifices made by our brave men, our brothers and cousins and friends under the red ensign for their country and for upholding freedom of religion, freedom of speech and freedom of the press.

I can well remember, Mr. Speaker, serving in the front line trenches with Indians, French, Negroes, ethnics and Jews made up of Protestant, Catholic and Jewish faiths, and when any of these men were wounded no one questioned their religion or race. When someone was wounded all of his pals came to his assistance, showing the true value of fellowship, companionship and unity. These and others are the type of men who should have a real say about our future flag. A plebiscite would give them this right. Thousands of our comrades will never come back to tell us about the horrors of war, but we certainly know some of them paid the greatest price—death. Is this in itself not enough to make the ensign official? Or was this, the greatest of human sacrifices, meaningless and wasted?

The least we can do now is to show our humble gratitude, reverence and respect. I say in all sincerity: Let the ensign alone and make it official. If the ensign was not distinguished in the beginning before the wars, it certainly was distinguished after the wars. Canada's sons have fought and died under the ensign for our freedom. Surely it is now unquestionably distinctive, and distinguished enough for us. Lest we forget, remember for a moment before a decision is made.

Mr. Eric Stefanson (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I make no apologies for rising to take part in this debate because it is no ordinary debate. The subject under discussion at this time is the flag resolution, the amendment and the subamendment and is something which will not be dealt with by every parliament. When parliament passes a bill and the legislation concerned does not do the job it was designed to do, then the following session or the session after that parliament can bring in amendments to correct the deficiency. The flag is different. Once we adopt the flag, that flag will be here to stay for scores of years, even centuries. Therefore it is most important that this subject be thoroughly debated, and I would certainly like to see more members from the government benches rising to take part in this debate.

So far, Mr. Speaker, there have been many outstanding speeches, but I do not intend to start naming those who have made such excellent speeches. Incidentally, all of the good speeches have been coming from this side of the house because, as the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Mandziuk) said, on the other side there is a filibuster of silence.

I am in the same position as that of the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Starr), the hon. member for Marquette, the hon. member for Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Rapp) and many others. I do not belong to either one of the founding races, and I belong to a different nationality than they. Both my parents came from Iceland, a small island in the north Atlantic which is of great importance to the western world. Iceland is a country with the comparatively small population of 185,000 people. It is a country which cherishes freedom and democracy. Great Britain is referred to as the mother of parliaments. Iceland can truly be called the grandmother of parliament because Iceland established the first democratic parliament in the world in the year 930. The old Icelandic sages indicate that Leif Ericson came to North America in the year 1000, which is a long time before Columbus discovered America in 1492.

I have indicated that both my parents came from Iceland. My father came as a young boy in 1886 and my mother at the turn of the century. Both my wife's parents also came

from Iceland. They came to this country because they felt there would be greater opportunity here than in their own native land. I am sure that practically all those who came to this country are glad they came. They have made a living for themselves and have fitted into this country very well. Incidentally, the first Icelanders when they arrived in Canada settled in Ontario briefly, and then settled in Gimli, Manitoba, where they were given a tract of land which was designated as an Icelandic reserve. This was in October of 1875, and the Icelandic reserve started at Boundary Creek. They were given land along lake Winnipeg and some islands in lake Winnipeg; and they were actually a sovereign state. They remained a sovereign state and had their own self-government, establishing their own schools during those years. However they became very loyal to this country and have participated very actively in everything.

I was surprised the other day to hear the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) give the members of the House of Commons a lecture about the length of debate. In fact I got the impression that he thought debate should be limited, although he did specify that this specific debate now in progress should not be limited. In view of all the talking he does in this house I feel he is not on firm ground when lecturing the house about the length of the debate. I suggest to him that if there were 265 members like himself in this house, who love to talk, no session of parliament could be completed, and certainly would not be completed within the year. If members like that hon. member wish to contribute to the reformation of parliament they should commence by restraining themselves. People who love to talk generally do so for the sake of publicity.

Mr. Speaker, the only suggestion referred to by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau) referred to was that in respect of extending the sitting hours. The Minister of Justice made an amazing speech last Thursday during this debate. He suggested that his party would be willing to consider other legislation on Monday, provided the hours of sitting were extended on Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays from eight until midnight. I should like to point out that during our consideration of the estimates of the Department of Industry on Friday afternoon, attendance in this house was very poor. At one time there were five members present in the government benches, and for a time there was not a single member of the New Democratic party, of the Social Credit party or of the Creditiste party in this chamber. Before these members commence to suggest longer hours perhaps they should attempt to sit in this house and pay attention to what is taking place.

The amendment moved by the right hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) is:

> That all the words after "that" in line one be deleted and the following substituted:
> "As the proposal to change Canada's national flag will affect the unity and destiny of Canada now and for years to come, the government be authorized to take such steps as may be necessary to conduct a plebiscite prior to any further action being taken by the House of Commons, in order that all Canadians may be given their rightful opportunity to declare their choice concerning a national flag."

I certainly feel that every member of this house should be able to support that amendment.

The subamendment moved by the hon. member for Regina City (Mr. More) proposed:

> That the amendment be amended by adding thereto the words:
> "and that in such a plebiscite among the questions to be placed before the people should be the following:
> 1. Are you in favour of the Canadian red ensign?
> 2. Are you in favour of the Canadian red ensign with changes made thereon to show the main heritages of both founding races?
> 3. Are you in favour of the three maple leaves design?
> 4. Are you in favour of a one maple leaf design?"

I was very pleased while listening to the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Herridge) to hear him say he had been back to his riding and the people with whom he spoke urged him to support the suggestion that a plebiscite be held.

I was not away as long as that hon. member but I did spend a Saturday and Sunday in my riding. The people with whom I spoke certainly are in favour of a plebiscite. They feel we should move on to more important business and settle this flag issue by referendum at the time of the next general election. That would not be too costly and would certainly settle this question once and for all.

Mr. Speaker, I was very interested to hear the hon. member for Kootenay West relate his experience in respect of the three maple leaves design flags that have been flying here in the capital city, and I certainly agree with his theory that once the price of an article is cut, that is an indication the demand is decreasing. When the price of an article is cut down as low as 19 cents I would suggest that

is an indication there is practically no demand. Surely this is a clear indication to the Prime Minister and the treasury bench that they should act on this subamendment and refer this issue to the people.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out that there are people in my riding of many racial origins and backgrounds. The 1961 census shows a total of 50,320 people in the federal constituency of Selkirk, broken down as follows: British Isles, 15,790; French, 3,747; German, 3,506; Italian, 57; Jewish, 122; Netherlands, 1,220; Polish, 3,304; Russian, 242, Scandinavian, 6,847; Ukrainian, 7,922; other European, 1,437; Asiatic, 118; native Indians, 5,765, and others and not stated, 243.

There are many religious denominations in my riding including Anglican Church of Canada, Baptist, Greek Orthodox, Jewish, Lutheran, Mennonite, Pentecostal, Presbyterian, Roman Catholic, Ukrainian (Greek) Catholic, United Church of Canada and others. These people with this variety of background and religion in this part of Canada live together, work together and play together in peace, understanding and harmony. They all think of themselves as Canadians first, and think in terms of one Canada. These people are tolerant and understanding. They are not rigid or inflexible. They believe in principles and they believe in God. They believe that symbols should be steeped in history and tradition. These people are all loyal to the flag of Canada.

The red ensign, as has been pointed out by many previous speakers, has been used by Canada since confederation, and was declared as Canada's official flag by order in council dated September, 1945. The thought of destroying or removing this flag arouses deep emotions in many people. This is the most controversial and emotional topic that has come before parliament since I came here in 1958. I fail to understand the Prime Minister in his determination to force this issue, despite the knowledge of the tremendous opposition to both the method by which this resolution was introduced and the design itself. For the Prime Minister to continue this stand is nothing but straight dictatorship. The opposition has moved an amendment proposing a national plebiscite, and a subamendment suggesting the form of that plebiscite. These suggestions have been made in an attempt to extricate the Prime Minister from the dilemma in which he finds himself.

I should also like to point out that I have received a great deal of mail in respect of this flag issue. I have received far more letters

[Mr. Stefanson.]

on this subject than on any other, and all the letters with few exceptions have expressed favour for retention of the red ensign. I have received only one letter from my constituents favouring the three maple leaves design. All the others are for the red ensign and oppose the suggested flag. I believe every Canadian Legion branch in my riding has written supporting the red ensign and requesting that it be retained as the flag of Canada.

I do not intend to read the letters I have received except one short one from Homebrook in my constituency. It reads as follows:

> I hear on this morning's radio that the flag issue is again to the fore. Am enclosing clipping which expresses my sentiments. I certainly will never fly Pearson's choice for a flag. Our family and neighbours always flew the red ensign and I would not object to some symbol being added recognizing French contribution to our country.
>
> Shame on all those who would forsake the flag which represents all that has protected us for hundreds of years. How long will it be before they tire of this new flag?

In his letter he encloses a letter that appeared in the *Western Producer* of July 16, 1964. I think it is appropriate that I read that letter too because this gentleman said that it expressed his opinions. The letter to the *Western Producer* is headed "Flag Won't Promote Unity" and reads as follows:

> Though I have never been a rabid sentimental flag waver I find I did not realize just how much the old flag meant to me until the almost certainty of losing it forever was brought home to me by recent events.
>
> For more than 60 years I have observed it flying from many a flagpole all across the country. Always the sight of it brings to me the same feeling that comes to me when I see and hear a flight of Canada geese winging on their way—a mystic sense and realization of the immensity of our country and its past history. To me the old flag is more than an old bit of bunting. It stands for and exemplifies the hopes and aspirations of many generations of every ethnic group who have sought for and found security and happiness beneath its folds. Unfortunately it is an historial fact that to a large section of our population the old flag or even the red ensign is and always has been obnoxious for reasons that are quite obvious.
>
> For this reason and the fact that our present federal government owes its very existence to these people we are to have a new flag of strange design thrust upon us, a design that features prominently three maple leaves. Most of us in western Canada have never seen a genuine maple leaf, yet this is supposed to convey a feeling of unity from sea to sea.
>
> The government is evidently determined to pursue this matter to its ultimate end—a new flag. Quebec must be appeased no matter how many other feelings are hurt.

We cannot prevent the institution of a new flag —but no one can make us love or respect it. Nor will it promote unity. More likely the reverse.

George Watson.

I have many more letters I could read but I will go on with something else. As I said, I have received many letters from my constituency and all of them ask for the retention of the red ensign, except one in favour of the new three maple leaves flag.

An hon. Member: Read it.

Mr. Stefanson: The odds are at least 100 to 1 so maybe you would like to read it. There are some questions I should like answered. Who asked the Prime Minister for a new flag? That question has been asked before but no answer has been forthcoming. I know that the Prime Minister visited Selkirk during the 1962 election campaign and again in the 1963 election campaign, and he certainly made no mention of a new flag during either one of those visits. He made one specific promise in Selkirk in 1963 which was reported by the Canadian Press. He promised to establish a committee of inquiry to investigate the effects of railway branch line abandonment, but to my knowledge such a committee was never established. However, I suppose in that regard we should accept the view of the Postmaster General (Mr. Nicholson) who said the other day that when you are in opposition and trying to get enough members to form the government you make promises to get votes, but after you assume office it is not necessary to fulfil those promises. The Prime Minister was in opposition at that time and I suppose he was only trying to get himself elected to office.

The Prime Minister has indicated that he promised a new flag within two years. I would suggest that the promise of a flag is in the very same category as the promises to which the Postmaster General referred the other day. There is another question I should like answered. Why did the flag issue become urgent all of a sudden and take priority over all other legislation? This question has also been asked before but certainly no answer has been forthcoming from the Prime Ministre or anyone else on the government side.

Mr. Nielsen: Politics.

Mr. Clancy: They have got no legislation ready.

Mr. Nielsen: Just a smokescreen.

Mr. Stefanson: Is it a coincidence that this piece of legislation became urgent shortly after the visit or safari of the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Sauvé) and the Prime Minister's chief adviser to Quebec city last April? According to *Time* magazine, when they made that visit to Quebec city they almost collided with the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill), but he was shooed out another door because he is too clumsy and has not got the technique or the finesse to be able to negotiate with the premier of Quebec.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Is that three flag Jack?

Mr. Stefanson: Did this visit have something to do with the flag question becoming urgent? If it did, the people of Canada certainly have a right to know and there should be an answer forthcoming.

Mr. Nielsen: There never will be. No answers; all promises.

Mr. Stefanson: Many editorials have appeared supporting the stand we have taken in asking for a referendum as set out in the subamendment and the amendment. However, I only want to read one short editorial because I do not want to take too much time in this regard. Many editorials have appeared in newspapers across Canada saying that the only logical answer, the only fair proposition, is to refer this matter to the people and let the people decide what type of flag they want. In today's Toronto *Telegram* there is an editorial headed "Stop It" which reads as follows:

The flag debate has gone on far, far too long. The Canadian people are wearied of it and people abroad must be looking at the performance of our 26th parliament with sniggering amazement.

Prime Minister Pearson's stubborn insistence that the Pearson pennant, or some modification of it must be approved before parliament rises is reckless and extravagant of time and money. The issue could be dealt with fairly if Mr. Pearson would agree to a plebiscite through which Canadians from coast to coast could express their preference for retention of the Canadian ensign or some new banner. The cost and inconvenience involved in such a poll would be less than that occasioned by wasted hours in fruitless debate and the stalling of parliament's business.

If Mr. Pearson is afraid of loss of face in taking this course, the matter could be put in the hands of an all-party committee. The recommendation of the committee then could be incorporated in a plebiscite.

It has been said that a plebiscite would be divisive. The late prime minister Mackenzie King did not hesitate to call a plebiscite on a far more explosive issue—military conscription—in the emotionally charged war years.

That article certainly suggests that the Prime Minister should accept the subamendment and the amendment, and that he

should refer this matter to the people themselves. It also refers to a committee. These suggestions have been made in the house.

An hon. Member: Seven more minutes.

Mr. MacInnis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, you saw fit to call attention to the remarks being made on this side of the house in support of the speaker. For the last five minutes the speaker has had trouble getting himself across—

An hon. Member: How do you know?

Mr. MacInnis: —because of the continuous interjections like the one we have just heard. I think it is about time members on this side enjoyed the same privilege as members on that side, and that they be called to order when it is absolutely necessary that they should be.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I would like to point out to the hon. member that when the Chair called for order it was calling on members from the other side of the house.

Mr. Hahn: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, now that the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) is back from his extended holiday, I would point out that his remarks have been preventing me from hearing the interesting speech to which we have been listening.

Mr. Stefanson: That certainly was no point of order.

People in public life generally have the same aims and objectives. They may approach these in a different manner, but one of the objectives of those in public service is to improve the lot of their fellow man. This flag controversy is making many people unhappy and is creating bitterness and hatred. Surely these are not the aims and objectives of any public servant.

In view of this I would strongly urge the Prime Minister to withdraw the resolution at this time. He would be doing his country a great service if he would do this. Many millions of Canadians are unhappy with the method the Prime Minister has used in introducing this resolution, and many millions are also unhappy with the proposed design. They feel that it is a sickly and insipid looking flag.

Some say the design is not important, but I say those people are wrong. The design should have a meaning, should be distinctive in appearance, and should be something which the majority of Canadians want and will respect. When a new flag is chosen by parliament it will fly from flagpoles in this country for many years, perhaps even for centuries to come. This resolution is not like other pieces of legislation. When parliament passes an act, and then a few months later it is found not to be doing exactly what it was intended to do, an amendment can be brought in to correct it. Not so with a flag. Therefore extreme care should be used in the selection and adoption of a new flag.

A flag should not be associated with any political party, and the design should not be associated with any one individual. The hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) has clearly indicated that the selection of the proposed design was not submitted to the Liberal caucus before being introduced in the House of Commons. It has been pointed out that the design is the personal choice of the Prime Minister. Seeing that it is his personal choice, it then becomes labelled with the government of which he is the head, and also with the Liberal party. It has therefore become a political flag.

Many thousands of Canadians have written to their members of parliament urging them to do everything in their power to prevent the adoption of the proposed three maple leaf flag. I firmly believe that these people are right, that the adoption of this proposed three maple leaf flag would be a calamity. It can only bring about division, disunity and dissension. I feel that it is my duty, and the duty of every member of parliament, to adopt a course to prevent this from happening.

When the time comes when the majority of Canadians want a new flag, let us act in a mature manner and select one flag, without any thought of appeasement to any region or section of the country. The manner in which the resolution was introduced clearly indicates the lack of understanding of the situation by the government, and also its indecisiveness.

It has been suggested that the matter of a flag became urgent through the pressure of the premier of Quebec. It has also been suggested that the inclusion of the second flag in the resolution was at the request of the premier of Newfoundland. Be that as it may, the timing of the introduction of this resolution could not have been worse.

The appointment of the royal commission on biculturalism and bilingualism was completely wrong. The expenditure of the taxpayers' money on this type of commission is unjustified. With a population such as we have in Canada, with so many racial origins, there is no room for this type of commission.

Since it was appointed it has certainly stirred up the pot. Also, with the extremists and separatists movement having been active in Quebec during the past few months and receiving nation-wide publicity, the introduction of a flag resolution was looked upon by many millions of Canadians with suspicion and disfavour. Under this type of climate it is impossible to get any resemblance of unity, support or respect for the resolution introduced by the Prime Minister.

Before the Prime Minister introduced the resolution he said there would be a free vote on this subject. Later he reversed that decision and said his government would stand or fall on this resolution and, if the resolution were defeated, he would take it as a vote of non-confidence and call an election. A few days ago he again reversed his decision and now says there will be a free vote. But it was ably pointed out by the Liberal member for York-Humber that there could not be a free vote on this resolution, that the resolution stood in the name of the Prime Minister and was seconded by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau). It therefore was a government motion and no free vote could be held.

If there is a general desire on the part of the Prime Minister for a free vote, he should withdraw the resolution and have it resubmitted by a backbencher. Many members have made suggestions and recommendations to help the Prime Minister and the government get out of the impasse in which they find themselves. The amendment moved by the right hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) to hold a referendum or plebiscite, was moved for this purpose. Having been denied the right of a free vote in parliament, and the proposed flag having become a political flag, and with the impasse the government find themselves in, the only proper and honourable course to follow is to refer this to the people themselves and let them make the choice. The subamendment moved by the hon. member for Regina City (Mr. More) spells out more clearly how the ballot could be taken, and I have many editorials here supporting the stand that a plebiscite should be held.

I would strongly urge members from all parties to support the subamendment. This would put into operation the most democratic principle of all, where the decision on a flag rests with the people themselves. This could be done most easily and economically at the time of the next general election. Once the vote was over, I feel certain that practically every Canadian would be willing to accept the rule of the majority, which would leave this country united and strong.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. It being 10.30 this house stands adjourned until 2 p.m. tomorrow afternoon.

At 10.30 p.m. the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to special order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, September 1, 1964

The house met at 2 p.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. MACQUARRIE—ANNIVERSARY OF CHARLOTTETOWN CONFERENCE

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Queens): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct the attention of the house to an event of national importance and historic significance which occurred in my constituency. Exactly 100 years ago, at two o'clock in the afternoon of September 1, 1864, the Charlottetown conference was called into session in the legislative council chamber of Prince Edward Island. Later that afternoon the official delegates from the maritime provinces agreeably and readily opened the conference doors to their fellow legislators from Canada and, by setting aside the smaller plan of maritime union and discussing a greater federal union instead, the conference delegates of 1864 laid the foundations of the great and free dominion whose people we collectively represent in this chamber.

As with other gatherings, Mr. Speaker, before and since, the Charlottetown conference illustrated that many human endeavours begun poorly may end brilliantly. Delegates from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick were not met by their island hosts, and there was not sufficient hotel space for the Canadians. Not surprisingly, the Prince Edward Island government was criticized by the press for its inept and inhospitable performance. But again, not surprisingly, the government had its explanations; the Nova Scotia delegation arrived earlier than expected, the New Brunswickers later and the Canadians in greater numbers than had been anticipated. Happily, history records that these little slips were soon quite overborne by the lavish hospitality which the islanders in succeeding days extended to their visitors.

Many at the time were unimpressed, Mr. Speaker, by the actions and utterances of the politicians of 1864, but others more perceptive appreciated more fully what was taking place in their time. The Charlottetown *Monitor* viewed the conference as "perhaps the most important event—as far at least as the future destinies of these colonies are concerned—that has occurred during the present century". It hoped that the delegates' deliberations would "culminate in the creation ... of a great nation in this western hemisphere of which neither we nor our remotest posterity will ever have cause to be ashamed".

May we today, Mr. Speaker, as we honour the fathers of our nation, drawing strength from their devotion, inspiration from their accomplishment, and example from their performance, go on to preserve that which they bequeathed us. Of them it was later declared, "Providence being their guide they builded better than they knew". Of us may it be said "They destroyed not what their fathers left them, rather did they ever cherish, strengthen and extend the nation which faith had conceived and wisdom constructed".

As one of the representatives of the cradle of confederation, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity of saying these few words, inadequate as they are in relation to the magnitude of the event they are intended to honour.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of my hon. friend the Solicitor General (Mr. MacNaught), I should like to echo the words of the hon. member for Queens, my fellow academic, and I will not in the least attempt to differ with him about the historical view he has given to the house this afternoon. Indeed, the hon. gentleman is a lily I would not attempt to gild. But it did occur to me, sir, that since at Charlottetown a meeting is taking place to commemorate that original meeting of the founding fathers which, whatever the welcome may have been at the beginning, seemed to be very hospitable before the close if one can judge from the accounts of the food and other dainties which were consumed at the time, I doubt whether these latter day statesmen would have as strong stomachs as the original Fathers of Confederation, though I am sure they have just as strong hearts.

I do think, sir, that on this day we should look forward to even greater development

than we have seen in that century that has passed.

It did occur to me, sir, that the house might wish to have the opening address which is being made in Charlottetown today by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister added not in the record but as an appendix to the record in commemoration of this day—a day, I might add, very much happier than that day a quarter of a century ago that all of us remember when that terrible war started from which the world is still recovering.

Mr. Speaker: Does the house agree?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Editor's note: For text of address see appendix.*]

RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES

CONCURRENCE IN FOURTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. J. T. Richard (Ottawa East) presented the third and fourth reports of the standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines, and moved that the fourth report be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

AGRICULTURE

QUEBEC—REPORTED STATEMENT BY FORESTRY MINISTER RESPECTING ARDA PROGRAM

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Forestry. It has to do with the serious agricultural situation, particularly in the province of Quebec. I would ask him what he meant when in a speech at Ste Lucie, Quebec, he is reported, as found in *Le Soleil,* to have made this statement:

Mr. Sauvé explained to a couple of hundred farmers that the task would be difficult—

That is the task of bringing ARDA into full and factual achievement.

—once the new program was put into effect because "at that moment the game of politics will come into the picture".

What did the minister have in mind in that regard, and what are the difficulties he anticipated by the use of those words?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): Mr. Speaker, at that time I was not referring to ARDA but to the problems of eastern agriculture and the new outlook that would be necessary to solve those problems; that would be very difficult political decisions to be taken by all parties concerned, provincial and federal, and that there would be political opposition to some of the proposals which would be made because some people might benefit from contrary views for political ends. I have not in mind any particular party or people, just the straight game of politics as we know it in the provinces.

Mr. Diefenbaker: What were the particular proposals the minister had in mind as he placed them before this gathering, and what particular political interference would there be in the application of such a non-political plan as the one which was set up under the distinguished leadership of the hon. member for Qu'Appelle?

Mr. Sauvé: I was not referring to ARDA but to the problems of eastern agriculture, as mentioned in the eastern farm survey which was tabled in the house about two months ago. All the problems were mentioned in this report; I brought it to the attention of the people. We were discussing the general situation of eastern agriculture. I was not speaking of ARDA. I did not divulge any of the proposals we intend to make to the provinces for the renewal of the agreements.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Forestry.

In establishing his farm program for eastern Canada, does he propose to take into account the political consideration to which he referred in his speech?

Mr. Sauvé: Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that extremely serious problems will have to be worked out when the federal and provincial governments advance proposals to find a solution to the farm problem of eastern Canada.

When we have proposed those solutions to the people, there will undoubtedly be some who will have opposite views, which is entirely normal. Never in the statements I made in Ste Lucie de Beauregard did I talk about anything except the normal game of politics. I have not seen the report or newspaper clipping which the Leader of the Opposition holds in his hand, but I am sure that I did not say anything wrong there.

Hon. Théogène Ricard (St. Hyacinthe-Bagot): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. A few moments ago, if I am not

mistaken, the Minister of Forestry said: Politics as we know it in the province of Quebec.

Could the minister tell us—

Mr. Sauvé: No.

Mr. Ricard: When reading over your blues, you will find those words at the end of your first reply to the Leader of the Opposition. You said: "As we know it in the province of Quebec."

Does the minister mean by this that such a situation only exists in the province of Quebec?

Mr. Sauvé: I never said that, Mr. Speaker.

[*Text*]

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Forestry. Is the minister undertaking an unusual recruitment drive for technical personnel in view of the expected expansion of the activities of his department?

Mr. Sauvé: No, we are dealing through the civil service commission in the normal way.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Clément Vincent (Nicolet-Yamaska): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Forestry.

Could he tell us if one of the decisions he is supposed to take in co-operation with the Quebec government and which, as he put it, might not be a popular one is consistent with the rumour now going around to the effect that the federal government and the Quebec provincial government would be advising a fairly large number of farmers to leave their farms and go into some other industrial fields?

Mr. Sauvé: I do not know anything about such rumours or decisions, Mr. Speaker.

[*Text*]

TURKEYS—REIMPOSITION OF QUOTAS ON IMPORTS FROM U.S.

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. E. Cardiff (Huron): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Has any progress been made since the minister told the house that he would look into the very difficult situation faced by the turkey growers of Canada?

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I am meeting the turkey people at their annual meeting in Winnipeg on the 14th. The hon. member will be pleased to learn that there has been no importation of turkeys in the past 12 to 14 days.

[*Later:*]

Mr. C. O. Cooper (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a supplementary question of the Minister of Agriculture. On August 26 I asked the same question and the answer was about the same. He said:

> —I shall be at that meeting to explain to these people why we do not feel we should impose these quotas at this time.

If the minister has an explanation for the people at this meeting, would he not give it to the house?

Mr. Hays: Mr. Speaker, if I have time I will be glad to do this, but it will take about an hour.

DAIRY PRODUCTS—STATEMENT BY MINISTER RESPECTING CONDITION OF INDUSTRY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture, and its urgency is based on the logical concern of eastern dairy farmers over the recent statement in the house by the minister. I should like to ask the minister whether, since he made his statement in the house on the eastern dairy industry, he has consulted individual dairy farmers or officials in his department. Does he feel that the eastern dairy industry is in better shape today than it has been in the last 15 years?

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I still feel that the dairy industry is in much better shape than it has been for some time. Nevertheless we realize that there could be great improvements, and we are working toward this end.

Mr. Grafftey: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister's point of view expressed after having consulted individual dairy farmers, and whom did he consult before he made his statement to the house?

Mr. Hays: Mr. Speaker, I just looked at the dominion bureau of statistics reports.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Clément Vincent (Nicolet-Yamaska): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

Did the minister consult the Prime Minister before the latter's departure for Prince Edward Island concerning the possibility of

calling a meeting of dairy producers and representatives of farm organizations in order to establish, before the house adjourns, an emergency policy concerning the dairy industry as requested by farmers?

[*Text*]

Mr. Hays: Mr. Speaker, we are pleased to meet with organizations of dairy farmers at any time in so far as their problems are concerned. If I may be permitted, I think I can reply to this question best by reading briefly from an article which appeared in the *Family Herald* weekly, although it is not altogether too kindly toward this side of the house. The article refers to the dairy problem and states:

> What is Harry Hays up to? In mid July the federal agriculture minister told cattle breeders at Waterloo, Ontario, that the list of government business at the fall session of parliament will include a new dairy program.
> "We are now working out a whole new approach to Canada's long-standing dairy problem"... "As you can imagine, I'm sure, this is a complicated and delicate job and one which we must work out in close co-operation with all the provinces—"

I could go on and read quite a bit more, but the last paragraph I think would be of interest to the hon. member. This article is written by one of the members of the parliamentary press gallery, and he says:

> With the industry healthier today than it has been in years, one wonders why Mr. Hays has chosen this moment to act.
>
> —David Suderman

Mr. Grafftey: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. After the minister's statement about the dominion bureau of statistics, does he now feel that Marie Antoinette's statement "Let them eat cake" should now read "Let them read statistics"?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Could the Minister of Agriculture say whether he has taken steps to meet with the farmers who have announced a march on Ottawa?

[*Text*]

Mr. Hays: Mr. Speaker, we should be very pleased to meet them if and when they march.

[Mr. Vincent.]

QUEBEC—INCREASE IN FEED GRAIN PRICES FOLLOWING SUBSIDY

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Henri Latulippe (Compton-Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Forestry.

Can he explain to the members of the house the reason why the price of feed grain and their by-products must rise in consequence of his policy of subsidizing truck transportation?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): Mr. Speaker, on Friday, August 28, I announced to the house that a number of amendments have been made to the policy of payment of transportation costs for feed grain. Those amendments will become effective on September 14.

The hon. member will find details of this policy on page 7439 of *Hansard* for August 28, 1964.

Hon. Théogène Ricard (St. Hyacinthe-Bagot): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a supplementary question.

Could the Minister of Forestry tell us whether a farmer making use of his own trucks for transportation will be getting those subsidies? If so, what steps should he take to take advantage of them?

Mr. Sauvé: Mr. Speaker, this is a technical question. I shall give a detailed answer to the hon. member tomorrow or the day after.

[*Text*]

FINANCE

REMOVAL OF TAX ON BUILDING MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. W. Monteith (Perth): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Due to the alarming increase in business failures during the month of July, as reported in this morning's *Globe and Mail*, will the minister not consider rescinding the sales tax on building supplies and materials and on machinery and equipment, or at least cancelling the additional tax due to take effect at the end of this year?

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I read the account in the morning paper. There has been an increase in the number of bankruptcies, due in large measure I believe to the overexpansion of certain smaller firms and some medium size firms with inadequate capital, prompted by

the general expansion of business activity. I do not relate the basic reasons for these increases to the other question my hon. friend raised.

Mr. Monteith: As a supplementary question, the same article pointed out that such an increase in bankruptcies in Canada was in direct contrast with the situation during the month of July in the United States, where there was actually a decrease in the failures, and I am wondering if, since that country has introduced tax reductions and Canada has increased taxation this would not have a great deal to do with it.

Mr. Gordon: I am not sure if that was a question or just a wonderment on the part of the hon. member.

Mr. Monteith: It is a question. I am simply asking if the minister would not agree with this assumption?

Mr. Gordon: Certainly not, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): Will the minister refer this matter to his new outside advisers?

Mr. Gordon: Mr. Speaker, I don't know if that was a serious question.

Mr. Martineau: Sure it is.

Mr. Gordon: The various commissions that have been looking into business and financial activities in Canada, and the Canadian tax foundation, have advised that the Department of Finance staff should be strengthened, and I am taking their advice seriously. I think it is important advice, and if the staff of the department can be strengthened I think it will work out to everybody's advantage.

[*Later:*]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Finance.

In view of the fact that he is enlisting at present additional staff to advise and assist him in the preparation of his next budget, has the Minister of Finance considered inviting representatives of the working class as well as farmers' representatives to assist him in that work, in order that the views of those two important social groups be represented and can permeate into the ivory tower of his department?

[*Text*]

Mr. Gordon: Mr. Speaker, first of all the individuals we are recruiting for the department are to assist departmental officials in respect of the recommendations that will be forthcoming from various tax commissions in Canada. In answer to my hon. friend's question, I will most certainly welcome all the help and advice I can get from labour organizations, agricultural organizations or any other organizations in this country that will improve the economy of this country still further.

OILSEEDS—TARIFF BOARD REPORT RECOMMENDING FREE ENTRY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reynold Rapp (Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance in connection with the recent tariff board report. The minister must be aware of the board's recommendation that would allow oilseeds, including soybeans, flax and rapeseed free entry into Canada despite the fact that farm organizations and I have strongly opposed this. Could the minister look into this situation to see that no injustice is done?

Hon. Walter L. Gordon (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, as I was required to do, I tabled the report of the tariff board in respect of this matter within the prescribed period, and when doing so I asked any interested party who might have any views in respect of the report or recommendations to submit those views to me. I can assure my hon. friend that such views will be given most careful consideration.

PUBLIC SERVICE

PROTESTS RESPECTING RECENT SALARY INCREASES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the President of the Privy Council. I asked a question of the Prime Minister on Thursday which he promised to look into, and in his absence I would like to direct it today to the President of the Privy Council. I wish to ask him whether he has had time to look into the allegation by the national unemployment insurance employees association that the salary increase granted to group B employees represents approximately 50 per cent of what was recommended by the federal civil service commission. Has the minister had time to look into that, and can he give the house an answer?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will realize that an answer to his question in the

form in which he asked it involves giving information about the recommendations from the civil service commission. These recommendations are, by a decision of this house, held to be confidential. That decision was confirmed by a vote of the house in 1960, so I cannot answer his question in the form in which he asked it.

However, if the hon. member is dealing with the general matter of the pay increases in group B, recently announced, I can add by way of explanation that on Friday of last week the Prime Minister and I received a delegation representing the staff side conference of the public service. The staff side conference made certain representations and presented some additional arguments and data, and that matter is receiving consideration at the moment.

Mr. Douglas: As a supplementary question may I ask the minister whether this means that the salary increases which were granted are now going to be reviewed in the light of the representations which were made, and that there is some hope they may be revised upward?

Mr. McIlraith: Well, all the additional representations made at that meeting, together with representations from one or two other organizations that are not represented in the staff side conference, will be given full consideration and a decision will be taken on the whole matter.

Mr. Douglas: By whom will this review be made; by a committee of the cabinet or a treasury board committee?

Mr. McIlraith: The treasury board is a standing committee of the cabinet.

Mr. Douglas: Then it will be the treasury board which will do this, not a special select committee?

Mr. McIlraith: I do not know how much detail the hon. member wants me to give about the processes of the government in arriving at a decision of this sort, but I presume it will be a treasury board decision, dealt with by the full cabinet.

HOUSING

VANCOUVER—REQUEST FOR MEETING RESPECTING VETERANS PROJECT

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 Northern Affairs and National Resources. I do so because of a telegram I received only a few moments ago. I would like to ask the minister whether he will accede to the urgent request of the Fraserview veterans for an open meeting with himself as their federal M.P. and a representative of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation to discuss their housing problems, in view of the recently announced and soon to come into effect government policy on increased rentals and home purchase prices.

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): Mr. Speaker, I have no objection whatsoever to seeing any of my constituents at any time. As a matter of fact I have met this particular group before, sometimes when the hon. member for Vancouver East was present. It would be my hope that he could also attend when I meet them again.

CONSIDERATION OF REPORT OF ONTARIO ASSOCIATION OF AUTHORITIES

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Chapleau): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Postmaster General?

Could the minister tell us if he has read the report on public housing submitted recently by the Ontario association of housing authorities, and if he intends to present shortly a program to improve the lot of a great number of ill-housed families in Canada?

[*Text*]

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, I cannot truthfully say I have read the full report. It has several hundred pages. I can say that I have read parts of it; I have read the conclusions; and I have read an analysis prepared for me by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. I would like to assure the hon. gentleman and the house—and if the hon. gentleman will read the report himself he will see this is so—that a great many of the recommendations contained in this report have already been incorporated in the amendments to the National Housing Act that became law in late June of this year. Others of the recommendations have been incorporated in the complementary legislation passed by the province of Ontario earlier this year. The others that have not been dealt with will receive careful consideration.

THE MINISTRY

TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES FOR FAMILIES AND FRIENDS OF MINISTERS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Théogène Ricard (St. Hyacinthe-Bagot): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Transport. Could the minister tell the house whether it is a common practice with this government to put at the disposal of ministers going on trips for the government a coach for their families and friends? I refer to trips on government business.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, it is certainly not a common practice, and the hon. gentleman might be more specific and perhaps commit this question to writing.

ARTS, LETTERS AND SCIENCES

TORONTO—CANADA COUNCIL GRANT TO CREST THEATRE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State. Has he yet transmitted my question of yesterday concerning the Crest theatre to the Canada Council; and if so, has he received any comment?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, the question asked by the hon. member has been transmitted to the Canada Council but no answer has yet been received.

Mr. Aiken: May I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. While the minister is waiting for a reply and comment in this regard, would he also ask the Canada Council where they hope to secure actors for all the centres for the performing arts that are being built as centennial projects, if the grant to the place from which the actors come is to be discontinued?

Mr. Lamontagne: I will, Mr. Speaker.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

TORONTO, ONT.—DENIAL OF BENEFITS TO STRIKING NEWSPAPER EMPLOYEES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I directed a question to the Minister of Labour. I would like to ask it again now that the minister is here. Could the minister give us any explanation as to the reason for the I.T.U. strikers in Toronto being ruled ineligible for unemployment insurance?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the insurance officer, reviewing the applications for benefits by the persons employed in the composing rooms, came to the conclusion that a substantial stoppage of work had taken place and this had been due to a labour dispute. For that reason the insurance officer disqualified this group from receiving benefits.

Mr. Scott: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister say whether it is true that the unemployment insurance commission have sent questionnaires to the publishers, and that if the answers to these questionnaires show that an 85 per cent production has been resumed, will they then be eligible for unemployment insurance?

Mr. MacEachen: I have no information as to the existence of a questionnaire, Mr. Speaker, but I do understand that just as soon as the insurance officer satisfies himself that a substantial resumption of work has taken place in this particular area of activity, the applications for benefits will be reconsidered. I will attempt to get information with respect to the questionnaire.

Mr. Scott: I have one final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. While the minister is seeking this further information, can he ascertain how the unemployment insurance commission decides whether there is a substantial resumption of work? I understand the questionnaires have already been sent out and are sitting on the desks of the publishers.

Mr. MacEachen: The insurance officer will probably consider the restoration of normal working conditions and the disappearance of what apparently is still considered to be an emergency situation in the working operations of the newspapers.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

REPORTED STATEMENT RESPECTING MEMBERS AND STAFF

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would direct a question to the Acting Prime Minister. It has to do with sordid and, if I may use language within the restrictions of parliament, scurrilous statements made by one Macdonald which cast aspersions on all members of

this house who were members in 1961, as well as on the staff of parliament. This was a general allegation that was made. Believing in freedom of speech as I do, and as I know the hon. gentleman does, is it the opinion of the government that the allegations that have been made constitute a disparagement of the House of Commons and its members and a contempt of this house?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I imagine that I read the same press report of these utterances as the right hon. gentleman. I read it immediately before coming into the house and have had no chance at all of discussion with any of my colleagues. Moreover, it is well known that the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice are absent in Charlottetown. It would not have been possible therefore, I think, for the government to form any opinion on this matter.

I must say, speaking as a member of parliament, that I think it is a perfectly shocking kind of allegation to appear, and quite frankly I am most reluctant to believe that it has any kind of substance whatsoever. When we think of what was said by this same person about Hon. M. J. Coldwell, which was refuted completely yesterday, I think his credibility as a witness has been somewhat discredited already. However, I do think it is a matter on which it would not be the government but the law officers of the crown that would form an opinion as to whether any kind of appropriate action could be taken which would not in any way endanger the right to speak foolishly and recklessly, which is one of the prized possessions of free people.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, the summation on the part of the Acting Prime Minister is an excellent epitome of freedom; but freedom does not, of course, include the right to libel in general or in such a way as actually to cast a shadow on all the members of this house and on all the staff of this house who have been here since 1961. Personally I am not concerned about contemptible statements of this kind, but I do think the minister should bring this matter before the Prime Minister, and any decision made by the Prime Minister in his position as custodian of the rights and prerogatives of parliament will, I am sure, be in the best interests of us all.

Mr. Pickersgill: I quite agree with the right hon. gentleman. I would go further and say that I believe the only way in which there should be any abridgment of freedom

of speech is by the rule of law; and while this house is frequently referred to as a court, it is not a court in that sense. The only proper place for the adjudication of questions as to whether freedom of speech has turned into offensive licence is in the law courts of our country, and I hope no decision of that kind will ever be made anywhere else.

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, in view of the implications of this to all members, may I ask which member of this House of Commons is going to take the matter to a court of law?

Mr. Pickersgill: If there is anything actionable I am sure the right hon. gentleman, whose view I accepted, is quite correct when he says that the Prime Minister as the leader of the house should give consideration to the matter in consultation with the Minister of Justice. I am quite sure that it would be for them and for our colleagues to decide whether it was proper for action to be taken, what kind of action should be taken, and in what jurisdiction.

Mr. R. A. Webb (Hastings-Frontenac): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I should like to ask the Acting Prime Minister whether he is aware that donations to the organization known as Underdog are exempt for income tax purposes.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge either of the organization or of the question the hon. gentleman refers to, but I am sure that my hon. friend the Minister of National Revenue will look into this point.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder whether the Acting Prime Minister, when considering this matter, would also consider looking into the responsibility for republication of this type of scurrilous material by the press and whether, consistent with the freedom of the press, anything could be done in that regard.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I assume the utterance itself and the diffusion of the utterance are matters which would have to be considered together. It is quite true that this person would perhaps not be very widely heard if there was no reporting of his remarks by people who have greater financial resources than he appears to have.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, most of us do not object to being reported.

Mr. Pickersgill: As a matter of fact the right hon. gentleman frequently complains about the way in which he is reported.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I have had assistance in that regard from the Minister of Transport on several occasions.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

CALVIN MACDONALD—REPORTED LISTING AS COMMUNIST

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Roger Teillet (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, perhaps this is an excellent point to answer the question asked by the hon. member for York-Sunbury yesterday with respect to Mr. Calvin Macdonald and his statement accusing the Department of Veterans Affairs of listing him as a communist and preventing him from obtaining employment.

First of all I want to assure the hon. member as well as the house that the Department of Veterans Affairs does not, has not and will not deal in this fashion. It does not list people according to ideological or political concept. Second, it has never prevented Mr. Macdonald from obtaining employment. Quite the contrary; over a period of time attempts have been made to assist in his rehabilitation including attempts made to locate suitable employment for him.

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

REFUSAL TO ACCEPT CHEQUE DRAWN ON CREDIT UNION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reg Cantelon (Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration of which I have sent him notice. The minister has received a letter from the credit union league of Saskatchewan having to do with contract bonds between the department and contracting firms. I quote one paragraph:

> Our information received from the manager of the Meadow Lake credit union indicates that your department has refused to accept a certified cheque on the credit union and insists that such a cheque be drawn on a chartered bank.

My question is, will the minister remove this discriminatory provision against credit unions?

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for having given me notice of this question. I am not personally aware of the letter to which the hon. member refers. However, I should point out that procedures in respect to tendering and security deposits are governed by the government contracts regulations. These regulations, applicable to all departments, provide for security deposits in the form of certified cheques drawn on banks to which the Bank Act or the Quebec Savings Banks Act applies.

Mr. Cantelon: Mr. Speaker, supplementary to my recent question to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, I understand the regulation to which he referred, but my question was, would he see that this regulation is removed?

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Speaker, I have been informed that those regulations are under consideration at the moment. However, I will bring this matter to the attention of the Minister of Finance.

CANADIAN CONFEDERATION

PROPOSED UNION OF ATLANTIC PROVINCES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. H. J. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Acting Prime Minister. Has he received any communication from the premier of New Brunswick relative to his proposal made at the Charlottetown conference that there be a union of the Atlantic provinces?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have not received any communication, and the Prime Minister's office has not advised me of any which has been received, but I will make inquiries.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

EQUALIZATION OF PAY FOR PREVAILING RATES EMPLOYEES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. Nasserden (Rosthern): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the President of the Privy Council. Has he a reply to the question I asked him the other day with regard to the prevailing rate employees at Dana?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (President of the Privy Council): Yes, Mr. Speaker. The question the hon. member asked had to do with the difference in prevailing rates paid to certain government employees in Dana and in Saskatoon. On investigation we found that in

some classes of employment the rate was the same in Dana as in Saskatoon but that in other classes there was a difference. As a result we are having the whole matter looked into by the Department of Labour to see whether there should be a revision of the rates in the classes where there is a difference. I do not have that answer, because it will take some weeks for that process to be completed, but it is being considered now.

REPORTED INTENTION TO DISBAND SOUTH SASKATCHEWAN REGIMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. R. Southam (Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I have a question I should like to direct to the Minister of National Defence. My question is based on an article appearing in the Estevan *Sun Advertiser* of August 27 and a telegram I received from Estevan today. Can the minister say there is no basis for the rumour circulating in western Canada that the South Saskatchewan Regiment, with its glorious war record, is to be disbanded?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, decisions in respect of reorganizations of the militia have not yet been taken.

REPORTED DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION TO COMMUNIST AGENCY

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Hon. Lucien Cardin (Associate Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon. member for Pontiac-Témiscamingue (Mr. Martineau) asked me to make inquiries about a statement made by Mr. Macdonald to the effect that a wireless operator in the Department of National Defence would have given secret information to a communist agency.

After investigation in the Department of National Defence it appears that there is no report indicating that a wireless operator in the department has given such secret information to a communist agency.

[*Text*]

INCOME TAX

HAL BANKS—STEPS TO ASSURE RETENTION OF ASSETS IN CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. V. Pugh (Okanagan Boundary): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the Minister of National Revenue with reference to Hal Banks, income tax and the question I asked yesterday. Has the minister taken steps to see that the assets belonging to this man are not entirely removed from Canadian jurisdiction?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question raised by the hon. member for Okanagan Boundary yesterday, I would like to indicate that Mr. Banks' whereabouts is not known to the taxation division of the Department of National Revenue, and that there is a question as to whether he is still a resident of Canada for income tax purposes. While it is not in the public interest and is contrary to the Income Tax Act to reveal information about Mr. Banks' income and taxes that may be due, since it is a matter of public record, I can inform the hon. member that there is a hypothec registered against his property in favour of the crown to secure taxes due.

NATIONAL REVENUE

SASKATCHEWAN—REQUEST FOR CONTINUATION OF SERVICE AT REGWAY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. K. H. More (Regina City): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of National Revenue. Can he announce any decision in respect of keeping the important port of entry at Regway, Saskatchewan, open on a 24 hour basis after September 14?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, may I take this question as notice.

PENSIONS

CANADA PLAN—INQUIRY AS TO INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Now that we are in the month of September, and now that our recess is just around the corner—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Knowles: I refer, of course, to the Christmas recess—during which week of this month will the resolution respecting the revised version of the Canada pension plan be placed on the order paper?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to take up my hon. friend's question with the house leader.

Mr. Knowles: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister aware that as long ago as April 23 the Prime Minister promised that we would proceed with this matter as soon as the constitutional amendment had been agreed to?

An hon. Member: What's a promise?

Miss LaMarsh: Mr. Speaker, the rhetorical question just asked by my hon. friend is one, of course, the answer to which everyone in the house knows. As my hon. friend is well aware, the difficulty is that the program of the government has been brought very much to a halt by virtue of the action of hon. members of the opposition.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Miss LaMarsh: The order paper is already filled with very important matters which we have not been able to deal with, and it is thought there is really very little to be gained by adding more items to the order paper now before those already there are dealt with.

Mr. Knowles: Does the minister not realize that it would be evidence of the government's readiness to go ahead with the Canada pension plan if it would at least put the resolution on the order paper?

Miss LaMarsh: Mr. Speaker, I am happy to repeat that the government is ready and willing, and with a little co-operation from the other side we will also be able.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the legislation now ready?

Miss LaMarsh: Mr. Speaker, I do not think I am in a position to say this. I do not have a copy in both languages on my desk, and I will have to check.

Mr. Monteith: A different story.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

REQUEST FOR NATIONAL SURVEY ON NUTRITION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. William Dean Howe (Hamilton South): Mr. Speaker, I have another question for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. On Friday last I asked her a question with regard to a national survey of health and nutrition. Is she in a position to answer the question today?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Yes, Mr. Speaker. My parliamentary secretary gave me the question which was asked the other day. I should like to say that I noticed the newspaper report suggesting that there should be a national survey of nutrition in the country. I am advised that members of my department have been in consultation with officials of the Department of Agriculture and the dominion bureau of statistics, and that they have been looking into whether there is any value to be derived from having a national survey.

It is quite true that in Canada we do not have the kind of information that is available in the United States, and the effect of not having such detailed information is being thoroughly reviewed. It is appreciated that such a survey would take considerable time and staff and would be very costly. It will also have to be determined whether this is the most effective way to use the staff and resources we have available.

I can only say to my hon. friend and the house at this time that the departmental study is not sufficiently advanced for me to take any final decision in the matter.

INDUSTRY

REPORTED INTENTION OF CANADIAN FIRMS TO ESTABLISH U.S. BRANCHES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Fred F. Stenson (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Industry. It stems from a newspaper report of an interview in Toronto last Thursday with Robert W. Latta, industrial development director of the Buffalo area chamber of commerce. The report reads in part as follows:

> He said that 7 of 17 firms he canvassed in Toronto this week were interested in setting up branch plants near Buffalo. He plans further trips here to meet officials of another 37 firms.

Could the minister's department not get in touch with these firms to try to encourage them to stay in Canada, manufacture here and export their products so as to help our export trade, which we need so badly, between this country and the United States?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, while there will probably be some difficulty in ascertaining the names of these firms, since I assume the industrial development officer from Buffalo is not going to make their names available to me so I can work against him, I will be glad to look into the matter and see what we can do.

Canadian Flag

Mr. Monteith: Surely you have enough employees to find out something.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

BATCHAWANA, ONT.—ASSISTANCE TO FAMILIES FACING EVICTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. H. A. Thomas (Middlesex West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration concerning the Indian families at Batchawana in the Sault Ste. Marie district who have been served with eviction notices by Scott Misener Steamship Company Limited.

In view of the statement by the local parish priest that these people lack the financial resources to protect their interests properly in court, can the minister assure the house that the Indian affairs branch will be given the necessary authority, encouragement and financial resources to make certain that the rights, privileges and desires of these Indian Canadians will be fully protected in court?

[*Translation*]

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, after making inquiries I found out that of the 250 persons who might be affected by the company anxious to take over their properties, only 47 were Indians coming under the Indian Act.

I understand that those 47 persons can avail themselves of all the advantages provided by the department for a location in the two reserves already allocated to the Indians living there.

On the other hand, I am informed that the 47 Indians coming under the Indian Act consider themselves as forming part of this group of 250 people and they wish, as individuals, to assert their claims to those properties.

As far as I know no request has been submitted to the department for legal or financial assistance, in order to put forward the group's views to the company wanting to take over the properties in question.

[*Text*]

CANADIAN FLAG

OFFICIAL ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW DESIGN

The house resumed, from Monday, August 31, consideration of the motion of Mr. Pearson:

> 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 the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Diefenbaker, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. More.

Mr. Eric Stefanson (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, at 10.30 last night when the house adjourned I was speaking in support of the subamendment to the amendment to the flag resolution, and had not quite completed my remarks.

At the conclusion of my remarks last night I was urging all hon. members to lend their support to the subamendment. I strongly urge some member of the government to rise in his or her place and indicate the government's support for the subamendment, for if someone did this we could immediately move on to other urgent business. However, on reading Mr. Newman's article in the Toronto *Star* yesterday it would appear that the government has no legislation ready. Under the subheading "No Bills Ready" Mr. Newman says:

> The Conservatives' filibuster has not, as is generally believed, prevented parliament from dealing with a backlog of essential legislation. The Liberal administration, unaccountably, has no major bills ready for debate. The pension plan, which was supposed to be the showpiece of the Liberal's first year in office, is now in its fourth sad mutation.

It does seem inexcusable that the government has no legislation ready. It is further proof of a mismanaged and badly organized session. The Prime Minister and the government house leader have to take full responsibility for this. The order of business is in their hands. The Minister of Justice entered the debate last Thursday when he suggested the extension of the hours of sitting. This shows a lack of understanding of the situation.

This is the 139th day of this session and so far there has been no recess. I urge that some consideration should be given to the welfare of the staff. I merely wish to point out that the *Hansard* reporters, the *Hansard* staff generally and others are working under pressure and against time. If orderly recesses were arranged it would be much better for everyone concerned. This is another indication of the mismanagement of this session.

Our Indian citizens have not been consulted about the flag. Their wishes have not been taken into consideration. The Indians

do not like a flag which does not contain the union jack. They are afraid that removal of the union jack would mean that the treaties they have made with the Queen would also be done away with. Anything which gives rise to fears or suspicion in the minds of people should be avoided.

The only logical and reasonable approach to this issue is the holding of a referendum. Many members have stressed the need for unity, and have pointed out that a flag should unite people. There is no point in changing the present flag until our people plainly want a new one and until there is an agreement among the majority on a design. If such a flag, when selected, would tend to bring about a greater degree of unity, then it would serve a useful purpose. The present proposed flag does neither of these things.

If the Prime Minister believes that the flag proposed in this resolution would bring about unity and respect, then I suggest he accept the subamendment forthwith and pass the matter on to the people for their consideration. I have faith in the tolerance and understanding of the people of Canada. I believe that any decision they themselves make will help the ties that bind and result in a stronger and more united Canada. I personally want to see a free, strong and united Canada. There is no room for dictatorship or dictatorial methods in our society. Let us forthwith pass this issue over to the people for them to make a decision. Then parliament can move forward and take action on the many important pieces of legislation which should be dealt with and which affect the economic well-being of every Canadian.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I was impressed at the opening of this sitting when the hon. member for Queens (Mr. Macquarrie) and the Minister of Transport, as Acting Prime Minister, recalled the days of 100 years ago when we saw the beginning of the action which culminated in the British North America Act and brought about the uniting of Canada with Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick.

It is well to recall the events of those days at a time when we are discussing a matter of great importance to Canada, to her people, to her destiny, and above all to her unity now. And it is well to recall the difficulties of those days for many, especially for the faint hearted. The position was one of defeatism. There were separatists in those days, too. There were annexationists who believed that the ultimate destiny of Canada was to join the United States. Indeed, as the house very well knows, from 1776 under the articles of confederation Canada had the right and the prerogative to join the 13 colonies on an equal basis on the terms under which they entered their journey into history as the United States of America.

One of the matters dealt with during this conference in Charlottetown might well have been consideration of a general agreement by the premiers of the provinces and the Prime Minister of Canada on designs, or on a design, for a national flag for Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: However, that was not to be; for the Prime Minister had seen fit months ago to determine his design and to determine, as well, that parliament should accept that design or face an election. It took three months for the Prime Minister to realize that the bludgeon, the threat, would have no effect on Her Majesty's loyal opposition. When he found that to be the case he decided he would in fact grant a free vote.

The Prime Minister and the premiers are meeting. I hope they will be able to achieve the repatriation of the constitution. We almost succeeded and would have done so but for one or two comparatively minor matters to which objection was taken by the province of Quebec and, even more so, by the province of Saskatchewan when that province was under a socialist government. Now there has been a change. It is not for me to discuss the merits or demerits of that change, but there has also been a change in the premiership, and the new premier has agreed that action may be taken. So we may hope that after the many failures of the past we shall attain now, with the assistance of the tremendous contribution made by the minister of justice in my administration, that which has eluded Canadians for many, many years.

It is well to recall the speeches of 1864 and 1865. Some today talk about Canada being two nations. That did not represent the views of John A. Macdonald or Georges Étienne Cartier. It does not represent the views of two members of the cabinet today. The Minister of Forestry has come out foursquare for one Canada, and the Minister without Portfolio has stated that he believes this is one nation and not two. Also I recall that another member of the cabinet, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, ridiculed the view I expressed of one Canada and said it was nothing but a futile slogan; but in the intervening months

two members of the cabinet have broken with the views of other members of the cabinet in this regard, and it is worthy of note that they are both from the province of Quebec. Indeed, they represent the views of Macdonald.

I quote Macdonald's words in 1865 at the third session of the provincial parliament of Canada:

—it seems to me as to them, and I think it will so appear to the people of this country, that, if we wish to be a great people; if we wish to form—using the expression which was sneered at the other evening—a great nationality, commanding the respect of the world, able to hold our own against all opponents, and to defend these institutions we prize; if we wish to have one system of government, and to establish a commercial union...obeying the same sovereign, owing the same allegiance....if we wish to be able to afford to each other the means of mutual defence....this can only be obtained by a union of some kind between the scattered and weak boundaries composing the British North American provinces.

I suggest that hon. members also read the speech of Cartier, the embodiment of French Canada and its aspirations, made on February 7, 1865. He dealt with the discussions that had taken place:

The matter resolved itself into this, either we must obtain British North American confederation or be absorbed in an American confederation. Some entertained the opinion that it was unnecessary to have British North American confederation to prevent absorption into the vortex of American confederation. Such parties were mistaken. We knew the policy of England towards us—that she was determined to help and support us in any struggle with our neighbours.

Those days and those fears of course no longer exist. Then he went on to say:

The absorption of this province into the United States had long been contemplated, as would be seen from the 7th article in the original draft of the constitution (American).

Then he referred to article 7, which ends up with these words:

But, except Canada, no other colony shall be admitted into the confederacy without the assent of 11 or more votes, as the case may require, by the confederation being extended.

Then he said:

As early as 1775, the French Canadians were solemnly addressed in a proclamation by General Washington, who called upon them to abandon the flag of their new masters, inasmuch as they could not expect anything from those who differ from them in language, in religion, in race, and in sympathies. But what was the conduct of the French Canadian people under these circumstances —what was the attitude of the clergy and the seigneurs? It was the right in treating this chapter of our history, to render justice to whom justice was due and it was truth to say that the seigneurs, forming as they did, the educated class of our population at that early epoch, had fully understood that the object and aim of those who appealed to them was the downfall of the monarchical system in America.

Then he went on to say—and these are not his words, they are mine—they had not been moved. Then he said:

Incited by these motives, and encouraged by the advice of many friends of liberty among you, the grand American congress have sent an army into your province—

Then he dealt with the reaction of those who but a few years before had found themselves in the position of having lost. They joined; they stood. Then he said this:

The question for us to ask ourselves was this: Shall we be content to maintain a mere provincial existence, when, by combining together we could become a great nation...a great nation could not be formed—

—unless there was a joining with Lower Canada—

—in great part French and Roman Catholic, and Upper Canada...English and Protestant—

—the other provinces mixed.

That was their aim. That was their purpose. That was their dream, and I think that purpose and that objective are as true today as when they were uttered by the Macdonalds and the Cartiers, repeated by the Lauriers and the St. Laurents and by the Lapointes throughout the years of Canadian parliamentary life.

Today I am going to review something of the elements that have been brought before this house so powerfully by so many members of Her Majesty's loyal opposition in recent weeks. I read in the press, I hear from the voices of those who see nothing good in any stand the Conservative party takes, criticism of parliament today and criticism of the speeches made. I hear the strident voices of criticism saying the speeches have been boring. No one can say I participated except for 25 minutes, so I have been a listener; and I say to you, sir, that in almost a quarter of a century of membership in the House of Commons I have not seen or heard more consistently good speeches than have been delivered here, coming as they were from the heart, coming from the soul, and coming from the feelings and traditions that we support.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am not talking about hon. gentlemen opposite. Their contribution has been the contribution of the hon. member for Lotbinière, who has led them. No longer

is he to be with us, Mr. Speaker. The voice of interruption is to be stilled. For the last two weeks he has been rotating from seat to seat, apparently representing a new leadership on the government side, because certainly they have not shown other leadership in this regard. They have been silent. Why, the silence of the sepulcher does not exceed the silence of a government under attack.

And do you know why they are silent? Well, hon. gentlemen sometimes reveal the reasons they are silent when they speak outside the house. The hon. member for Port Arthur has a program on television, and he has been able to mobilize hon. gentlemen from all parts of the house. I regard it as a most interesting program, "Fisher's Frolics," and I do not say that disrespectfully because I say that he is able to draw out—I think the expression is "draw out"—the truth, by that bedside manner he exhibits.

It is amazing what he has been able to achieve. Do you know why they are silent, Mr. Speaker? I am not going to read it all, but if any hon. gentleman would like it tabled I would be glad to do so. He had an interview with two Liberal members on August 2, and he started out by saying of them:

> Neither in my opinion is a rubber stamp—

In other words "there are no rubber stamps here." They gave their experience. They talked of these great men who occupy the front seats of Liberalism. They spoke of it, and what did they say? They seemed to detect an attitude of domination. They believed these great men should have their say. Let me quote one hon. member.

An hon. Member: Name?

Mr. Diefenbaker: He said "They have a special place". He was referring to ministers:

> It was said, I won't say where it was said, I'll say very recently it was said by a minister to a backbencher, "You are not the same as we are".

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Monteith: The typical attitude.

Mr. Diefenbaker: "You backbenchers, you are made of other stuff. In fact", said the hon. member—these are the very words he used—"How dare you say you are the same as we are?" The hon. member occupies a prominent place in the ranks of Liberalism opposite. Then another spoke and he said in effect, "Well, we don't know what is happening. We never know what is going to take place. They don't tell us anything". Then he said:

> Our people are amazed when an order is issued and they will call you up and say to you you know about these new wharfage charges. No, I don't know anything about them. Yet they could defeat me, but somebody initiated them that even the minister doesn't know too much about.

There is where he touched a tender nerve. Perhaps hon. gentlemen opposite would like me to read some more. Even the Minister of National Defence is mentioned. This Liberal member said, in effect, that the minister could not trust them:

> He didn't even trust it to be typed by the establishment.

The minister had to make his notes in his own handwriting, otherwise he might have been overwhelmed. Then he said:

> I know how people tick and this is the trouble in Ottawa.

One of them said the trouble in Ottawa is that they don't know what is happening. Mr. Speaker, now you are beginning to see why it is these people are silent. They are strong, silent men who make their observations from a seated position because they are afraid to stand up.

Sir, never have I seen anything approaching the attitude of this government. Only one minister apart from the Prime Minister has spoken. The Minister of Justice has made two general observations. Why is this, sir? These two members to whom I have alluded, who bared their souls to the Canadian people on television, who opened the secret recesses of their innermost depths, say "We don't know anything about these things because we belong to a different category". That is why they are not speaking. Two of them spoke, the hon. member for York-Humber and the hon. member for York East; and what they said was tremendously revealing. It indicated that nobody knew anything about what was going to be brought forward.

I am now going to deal with the course that was taken by the Prime Minister. I am going to be very restrained in my observations regarding him today, in his absence, because there will be other opportunities, I am told, for me to speak before this matter is concluded.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: We would like to know, not what the private members had to say; not the digits referred to by the two hon. members, but who were the four English speaking ministers who sold the Prime Minister on this flag design. There is one of the great mysteries. Mr. Stewart of the Montreal *Star* said over the C.B.C. that this

was so. Who were they? I do not want to embarrass anyone, but the information I have is that two of them come from Toronto and one from the Pacific coast. I immediately absolve the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources. I designate the Postmaster General, because he came up with the three maple leaves on a stamp. I am going to deal with that, because what he said in April was different from what he said last week in this regard.

Who were these four? Why don't we get this information? These men deserve to have their names perpetuated in the annals of parliament. They showed the Prime Minister something that he never showed to his members until after he had revealed it at a siesta at 24 Sussex drive. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that he placed this design over the fireplace and said "I hanker after it". On the basis of recent experience he is hankering after something else at the moment.

Mr. Pugh: A handkerchief.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The Prime Minister said he hankered after it. These members had it given to him, and they cannot defend it. That is why they are silent. Why was this matter rushed before the house? What happened? To whom did the Prime Minister make promises? We don't know. In the month of February there was no reference to this matter in the speech from the throne; several weeks later there was no reference to it among the priorities.

Mackenzie King knew what a matter like this would do to the unity of this country. The Right Hon. Louis St. Laurent knew what would happen. Why was this matter suddenly brought forward? Never at any time in the election campaign had the Prime Minister said that by a distinctive flag he meant one from which was removed the union jack. There was not a word about that. That impression was left in the province of Quebec, but not by the Prime Minister. In other parts of Canada it did not appear in the program or in the advertisements, and I have them here. There is not one word. This parliament has no mandate and this government has no mandate to do what they are trying to do.

I am going to deal, Mr. Speaker, with some of the frenzied fantasies of the press and radio in their criticisms of the Conservative party for the stand they have taken. For who else is going to stand with us? Is it going to be the hon. gentlemen of the New Democratic party? The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre on January 12, 1964 advised the Legion in Manitoba that he was for the red ensign. He has changed; a metamorphosis has come over him in recent months. Will we get from that party the support of any more than two, three or four members in this regard?

Mr. Peters: Let us vote and you will find out.

Mr. Diefenbaker: What about the Social Credit party? We have yet to find out where they stand, with the exception of one or two members. We want to know.

Some hon. Members: Let us vote.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Ah, they say let us vote. Mr. Speaker, that illustrates above everything else the philosophy of the people who have said that. That is what they say under alien forms of government, just "vote". We know where the Creditistes stand. I look at my hon. friend the Minister without Portfolio and recall some of his statements regarding the leaders of the Social Credit party and the Creditistes. It must be the words of love and affection he spoke which now bind them to the bosom of Liberalism.

Mr. Dupuis: Are you jealous?

Mr. Diefenbaker: May I point out this fact. There are matters of immediate consequence on which action is needed. For example, what about the economic situation of which the Minister of Finance speaks so blandly? What about the pension legislation? We had an explanation of that when the question was asked, "Have you got it ready? If so, put it on". Why do not the government bring in that legislation? Are they changing their minds again for the third time?

Mr. Monteith: The fourth.

Mr. Diefenbaker: For the fourth time. Where is the legislation promised by the Minister of Agriculture. This is legislation which is going to bring about a new heaven and new earth agriculturally. Where is this legislation? We are not holding up anything, and hon. members opposite have not anything to hold up except themselves. There is not one iota of truth in the suggestion that we are holding anything up. We are holding up—

Mr. Mandziuk: A vacation.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I would say to my hon. friends opposite that all of them have qualifications for drama in an animal field. What

are we holding up? We are holding up the government—

Mr. Peters: Right.

Mr. Diefenbaker: —on behalf of millions of Canadians. We are putting up a meaningful fight for a meaningful flag for Canada. We have said, and I repeat, in the addresses given by hon. gentleman in this party that we have always stood for a distinctive flag; but never at any time did the Conservative party, any more than the Liberal party, openly contend for anything other than a flag which was called distinctive by Mackenzie King and by Louis St. Laurent. Do you know where they made their mistake? They let their sycophants believe there would be a token fight and they would push this thing through and achieve what the Prime Minister wants as a personal flag.

The hon. member for York East revealed something that must be of interest to hon. members in various parts of Ontario and elsewhere when he said "We did not expect that there would be such a strong feeling on the part of Canadians". Mr. Speaker, Gallup polls cannot convey the soulful things of life. Where would Canada be today so far as the flag is concerned if it were not for the fight put up by this party standing alone?

I intend, sir, to call the great parliamentarians of the past to give their views as to a government endeavouring to push through something that the people generally do not want. They have played with parliament. They want the people to believe that all this legislation which they have in their minds but which they have not been able to translate into legislative form would be brought in if only we abdicated our responsibilities. They misconstrued the attitude of the people.

A few weeks ago the government were talking about an election. They said that was the reason we were fighting. We have made it perfectly clear that this is not so, because this is not the kind of issue upon which a general election should take place. But that is what they said. Today the Minister of Transport said in effect that the achievement of freedom demands the right of free speech. He is one of those to whom the press and radio have been most free in their free speech, and they have never heard me take a stand against it.

I ask, and parliament has the right to ask, that both sides be given not an expurgated edition, not a translated interpretation, but actually the other side of the equation. We have not been able to get that so far, but someone has stated that the stand we are taking is getting through to the people. I do not know how it is getting through, but whereas three weeks ago there was criticism, more and more the attitude in every province, including the province of Quebec, indicates that the importance of this debate is finding its way through.

Mr. Speaker, they have been assisted by one United States magazine that masquerades in Canada as Canadian, but which week after week reveals one side of the equation. We have had our experience in the past, in 1962 and 1963, with extraterritorial interference. Let me interpolate here. There is an election campaign now on in the United States. Canadians should use that same discretion regarding an election in that country as we ask from them for Canada.

It has been argued that Canada does not have a distinctive flag. She had one, as was said in parliament by Mr. Ilsley, now the chief justice of Nova Scotia. The red ensign flying over parliament from 1867 to 1904; the red ensign was declared to be the flag for the army overseas in 1943; the red ensign was declared in 1945, until parliament otherwise directed, to be Canada's national flag. I have heard some say "But think of it; the Prime Minister brought this matter before parliament rather than doing it by order in council". Mr. Speaker, he could not do it by order in council, because that order in council of 1945 stated explicitly that a change could only be made by parliament.

Sir, I summarize these few general remarks I have made by referring to an article by Guy Lamarche in magazine *Maclean's*, September edition. Mr. Lamarche was speaking of our country and, reading from the translation, he said:

> Here, we deliberately chose to adopt a national flag under the worst possible conditions...
>
> Not only should we have waited, but it should have been orchestrated and executed with *brio* as an important step in our adolescence.
>
> It was a question of public relations and I cannot understand how the image makers of Mr. Pearson, who work so hard to make us swallow their productions, were unable to convince the Prime Minister that at least in the matter of the flag, the public interest demanded that they should be allowed to make a success of it...
>
> Instead of this, they spent their time saying the flag was a question full of sentiment and emotion, going right to the heart of every Canadian; and then nothing at all was done to reach the heart and sentiment of these Canadians...

Mr. Speaker, we have nothing to apologize for or explain in respect of the stand we

have taken. This is not a frivolous or captious stand. This is a stand based on abiding principles. I say this to you, and through you to the government. We in Her Majesty's loyal opposition are here to all intents and purposes standing alone in this house, but we do not represent a small minority of the Canadian people. Sir, we have a responsibility, and the government tries to becloud the issue by saying they have got legislation ready. Mr. Speaker, no arteries of legislation are being stopped when the government has no legislative items ready. We have passed all the legislation that has been brought before parliament—

An hon. Member: What about redistribution?

Mr. Diefenbaker: —except redistribution. Everything has received consideration, and the only reason redistribution was not passed is because the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre decided he wanted to change the ideas of the government regarding appointments being made, one by the prime minister and one by the leader of the opposition. There was also a question raised as to the relative tolerance that should exist as between urban and rural areas. We showed signs of being able to come to an agreement. We suggested 20 per cent was too low. What about Mr. Lesage in the province of Quebec; what did he do? He raised this to 25 per cent in his province, according to the press.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the hon. gentleman would permit me to ask him a question.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Yes.

Mr. Pickersgill: The right hon. gentleman has suggested that the only piece of legislation the opposition held up was redistribution. Does the right hon. gentleman think that a minority in the house, if it disagrees with something, has the right indefinitely to refuse the majority the right to express its views through a vote?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman will receive his answer in a few moments, when I deal with the words of a parliamentarian with whom I am sure the hon. member will agree, irrespective of his feelings. I refer to Right Hon. Mackenzie King. I will deal with that subject when I reach it.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I did not make the question clear to the right hon. gentleman. I should make it clear that I was referring in my question to the redistribution matter.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Yes. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has a way about him, and I do not take him any more seriously than he sometimes is taken outside the house. I did say to him courteously that I would deal with his question, but then he ran away from it by asking another question.

Mr. Speaker, he brings me to this position. In spite of all the Liberal mythology in relation to parliament being brought to an impasse, who brought it here? Did we bring in the Prime Minister's personal choice? Did we prevent him bringing in legislation regarding the economy, the necessity of expansion of trade, and the subject of the question raised by the hon. member for Perth, in reference to the declaration of national goals? Who brought about division within this country? Who created it or, if not created, who added the fires to division? We have never seen anything to equal the separation, the division, the antagonisms expressed within our country that we have seen since the present government came into office. One of the major reasons is this: They promised everything and they have executed little or nothing.

It was not the Conservative party that had the separatists. It was not the Conservative party that had an hon. member in their midst who would abolish the Queen and remove the British connection. I thought that hon. member was speaking for himself, but in the last 10 days it is apparent that he has become a paragon of perfection as he moves around, interrupts and receives the warmest plaudits from those who I would have thought would have contemptuously spurned one who expressed views such as he is expressing.

Did we bring about the bitter division? Sir, this parliament has a great responsibility. Some newspaper editorials say: Mind you, the Prime Minister made a mistake, he should not have got us into this, but the opposition is terrible because it dares to stand against his personal desires. Sir, we have no excuses to offer. An hon. gentleman says, should it not be brought to a vote? Shades of Laurier and Borden. I have two volumes here that I am sure will take their place alongside the volume on Mr. King that was edited by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill).

I make an appeal to the government. I know it is late to do it but we have a sacred trust. Do not let us continue this course and

build up controversies for the future. We believe that policy should bring Canadians together rather than disintegrate them. All of this was encouraged by the Prime Minister when he made that speech in the month of April after the election, in which he said he believed in two nations. That is when the trouble began. In other parts of Canada it was explained that he really had not meant it. In the House of Commons one Friday he came forward with a commission to investigate separatism but when he saw the effect of it somebody issued a press release that night.

Who has been building up false hopes for the people? What about the wild and unrestrained statements that have been made by influential men not in the Conservative party? It is not being anti-Quebec to say that certain men have spoken in a way that cannot help but divide this country. Yet when one takes that stand it is argued that one is anti-Quebec. Not at all; I have never in my life uttered a word that could be so construed.

I go back to 1924 when I took a case in the province of Saskatchewan on behalf of French school trustees. I was told: Do not take it; it will cause you difficulty in the future. Sir, I have never failed to take the stand which I believed was necessary and proper. When I spoke, as did many members of the N.D.P., regarding the injustice done to the Japanese Canadians, their only offence their colour, I was alone among my colleagues. When in June of 1940 I made a speech for the first time in the House of Commons I appealed then for a Canadianism. At that time terrible criticisms were being uttered against those of German origin. I said: These people are Canadians. It was not popular to take that stand.

I recollect what happened in 1961 and 1962 when I said that we must have a colour-blind commonwealth. What did hon. gentlemen opposite say? They said that I lost favour with the United Kingdom; but today this is accepted. Speaking for this party and the government of that day, I said to the British people in 1962: You have full right as an independent country to join the common market but you have responsibilities to the commonwealth which you yourselves have admitted and we ask you not to forget the institution that above everything else in the world represents something that no other group of nations has ever been able to achieve. I was criticized; I was bitterly denounced. Do you hear any of those opposite saying today that they want to get into the common market? Today they are using the arguments for which they criticized us. Great is the experience of public life when you see people sitting opposite who in the month of May, 1962, said that nothing more terrible had ever happened than the pegging of the Canadian dollar but who now embrace the heresy of those days as their own.

One must take a stand. One cannot always be on the side of a majority, but when there is a great principle at stake parties have a responsibility. A very prominent Conservative wrote me and said: Don't fight them, they are thirsty for this flag; let them have it and when a change of government comes bring in your own flag. The hon. gentleman says, let us get to a vote, because he has the artificial certainty of a quiescent majority with him. Sir, that is not parliament, as I will show when I refer to the words of Laurier.

I want to see this institution not derided, not downgraded. There are one or two who are doing so whose knowledge of democracy is not in keeping with their enthusiasm for condemnation of the Conservative party. The relation of parliament to public opinion is a serious matter. That is why the press has its place. The elector requires and is entitled to a fair and impartial view of what is going on in parliament. I ask you, sir. Is it a fair division when the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, on the day when two speeches were made, one by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp) and the other by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Starr) speaking from the wells of experience, those wells from which his people have drawn their sustenance and power for a thousand years, should devote to one speech eight times the amount of attention devoted to the other?

An hon. Member: Typical.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is one-sided. No one can argue that it is not. And you will never build a Canada if information is to be denied when it is critical of a government, but given first place when it consists of the declarations of a government. I speak realizing that what I say may be misinterpreted. But I do not want to be misinterpreted. I want to say this finally and unequivocally—that only now, in the last week or so, is the feeling getting through to the people.

I should like to read what some of the hon. gentlemen opposite are hearing from their constituents. "Get to a vote". Yes. If they would heed the call of their constituents it will be of interest when they do vote. We

must work for national unity. We did. When were in office, we tried to unify. We made the House of Commons a living place when we installed the simultaneous translation system. Today there is a degree of exchange which never took place before in this house. We did not contribute to separating the people of our country on the basis of race, religion, or province against province. Somebody will argue: Oh, if you only fall in line with this and allow the three maple leaves, all will be well. Mr. Speaker, the niggling knife would still continue. I said I would be restrained in what I have to say in the absence of the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) because I will be able to say more when he is back. But I find it difficult to explain why, knowing in advance that there was going to be division, he got into this and carried his supporters along, the speed of the caravan being determined by the right hon. gentleman.

I do not intend to follow on this occasion the sinuous course the government has followed. The Postmaster General (Mr. Nicholson) is not here; I will have some reference to make to him when he is. But I simply point out in this regard the fact that what has happened is now being blamed on us, because we dared to stand. Well, last evening I read the words of *Ulysses,* which are the embodiment of our attitude—"strong in will to strive, to seek, to find and not to yield". Members opposite thought they would dominate us by a campaign of vituperation the like of which I have not seen in this land. I do not complain, but I point out that this is the situation. Sir, why did they do it? Why did they act? Why did not the Prime Minister, unless he wanted to make a political matter of this, go to the leaders of the various parties before the seeds of dissension had been planted by his aggressive speech in Winnipeg to the Royal Canadian Legion? Can we not sit down together and talk things over? Was there any attitude of compromise when, knowing that he had a multitude with him, he could ride roughshod? We said, no.

Sir, have we a national flag, a distinctive flag? I ask you to turn to the answer given by Mr. St. Laurent as prime minister in 1951, on November 21 when he was asked the question:

> What steps are being taken by the government with respect to the adoption of a distinctive national flag?

To that question, his answer was: "See order in council P.C. 5888 of September 15, 1945."

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Why did they do this? What did they think they would achieve? Why do they now try to blame us for standing in the way of one of the most barefaced attempts in Canadian history to overwhelm an opposition which represents millions of Canadians? Again, I ask the question: Why? You do not choose a flag that way. You do not change a flag in the systole and diastole of political controversy following an election. This is something for Canada's next hundred years. Yet the government decided for political purposes —that is what *La Presse* said—for the prospect of votes, to bring about a stifling of the outpouring of the spirit of millions of Canadians. And they did it by fooling the people of the province of Quebec. I have had a great deal of correspondence from that province lately and the question asked me is this—

What is the constituency of my hon. friend—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Yes, that is one of my afflictions; I can never remember the names of constituencies. I have not that kind of memory, though hon. members opposite may have it. But I remember the great things, and the great principles, and this is something they might bear in mind.

Some hon. Member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Can you imagine hon. gentlemen opposite—I would like to identify them if they would let me know who they are, so that they would be on the record—when we are discussing a matter of importance to Canadians as a whole indulging in that kind of exhibitionism?

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Diefenbaker: There is no identification. Their silence is their own rebuke. What they are trying to do is to cover up their failure to act on so many matters that desperately need to be solved, and they bring up an issue of an emotional nature to conceal their failure.

I do not want to impose anything on the people of Quebec. I have acted for the French Canadians through the years. As one gets on to my time in life he can look back. I have acted for them throughout the years. I know them. I do not want to impose. That is not the spirit of 100 years ago today—to impose. Neither do I want them to say to the rest of Canada. "We must do this." I am sure they do not have that view. This is not a country that can be governed by the imposition of brute force.

Sir, I speak with more emotion than usual when I think of what is being done to this, my country. I am of mixed origin too. I am not one with a colonial viewpoint. Conservative prime ministers and leaders from Macdonald to date have not been colonialists. They have led the way on behalf of an independent nation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: When I read the editorials in *Le Devoir* I do not think the people of Quebec are prepared to accept the synthetic lure artificially contrived by the Liberal party in the form of this flag design, obviously to conceal its inaction in meeting problems of agriculture, unemployment and the like. It is not too late yet for the government—and only the government can act.

The hon. member for Yorkton (Mr. Clancy) mentioned a wedge. I ask them not to drive this wedge deeper. Why pursue this course? I ask hon. members opposite, can't you do something with this government in spite of the revelations made by two hon. members as to the impotence of private members? Can't you do something for Canada? Can't you stop this? I know Canadians as a whole would appreciate action in this regard.

This is one of the most frightening problems facing Canada today. It is one that should cause men to think; but who gets the blame? They blame us for daring to stand against them. They used the mailed fist and we stood firm, and we intend to stand firm.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Sir, when I say that, I also want to add that we are prepared at all times as Canadians to hold out the right hand of fellowship in a spirit of compromise, for after all this is a country where compromise is of the essence, so long as compromise does not violate principles.

I have not forgotten the question put by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill). I shall come to that rather too soon for him.

Mr. Pickersgill: You cannot come to it too soon.

Mr. Diefenbaker: He was one of the devotees, one who was described by pamphleteers as the power behind Mr. King. I see he wags his head in a horizontal position. Such modesty is unusual even though unvoiced. Sir, on August 11, 1944, near the end of the war, I spoke immediately before the prime minister, who was my member. We had that relationship of member and constituent that did not always bear the relationship of Damon and Pythias, but Mr. King had his views. Let me read what he said. In my remarks, I mentioned that, when our men came back from overseas, let them be Canadian. I am not going to quote my speech. I have never made a habit of doing that, but I preceded him, contending that we should build Canada with Canadians, maintaining the constitutional rights by assuring to those of us in whose veins flowed blood not entirely British or French equal rights as citizens, equal rights as Canadians, and Mr. King said:

> May I say to my hon. friend that in that I am in entire and wholehearted agreement with him. I cannot express too strongly the feeling I have that some of these practices which have been carried on by the census branch for statistical purposes, or possibly for ethnological purposes—I believe that is the way it is described—might be done away with. I would be happy to join with my hon. friend and with any others in seeking to do my part to see absolute recognition, or recognition made in an absolute way of men and women who were born in this country, and those who have become Canadian citizens being regarded as Canadians first, foremost and all the time.

Sir, what do the three maple leaves typify? The Postmaster General (Mr. Nicholson) in his speech to the philatelic organization, said one stands for the British, one stands for the French and the other stands for the other racial origins. He never got to telling them what the centre one stood for. It was nonsense.

Were they thinking about other ethnic groups in Quebec in 1868 when they came out with their coat of arms? Were they thinking of them in Ontario? Not at all.

As a matter of fact this flag was first placed on a stamp as a result of the action of the Postmaster General after he took office. He told us the other day it had been decided in July of 1963. That is what he told the house, but he forgot what he said in the month of April. I will read what he said then, according to Southam news services:

> Postmaster General John R. Nicholson, however, said he knew nothing about this design representing the new Canadian flag, although he chose the stamp and decided its colours himself after entering office last February 1.

Ten days ago he told us he had nothing to do with it, that it had been decided before any question of a change of flag was being considered. Then listen to these words:

> Mr. Nicholson admitted that it had been proposed that the stamp be issued with the maple leaves red on a white background, but he decided to try a little background colour.

"I thought of that pale blue they use in the United Nations flag," he said—

I say to him, on the basis of his statement of April 17, that this was just part of the propaganda to soften up the Canadian people.

Mr. Nicholson: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Good.

Mr. Nicholson: The right hon. gentleman is glibly suggesting that the statement I made here in all sincerity is not true, that it is hypocritical.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I did not say either of those things.

Mr. Nicholson: I did say the maple leaf design was chosen in or about the month of July, 1963. The records of the Post Office Department show that. I did make a modest contribution to the final design when I learned, through technical advice, that there was a question of whether a red stamp on a white background could be picked up electronically. After I became Postmaster General I directed that a colour change be made from a white background to a blue background. That is the simple explanation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, it is a simple explanation but it is far removed from the explanation of April 17 that appeared in the Canadian Press. But I am really not concerned about that, because all the minister has succeeded in doing is assure the house that he was not one of the four wise men who induced the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) to accept the three maple leaf design.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the right hon. gentleman would permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. Diefenbaker: No. If the hon. gentleman would—

Mr. Pickersgill: I am asking if the right hon. gentleman will permit me—

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

An hon. Member: He isn't speaking to the subamendment.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The right hon. Leader of the Opposition is making a speech.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Oh, the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) said I am not on the subamendment. I am glad he raised that point.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I know the right hon. gentleman suffers from the same defect I do, that of hardness of hearing; but that does not excuse his misrepresenting what I said. I asked the right hon. gentleman, very politely, if I could ask him a question and I made no other remark of any kind. And I was denied the question.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I hasten immediately, Mr. Speaker, to say that if the hon. gentleman says he did not make that remark, I accept it; but it just shows the influence he has on backbench members, one of whom has a voice that sounds very much like his, apparently in emulation. I was reading what Mr. King said, and I would have thought it would have commanded the attention of the Minister of Transport. Mr. King said:

> And may I say this to my hon. friend, that he has touched upon a very real subject, when he speaks of men who have fought and died as Canadians, irrespective of race and religion. I regret much to see in this country at the present time some gentlemen who are in positions of high respect, and who know better, seeking to raise matters of creed and race, with the suggestion that things are being done for people of one area rather than for those of another. May I say to this committee that if anyone wishes a battle on the question of whether we are to have one part of this country singled out as non-Canadian as against what by others is said to be Canadian, no one would welcome that fight any more than I would.
>
> And anyone who raises the question of race to prejudice anyone of another race in this country is doing the greatest disservice that can be done to Canadian unity and to Canadian nationality. And not only do I wish to see our people recognized as Canadians, but I also wish to see a Canadian flag recognized in this country. I would like to see it the flag that our Canadian men are fighting under today. We have a Canadian flag unfurled in battle today by our very brave men in Italy and in France. I think in time the people of this country of Canada will say we want to have as a Canadian flag the flag they are carrying in battle today.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is No. 1. Then they say we have not a distinctive flag. That is not what Mr. King said. And what did Mr. St. Laurent say? I want to nail down these misconceptions and falsifications that are being bandied about. Mr. St. Laurent said on November 13, 1945, with regard to a distinctive flag and a design for it, that any such design should include the union jack in the upper left corner. That was Mr. St. Laurent. Was he any less a Canadian for saying that? Then he went on to say that the question of a flag "should be lifted above the plane of partisan politics." Sir,

how much I agree with that view. This design was put forward by the Prime Minister for political purposes and now, finding himself in difficulties, who is blamed? We are blamed for not letting him do that. What a hypocritical stand to take. Let me read further what Mr. St. Laurent said. They say that to have the union jack on the flag is a mark of subservience and domination. What did Mr. St. Laurent say, as is reported at page 2096 of *Hansard*:

I do not think any member of this honourable house would quarrel with that statement.

He is referring to the preceding statement, whatever it was:

The union jack is a symbol which represents much that is best in the heritage of all those who derive their traditions and their culture from western Europe.

Then he said:

I do not believe that any of us in this country at this time regard the union jack as being a symbol of conquest or a symbol of subjugation. It is under the union jack that the institutions of this Canadian nation have grown and developed and have brought us to the point where now, and for a good many years now, the dominion is and has been an autonomous state subject in no phase of its domestic or of its external affairs to any other authority—

Then he quoted with approval Mr. King's words to the Canadian Legion.

Mr. King assured the Legion officers that, so far as he was concerned, the new Canadian flag should certainly contain the union jack. It might be debatable whether a single maple leaf in the fly would be preferable to the Canadian coat of arms at present incorporated in the Canadian red ensign, but it would be unthinkable to have a flag for this dominion that did not contain the union jack.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That was Mr. King's stand, and certainly throughout his life he stood for independence, and strongly stood for it. In this regard Mr. St. Laurent said:

I am prepared to say now that I for one fully share the views expressed by the prime minister to this delegation, the legionnaires—

There are those who tell you, sir, and try to lead Canadians to believe that we are pushing something on Quebec. Who was in the cabinet then? Mr. King was the prime minister, there was Mr. St. Laurent, and Mr. Lesage was in the cabinet. Did we have anything to do with this flag that was recommended, with the fact that the red ensign should be the flag—

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, surely the right hon. gentleman realizes that Mr. Lesage did not come into the cabinet until Mr. St. Laurent had been prime minister for several years?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, this is one time that the hon. gentleman's memory regarding this question is correct. But Mr. Lesage was in the house. Did he raise any objection?

Mr. Nielsen: He was honestly silent.

Mr. Diefenbaker: He was never one not to speak what he thought. I have placed these quotations before the house, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of answering this kind of propaganda that the Liberal party has disseminated, namely that we are trying to push something on Quebec. It was done when the hon. gentlemen opposite were in power. The Minister of Transport was the grey eminence—although not grey—behind Mr. Mackenzie King.

I was asked by the hon. gentleman what the attitude would be as to an opposition that stands for the things that it believes in, in principle. I do not refer to questions of ordinary, every day economics but to matters that affect a nation, its well-being, its future —everything that we hold dear. I would ask him to read the words of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, because they represent a viewpoint that cannot be gainsaid. He pointed out during the course of his statement in this House of Commons when the house was discussing the navy bill, debate on which lasted for months and months in 1912-13, that an opposition has the right to act when there is a question of principle at stake. In the course of his remarks he dealt particularly with what had happened in the past. In 1912 the Conservative party under Sir Robert Borden brought in legislation to provide for naval assistance to the United Kingdom. Sir Wilfrid has always been regarded by friend and foe as a great parliamentarian. I read from the "Life and letters of Sir Wilfrid Laurier", volume 2. I have *Hansard* in my office, but not having brought it down with me I will read from this volume. At page 409 the following appears:

Amendment after amendment was made, only to be voted down.

That was by the Liberal party of the day.

Every naval commander from Noah to Nelson was quoted and quoted again. Conservatives ceased to speak and Liberals spoke double time. Tempers rose, interruption was frequent, the Speaker "named" members, and still little progress was made with the bill. Finally, the government decided to force the bill through under closure.

That is when Sir Wilfrid gave not only Canada of his day but posterity the answer to those who talk of filibuster. They did not use that expression then. Filibuster is an

Americanism; obstruction was the expression used in those days. The Conservatives said they were being obstructed; therefore the rules had to be changed. Sir Wilfrid went on:

We have heard it stated that these rules are antiquated. I do not admit that at all.

Then he went on to deal with that and continued:

Sir, these rules are to be swept away, they are to be ridden over roughshod; they are to be put aside, and we are to have the gag substituted for them.

Then he uses these words, and I would recommend them for the edification of the souls of hon. gentlemen opposite:

As I have said, there are some occasions on which there is a cleavage between the majority and the minority, and then there is an easy remedy, an easy solution. The remedy is not closure; it is not the application of brute force. The remedy is an appeal to the people. 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, as between the majority and the minority;...

When we come to discuss these constitutional questions, these questions of public policy, the best authority after all is the authority of history.

Now mark these words:

Confederation will have been in existence 46 years next July—

—that was in 1913—

—and how many times has there been obstruction during these last 45 years? Just four times before this year. Let me recall them. There was obstruction in 1885, in 1896, in 1908, and in 1911, and after I have mentioned the causes for the obstruction on these several occasions, I shall have furnished the most complete justification for the attitude we have taken upon the present occasion.

I am not admitting obstruction of course; I am just quoting what was said by Sir Wilfrid.

We introduced the reciprocity measure on the twenty sixth of January,—

—that was in 1911—

—and on the twenty ninth of July we had not yet been able to obtain even a preliminary vote upon it.

Then the house sat to exhaustion. I do not know how many times it sat all night and all day, but Sir Wilfrid was on the receiving end at that time. He continued:

We had been met at every step by obstruction from the Conservatives, then in opposition; dilatory motions of every kind were made, speech after speech was delivered day in and day out, even in the dog days of summer. I did not complain; I did not whine. Two courses were open to me. I could have done as is done today by the prime minister; I could have introduced the closure and said that we must carry on the business of the government and that consistently with our dignity, we could not allow obstruction. But there was another course open to me and that was an appeal to the people; and I advised my colleagues to give the honourable gentlemen of the opposition opportunity of appealing to the people. We appealed to the people and we were defeated. Heaven is my witness that I would rather stand here today, defeated and in opposition by that appeal to the people, than stand over there in office by the power of the gag...

Let me repeat to my right hon. friend: As you sow so shall you reap; as you are fair, so shall you meet with fairness; as you are unjust, so shall you meet with injustice...

The poison—

—that was the poisoned chalice—

—that he offers to us today will come to his own lips at some future day.

Then he went on to say that in looking back over the history from 1885 on, in every case the opposition was right. And we are right today.

I would ask the hon. gentlemen to read what Sir Wilfrid Laurier had to say in this regard, because he sets out in detail that the stand taken was in accordance with the historic rights of an opposition when a matter affecting not only the economy of the country but the future and unity of the country was brought forward to the house.

Then in 1912 the Conservatives did something that I have never been able to understand, nor do I try to defend. They brought about closure. They pushed through the navy bill. And what was the result? They got it through after weeks and weeks of argument and it went to the Senate. The Senate refused to agree that the navy bill was necessary. Sir Robert Borden forgot all about that, because he knew the stand that was taken then by the Liberal party, in the light of the events as they came to him subsequently, was the right stand. Sir, I am going to ask hon. gentlemen to read what Sir Wilfrid said, and read what Sir Robert Borden said in that regard as well. Both agreed that the opposition had the responsibility, when it speaks on a matter of great principle for the voiceless of the country. It has the right to take a stand.

Sir, I still ask the government to give consideration to ending this situation and let the members get back to their constituencies to find out what their constituents are thinking. Let us get together. I suggested the establishment of a committee. If we had set up a committee in the first place, instead of the flag being introduced as a personal thing, I think we would have come to some conclusion and agreement. I think we would have finally decided on something that would be generally acceptable, as did the committee of 1945-46. There were just as strong feelings

expressed before that committee was set up as there are now, and the vote was 23 to 1.

Sir, I ask hon. members to read what Sir Wilfrid said on April 9, 1913, in this regard when he set out in detail what I have been trying to impress upon this house, that the essence of government is consent, not domination, not brute force and not a steamroller.

The government thought all it had to do was bring this resolution in and the opposition would say, "This is wrong", but would then retreat. That is not the way to bring in a matter that is above politics and above partisan considerations, or to use the words of Mr. St. Laurent, that transcends the parties.

Sir Wilfrid gave four examples, and said:

> Let me recall them. There was obstruction in 1885, in 1896, in 1908, and in 1911, ...
>
> There was obstruction in 1885. In that year the government of Sir John A. Macdonald introduced a uniform franchise bill for the dominion. Up to that date the franchise had been under the control of the several provinces, each province having its own franchise. While in two or three provinces there was manhood suffrage, in the others there was a diverse franchise, and we of the Liberal party thought this system was the best. ...We compelled Sir John Macdonald to accept many of our proposals.
>
> There was obstruction in 1896, and what was the occasion of that? The government of that day undertook to deal with the Manitoba school question, which had been for six long years before them, and had been debated and debated again. The government did not dare to give a decision on the question until at last in 1896, in the dying days of a moribund parliament, it introduced a measure for the purpose of giving satisfaction to the minority;... We fought that measure and we obtained what we were asking for.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier said they made them feel—

> —that a grievous wrong had been perpetrated on them.
>
> We obtained what we were asking for.
>
> There was obstruction again in 1908, and what was the occasion? The government of which I was the head had introduced an election measure providing for voters' lists... We offered a compromise, which was accepted. The obstruction on that occasion...came from the Conservative party. I found no fault with it; I never whined.

Sir Wilfrid then mentioned the other occasion of obstruction in 1911 and said:

> We introduced the reciprocity measure on the 26th of January, and on the 28th of July we had not yet been able to obtain even a preliminary vote upon it.

He said he did not object to that, because that is the essence of parliament in respect of matters that affect the sentiments of people and their welfare.

Sir, I suggested that there should have been a committee set up. I still think a committee should be established. We believe the people have a right to a say in this matter, and that is the essence of our amendment and our stand. We think there should be a roll-call of Canadians. In other words, we suggest this matter has never received a mandate from the people.

The amendment of the hon. member for Regina City (Mr. More) sets forth certain questions that might be placed before the people. A referendum would not be costly. It could take place at the next election, and this issue could be removed from partisan considerations. That suggestion was put forward. A similar course has been suggested on one or two occasions in Canadian history. However, with the desire to help, but without being browbeaten by threats of an election, the suggestion was made to establish a committee. I think such a committee could come up even yet with a recommendation, but it would have to have time. I do not like in camera meetings, but if you are going to have this kind of a committee, and if it can ultimately arrive at a recommendation which is substantially unanimous, then in the interest of all, anyone who had strong feelings would not have to answer directly for that stand. I think the recommendation of a committee should receive the support of an 80 per cent majority. I say that because you cannot impose a flag on a people. A flag is something to look up to, it is not something to look down on. Therefore, it must represent the consensus.

Sir, I made an offer, and many of my colleagues have spoken, that I would pick the representatives of the Conservative party from those members who have not spoken, so there would be no frozen opinions, but I am not going to place this matter in the hands of a committee unless there is an agreement that any recommendation of that committee must represent substantial support. If perchance political considerations entered into the deliberations of such a committee, and if 66⅔ per cent of the members were politically with the government or its allies, we would lose the benefit of that committee bringing to the Canadian people a flag that is generally acceptable.

Sir, I think by establishing a committee we would remove from the public's mind the ineptness, the confusion and the chaos created by the maladroit course followed by the government. I think Canadians are divided into various groups, some wanting a distinctive flag, but some define "distinctive" in one way and some in another. Louis St. Laurent defined it as a flag upon which the union jack

had its place. The present government, after an election, decided to give their own definition to "distinctive", and their definition is one without any recognition of the heritage of the past, the devotion of either French or English to our country.

There are others who insist on the red ensign without change or modification. There are some who in the interests of unity, and I plead that, are prepared to agree to modifications that will recognize the contributions of the two great races. There are some who want the three maple leaf flag. There are others who want a one maple leaf flag. Then, sir, there are some in all these categories who have been shocked at the course that the Liberal party took in bringing this flag before us.

The Canadian people have a right to say what kind of flag they want and they can only exercise that right through a plebiscite. But in the interests of bringing us together I repeat the suggestion of a committee, but not one to meet for three or four weeks. Her Majesty will be here on the 12th of October and such a committee does not have to be limited to that date. Let it sit for three months. Certainly I think it would take two months. The question of time is not important, but the committee should not be directed that it has to do the job within a certain time. If the committee comes up with a substantial majority, then there is no need for further argument. A short debate would be sufficient. But, sir, unless it does we are back to where we were, except that we have given Canadians a chance to think this over.

Feeling has crystallized very strongly in the last few weeks. So far as time is concerned, I have read one commentator, who in the past has achieved monetary gain by libellous statements, who says that it is costing $33,000 a day for parliament to sit. That is absolutely false. Our salaries are spread over the year. It does not cost any more for parliament to sit today than if we were home, except for the paper, the printing, the page boys and the like. That statement is a complete fabrication. If we were home all of the staff here with few exceptions, as you know, Mr. Speaker, would still be on salary. That statement is designed to hurt and to damage, and the truth can never catch up to a falsehood. But that statement should be answered. In addition, sir, I do not think that anybody should object to sitting, with the salary that is being received today, and I speak as one who does not receive the addition. Parliament is not to be measured by cost. Parliament is to be measured by the degree to which it brings about improvement for the benefit of the nation.

We are ready. Bring on your legislative program. We will be glad to pass it as we have passed other measures. The government have nothing ready except that in their minds they have got plans. If they have anything ready, let them bring it forward. What is there to stop them bringing in the resolution on pensions which has so frequently been asked for? Let us deal with that. Let us set up the committee and let the committee go to work. The government has endeavoured to lead the Canadian people to believe that we are preventing them from bringing in anything. We will welcome legislation. Bring it in and we will give a legislative program every support. But I want to brand as another myth the suggestion that while we debate this matter that will affect Canadians for 100 years we are holding up other legislation.

Sir, you cannot make a flag for a country by putting a slug of political advantage into a jukebox. That is what they are trying to do. The Prime Minister looked over this flag and he said, "I hanker for it". What would this committee do? Would it not consider the indicia of a flag? In the darkest days of 1915 when the British and French had their backs to the wall President Woodrow Wilson spoke of the flag as the embodiment not of sentiment but of history.

I do not want to say anything critical about the three maple leaves, but does it move your heart to see this flag after it has flown for a week or ten days? Does it touch you as freedom's banner streaming o'er us? Does it consecrate in everyone looking at it the history, the struggle, the strife that brought about our Canada? Sir, a flag cannot be created by one man however powerful his position. This is a time of instant creation but you cannot create instant flags. Flags are born in the strife and turmoil of clash of history. They are not the result of an egocentric decision.

That is why we have taken this stand, Mr. Speaker. I speak again as one of two racial origins, neither one of which ever could be dominated. My paternal ancestors came here 150 years ago and until I became prime minister it was often said it could never be that one of German or Dutch origin could be prime minister. My highland ancestors were not dominated. The English tried to dominate them after Culloden. They directed that they could not wear the kilt or sound the pibroch, and the Bannermans were at Culloden. The

penalty was death. It did not mean anything. They stood because those things represented something to them, the richness of their past. They arouse the sacred emotion of loyalty. I plead with the government: Do not push on with this.

Today the Prime Minister meets with the premiers of the provinces. I will be the first to congratulate him if they bring about today something that we tried for and did not succeed in accomplishing. That is the history of mankind. Some try, and we advance. They have not lost because they do not attain. This is a step forward. If we get this accomplished, then let us together, in a spirit of Canadianism, a spirit of give and take, bring about a flag which will not disunite, as will this creation that is before us, but which will within its folds gather us all together so that in the next hundred years this country's destiny will be that for which we all hope.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Acting Prime Minister): When the right hon. gentleman began to speak I had no thought of taking any part in the debate on this subamendment which, it seems to me, we could best debate by deciding, because it concerns a purely technical problem. It is not the real issue before us. The real issue lies in the resolution itself, not in the subamendment or even in the amendment.

But the right hon. gentleman made one statement which, because the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) is not here, I feel should be corrected. He said that at no time before the elections of 1962 or 1963 did the Prime Minister make it clear in public what he meant by a distinctive flag. I know that the right hon. gentleman did not knowingly—

Mr. Diefenbaker: I will immediately withdraw if the hon. gentleman can show me I was wrong. I have every one of the quotations.

Mr. Pickersgill: The right hon. gentleman might have every one of the quotations, in which case he must have mislaid the two I am about to put on record now. I think every hon. member will consider it desirable that they be put on record so that there will be no further inadvertent misquotation or misrepresentation.

On January 21, 1960, my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, speaking on the program called "The Nation's Business" said—and I wish to quote one sentence from his remarks at that time:

> We must agree on a distinctive national flag which cannot be mistaken for an emblem of any other country and which is accepted as such by the Canadian people.

Now, the Prime Minister was asked by a number of people to interpret precisely what he meant by the phrase "a distinctive national flag which cannot be mistaken for an emblem of any other country". And on January 27, from the office of the leader of the opposition he issued a statement which I intend to read.

Mr. Nowlan: What year was that?

Mr. Pickersgill: This was in 1960. So that there may be no doubt whatever about where my right hon. friend stood, here is the statement:

> In the reference which I made in my television talk on "The Nation's Business" series on January 21 to a national flag for Canada, I was concerned with the desirability of the Canadian government taking full responsibility as soon as possible for finding a solution to the flag problem by submitting to parliament a measure which—if accepted by the representatives of the people in parliament—would, I hope, settle the problem.
>
> The present red ensign has never been given formal sanction by parliament. Furthermore (I know this from my own correspondence) it is not approved by a great many Canadians as a national flag because, in design, it is the same as the United Kingdom merchant marine flag, with the Canadian coat of arms added. The two flags can be mistaken for each other, and there are many who think that this confusion should be removed. There is no such confusion in any other part of the commonwealth, because each country, including Australia and New Zealand, has a flag which is easily identifiable with its country and cannot be mistaken for that of any other country.
>
> The union jack, a flag which every Canadian should honour and respect, is not however acceptable to many Canadians as a distinctive national flag of Canada because it is also the distinctive national flag of the United Kingdom. In consequence as I have indicated above, there is an unfortunate division of opinion in this country on the flag question. The time has come, I think, when this situation should be cleared up by governmental initiative and parliamentary action.
>
> Indeed, whatever action parliament might take in regard to a Canadian flag, I believe that the union jack should be accepted by Canada as an emblem to be flown on all occasions which are concerned with our commonwealth association and our status as a monarchy with the Queen as the head of that commonwealth.

When the present Prime Minister said this in 1960, it was accepted, and that position was accepted by the Liberal party, and it was the position we took at the election of 1962. It was in our literature.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Not at all.

Mr. Pickersgill: In exactly the same words, that was in our literature in 1963.

Some hon. Members: No.

Canadian Flag

Mr. Pickersgill: No one can say I did not listen intently, or with courtesy and politeness, to the right hon. gentleman when he was speaking, as did my hon. friends, and I think I might be permitted to say what I have to say without these noisy interruptions. What I say seems not to be palatable, but it happens to be the simple truth. I will bring these statements down at eight o'clock and if anyone wishes me to do so, I will table them. Each of these statements has been circulated throughout the country. One of them has been handed to me, now—

Mr. MacInnis: Would the hon. gentleman permit a question?

Mr. Pickersgill: Not at the moment. I think the hon. member has not been recognized by the Chair.

This is from the 1963 program under the heading "Adopt a Distinctive Canadian Flag and Anthem".

> Within two years of taking office, a new Liberal government will submit to parliament a design for a ffag which cannot be mistaken for the emblem of any other country. When adopted this will be the flag of Canada. "O Canada" will be proclaimed our official anthem.
>
> The union jack will be flown on appropriate occasions as a symbol of our membership in the commonwealth. A new Liberal government will also maintain the honour given to the traditional anthem which expresses Canada's devotion to the sovereign.

This document was published. It is published all over this country and nobody on earth has any right to say that we did not make our position clear in two general elections.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pickersgill: We did that, sir, and I suggest we had a perfect right to place that program before parliament.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. There is a point of order by the hon. member for Cape Breton South.

Mr. MacInnis: I rise on a point of order because of the reference made to myself by the Minister of Transport when he told the house that I had not been given recognition by the Chair. I recall, sir, that within the last two days the Chair gave a specific—

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. There is no point of order there. I am sure the hon. member does not wish to interrupt the Acting Prime Minister. No one interrupted the right hon. Leader of the Opposition and I think we should have a little fair play.

Mr. MacInnis: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I wish to mention in my point of order that there was a ruling given by the Chair within the last two days which indicated that a member rising on a question had the right to the floor provided the hon. member speaking would yield the floor to him. That was the ruling by the Chair with respect to a question put the other day. The Chair ruled that a member had the right to ask a question if the hon. member speaking yielded. I would also remind the Minister of Transport that on two occasions he was permitted to interrupt the right hon. Leader of the Opposition. The floor was yielded to him.

Mr. Speaker: In this particular case the floor was not yielded by the hon. member who was speaking.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I am rather astonished that after all the appeals from the other side for someone on this side to speak, when someone on this side tries to speak he is not permitted to continue.

It would be rather redundant, but I could go on and put on the record precisely the same words that were in the program of 1962. I think that disposes pretty conclusively of this talk about the resolution which stands in my right hon. friend's name being anything personal.

This resolution was not merely put on the order paper with the full authority of the government, by the head of the government, but it was put on with the full authority of the Liberal party, passed through all those channels used to put a program before the people of this country in two elections in which we were participating. And in order to make it clear it was neither personal, nor even for that matter governmental, at the request of hon. gentlemen opposite, my right hon. friend the Prime Minister has indicated there will be a completely free vote on this matter and that the government would not consider its life at stake.

If hon. gentlemen opposite are so afraid that hon. members in other parts of the house—I do not mean just on this side—will express opinions different from theirs, if they are allowed free expression of opinion, then that is an odd conception of that democracy of which the right hon. Leader of the Opposition said he had so much knowledge. It seems to me, sir, that the proper conception of democracy is that under a system of delegated

democracy, which any parliamentary system is, programs are put before the people. A government is chosen, and if that government puts matters before parliament it should have a right at least to have the voice of parliament on those matters after there has been all the debate there can reasonably be.

I am not one of those who think there should be any restriction on the right of any member in this house to express his own opinions on the flag. But I may say I think it rather astonishing that all these letters from other people, and newspaper comments which we can all read anyway and which, under our rules of debate we are not supposed to inject into debate, seem to be a large part of many of the speeches made. Indeed I am rather surprised that they are represented as a contribution, a personal contribution coming from the heart, particularly in cases when a sheet of paper is lost and the heart stops beating until it can be recovered from the floor.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pickersgill: I endorse the words of the right hon. gentleman opposite when he said we want consent in this house, not domination. I agree. We do not want to be dominated by a man who is dominating a minority in this house and preventing the majority from expressing its views. I am not going to take up the time of the house by quoting gossip columnists about anonymous members in the Tory backbenches and what they think about their leader. Picking up gossip and retailing it about anonymous people strikes me as being a rather second rate form of debate, and that is what the right hon. gentleman opposite did.

He also said that one man was not going to be allowed to impose his flag on this country. Sir, I hope that the people of Canada are not going to allow one man, drunk for power, to prevent the people of this country from having a flag if they want one.

The right hon. gentleman has found in my old master, Mr. Mackenzie King, a patron saint for the Tory party. I may say this is not untypical of Tories; to wear the worn out clothes of Liberals to cover their nakedness. I remember the enthusiasm with which the Tory party greeted Mr. Mackenzie King's initiative in 1945. They called it separatism and accused him of breaking up the empire. They said this red ensign was the end of all we held dear, that we must stick by the union jack. Now Mr. Mackenzie King is their hero.

The right hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, saw fit to degrade those three maple leaves which have been the emblem of this country since confederation and which the right hon. gentleman, himself, when he was prime minister had cast in bronze—they can be seen in room 16—as a symbol of Canada.

The right hon. gentleman, when he was prime minister, proudly had them put on his motor car—before the days of stickers.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pickersgill: He approved the Queen putting them on the royal standard. He put them on a postage stamp long before my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Nicholson) was postmaster general.

Mr. Nielsen: When?

Mr. Pickersgill: The hon. gentleman can do his own research on that.

Mr. Churchill: Give us the facts.

Mr. Pickersgill: All right. It was in 1959, when the right hon. gentleman was prime minister, that the three maple leaves conjoined on a single stem were put on a postage stamp of Canada, and the word "Canada" proudly underneath, and the prime minister of that time is now the Leader of the Opposition.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pickersgill: That is the plain fact. Sir, one thing that does shock me, and I think it shocks a great many other Canadians who have memories, too, that this maple leaf symbol of ours which is associated with Vimy ridge, which is associated with Dieppe, which is associated with every glorious feat of arms of this country—and in our short history we have had many of them—that hon. gentlemen have sought in this debate to degrade it. I think that is shameful; I hope it will not continue. Let us by all means differ, but let us try to avoid in this debate, on both sides of the house, casting any aspersions on the cherished views of others.

For myself, I do not have a very mixed origin. I am mostly a rather stolid, rather stupid Anglo-Saxon, but I also have a little Dutch blood and I am not ashamed of it. I do not think it has ever prevented me from doing anything I have wanted to do. But I do say, sir, that for me the union jack is the symbol of the land of my ancestors, and I think that land is as good a country as any other in the world, except Canada. But it is not the symbol of Canada—and the maple leaf is.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Canadian Flag

Mr. Pickersgill: I can tell the right hon. gentleman, if he does not know it already, why there is unity in the Liberal party and among its members in this house with regard to this question. There is not unity in his party, and if he doubts it, let him ask the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Balcer). I will tell the whole house why there is unity in the Liberal party on this question. It is because we did what has been done time and again in the history of this country. It was done at Charlottetown, Quebec and at the Westminster Palace hotel and was embodied in the British North America Act. We agreed on a compromise. That was set out in the program that we honestly and straightforwardly put forward to the Canadian people in two elections. We said we wanted a Canadian flag that was Canadian, and we wanted to fly the union jack, or a flag containing the uion jack, to symbolize our association with the commonwealth and our monarchical character and devotion to the crown. I say, Mr. Speaker, that is a position that is honourable, that is loyal and that, above all, is Canadian.

I certainly would not wish anything I might say to appear to deny to any hon. member in any part of the house his full right to express his views and to express them fully on this question. But we are not debating the flag question at the moment; we are debating a subamendment, a technical subamendment, to an amendment. This subamendment concerns a plebiscite. The right hon. gentleman talked about where his party stood. Well, where do they stand? They have never told us what kind of flag they want, because they cannot agree, because they will not agree, because the section of the party led by the hon. member for Three Rivers cannot agree with what the right hon. gentleman wants. This is not a secret. I suggest that the main reason hon. gentlemen opposite are not willing to allow the rest of us to express our opinions by a vote is because a vote would reveal the hopeless division in their own party.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pickersgill: But I suggest to the right hon. gentleman that we go ahead and have a vote on this subamendment and the amendment, on which there is no question of principle involved at all, and then we go on to deal with the main motion. There has only been one speaker on the main motion so far, and that is the right hon. gentleman himself. I suggest that we debate the main motion and when there has been the fullest possible debate, that, like adults, we decide this question; like the other great questions that other parliaments in this country in other times have been called upon to decide. I suggest, sir, that this is the way to make parliament work and to make parliament respected.

I agree with the right hon. gentleman when he said this was an important question. I have no patience with those who say it is an unimportant question and we should get on with other matters that are more important. There is no more important question than any question which affects the basic unity of our country. We will not have much of a Canada pension plan if we have not a united country to support it; we will not have much of a railway policy. I might say, *en passant,* that if the right hon. gentleman will carry out his word when I bring this important railway legislation forward—and it has been ready for months—and put it through, I will be most grateful to him.

Some hon. Members: Bring it in.

Mr. Pickersgill: If he will do the same with regard to redistribution—a principle that he claims the parentage of, but he does not want his child to be born—if he will let it be born, we will appreciate it.

An hon. Member: Bring it forward.

Mr. Pickersgill: Well, settle this question. This is the basic question.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pickersgill: I suggest that those hon. gentlemen opposite who can read should read the order paper. They will see what is on it already. There is plenty to do. But, Mr. Speaker, having undertaken this task, surely we can find it possible to act like adults in this house and settle this matter in an adult fashion. I suggest that no minority and, above all, no minority dominated—apparently all but bewitched, by one man—

Mr. Churchill: Nonsense.

Mr. Pickersgill: —should consider that it has a right to prevent the equal right of everyone in this house to express himself in the only way in which we can all express ourselves, and that is by a vote. That, after all, is perhaps the characteristic of our civilization. In four fifths of the world the people cannot do what we can do here in this house; they cannot settle their own destiny and they cannot get rid of the people who do it badly, either. In four fifths of the world the only way to get rid of a government you do not like is by violence and force.

The whole basis of our system is, as the right hon. gentleman said, consent and not domination.

However, Mr. Speaker, this kind of system will only work when we all honestly and loyally resolve to make it work. There is no system easier than the parliamentary system to disrupt, if the desire to disrupt is there. I appeal to hon. gentlemen: make all your speeches; say everything that is in your hearts; do your best to get your way—but if you cannot get your way, accept the democratic way and allow these matters to be settled, like adults.

An hon. Member: By bringing in closure again?

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I think an hon. gentleman said something about closure. I have said nothing about closure. I do not think any of us should even be thinking about closure; I think what we should be thinking about is resolving this question. Certainly, sir, there is no reason whatsoever why we should not dispose of the subamendment and the amendment and then, if someone else has another amendment to move, deal with that. I dare say there will be several amendments. There is going to be a free vote; my right hon. friend the Prime Minister has said that. If hon. gentlemen opposite have any united conviction about a flag, there is nothing to stop them moving an amendment to the Prime Minister's motion and putting it to the test of this house.

I hope we will have, after today, an end to these reflections upon the motives of our fellow members of parliament. Mr. Speaker, I have sought in what I have said to reflect in no way upon the motives of hon. gentlemen opposite, except possibly in the case of the right hon. gentleman, the early part of whose speech was a reflection upon everybody on this side of the house, and a deliberate reflection upon them. I have not done that and I do not intend to. But I do suggest that we rise above that kind of thing. Even though we feel strongly and differ on this question we are all honest in our differences, and I suggest that we settle this thing like Canadians.

Mr. Starr: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) a question. I am sure we are all grateful to him for setting out the ideas the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) had when he was leader of the opposition in respect to the flag situation and the national anthem. It was set out very clearly that the union jack would denote our commonwealth association and that "O Canada" would be our national anthem. Then he mentioned a distinctive Canadian flag. I wonder whether perchance he missed the paragraph where the flag was described as a three maple leaves flag.

Mr. Pickersgill: No, Mr. Speaker. I am speaking from memory, but I do not think my memory is too bad, and I have always had a disposition in this house to correct a mistake if I make one. I am sure all hon. members will agree with that. However, my memory is that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister said on a good many occasions that he felt the only way this question could be resolved was to have a design put before parliament for parliament to decide. There is the greatest liberty being given to this House of Commons. We have a design put forward by my right hon. friend as head of the government. He has now said that the government will not consider its life at stake in this matter. Therefore it is open to any hon. member who wishes to do so—as the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Scott) has publicly indicated he wishes to—to propose a substitution for that flag. Now, what could be freer than that?

Mr. MacInnis: Would the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) permit a question now?

Mr. Pickersgill: Yes.

Mr. MacInnis: The minister indicated to the house that during the last two elections the Liberal party advocated both in their literature and otherwise a distinctive Canadian flag. He said that this is the simple truth. Is the minister now saying that the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) was lying to the house on August 24?

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I really do not think I need make any comments on the speech of the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan), because if I did I might be tempted to say something about the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. MacInnis) and I do not want to create that kind of atmosphere in the house this afternoon.

Mr. MacInnis: A supplementary question. Is the minister aware that what he has said this afternoon is in direct contradiction of what the hon. member for York-Humber said on August 24?

Mr. Pickersgill: No. I have not read the speech of the hon. member for York-Humber.

Mr. Churchill: Then you should.

Canadian Flag

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the Minister of Transport. I should like to verify whether what I thought I heard is correct. The minister read two statements made by the leader of his party, and in the second one it seemed to me that he designated the flags of New Zealand and Australia as the type of distinctive national flag which cannot be mistaken for the flag of any other country. If that is the case, would the minister not agree that this gives no indication that the union jack would be removed from such a flag? I have made my own position clear, but this seemed to me to be the intent of the statement, that it would be a flag similar to that of New Zealand and Australia; and we all know what those flags look like.

Mr. Pickersgill: The hon. member will be able to read in *Hansard* what was said and can draw his own inferences from that; but I do not draw that inference from it and I do not think anyone else did. I remember very well the statement; and when you remember the fact that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister also said we should fly the union jack, that seems to be a clear indication that the union jack would not be in the national flag.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pickersgill: Well, I do not think that any person who wanted to accept those words in the sense in which they were written would have had any doubt whatever about them.

Mr. Monteith: Then why didn't he spell it out?

Mr. Pickersgill: The hon. member for Perth (Mr. Monteith) asked the question from his seat: Why did the right hon. gentleman not spell it out? He did spell it out. Why does not the right hon. gentleman opposite spell out the flag that his party stands for? I will tell you why, Mr. Speaker: It is because they do not stand for one at all.

Mr. Monteith: Our flag is the people's choice.

Mr. Speaker: Is the house ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the minister to clear up one point. Is he aware that I have in my hand a document published by the national Liberal federation, 251 Cooper street, Ottawa—at least, it says that on it—which was issued in 1963—

[Mr. Churchill.]

An hon. Member: Let us have all of it.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Someone is yapping in the background, something which has happened many times, and saying this is only part of it. I think this is all of it.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I would be very glad to—

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Would the minister contain himself for a moment. I also have here a document, issued I believe only in the Atlantic provinces, again published by the national Liberal federation, and I have found that nowhere does it say anything about a new flag. Is he also aware that the Liberal candidate in my area in the last election never at any time mentioned a flag on the radio, or on television or otherwise? Would the minister please clarify those points?

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to answer that. I do not see why the Liberal candidate should have mentioned the flag, any more than I should have mentioned the Canada pension plan, which I never did once, in my constituency during the last election. As for putting the business about the flag in the leaflet especially for the Atlantic provinces, the flag is a national matter, not something specifically for the Atlantic provinces, so there is no reason at all why it should have appeared in the leaflet.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, I am the last one who would enter this debate with any idea of prolonging it unnecessarily, as all hon. members know. I have a suggestion which I am going to make to the house which might be an acceptable compromise to resolve this rather acrimonious debate which has now gone on for the best part of three weeks. I should like to say that this is the first time that I have participated in the debate on the flag.

Before making the suggestion which I propose to make for the consideration of the house I think that some of the accusations and statements made by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) who has just resumed his seat should not be allowed to pass unchallenged. He has, for instance, stated that many members have spoken in breach of the rules of this house by reading from letters received from their constituents, from newspaper reports and the like. Yet the minister himself has just finished reading from a Liberal document supplied to him by one of

his backbenchers. I believe the rules stipulate that it is proper for a member to quote from newspaper reports and letters and the like if he wishes to adopt the opinions expressed therein as his own. I do not think it is an abuse of the rules of the house to proceed on this basis. He has accused the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) of being drunk with power, of preventing the people of Canada from having a flag if they wanted one. Therein lies the importance of that statement—that little word "if". All the leader of this party in opposition has been requesting is co-operation in putting that very question to the people of Canada. If the people of Canada want a new flag there is only one way to find that out, and that is by holding a national plebiscite to ascertain their views.

Mr. Speaker, he has said that members of this party wish to cover their nakedness, if I paraphrase him correctly, with the cast-off garments of the Liberal party. I for one, sir, would rather freeze to death than clothe myself with the spurious, political approach that they are taking in respect of the question of a national flag for Canada.

He has said that the leader of the official opposition dominates this party, and he accuses us of being bewitched. I say, sir, even if that accusation were true—and I deny it—it is a far better thing to have a leader who is leading his party members than a prime minister who is obviously enslaving his backbenchers, making them kowtow to his own personal choice and silencing them in this debate. This must be true, otherwise we would have heard a good deal more from them.

Sir, he also said in a very sanctimonious and righteous fashion that he would not wish to reflect on the motives of members of this house. He appealed to hon. members to keep any reference to the motives of members out of the debate. How can we do this in the face of the evidence?

I am going to say a word or two about whether or not the Prime Minister, prior to the election of 1962-63, and during the campaign, had anything to say of a definitive nature to the Canadian people in respect of a distinctively designed Canadian national flag. I say he did not, I have press reports and copies of interviews which, if true, certainly bear out that statement.

Mr. Speaker, before I leave the subject in respect of the sanctimonious appeal of the Minister of Transport, I should like to ask him, when he appeals to members of this house to refrain from interjecting aspersions related to the motives of hon. members, to reflect upon the words that have been used by his own leader, the Prime Minister, when he was speechmaking about the activities and motives of the then prime minister, now the leader of the official opposition.

On September 18, 1962, the present Prime Minister, in a speech to the Toronto and district Liberal members of parliament, at the Royal York hotel, in reference to the prime minister of that day had these words to utter in respect of motives. In respect of Mr. Diefenbaker he used the phrase "incredible effrontery". He used the phrase "gross and unpardonable deceit". He also said: ".... still kept up the deceit—", referring to the then minister of agriculture, Hon. Alvin Hamilton. He also used this phrase in reference to Mr. Diefenbaker, then the prime minister:

> The prime minister after the election was over did not try any longer to conceal the facts.

I intend to put a few facts on the record, which I say the Prime Minister and his colleagues now in the cabinet obviously concealed from the Canadian people when those gentlemen were tramping across this country making speeches in respect of the flag. One of these phrases has already been referred to by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken).

The hon. minister also said while referring to motivations:

> Was there ever a greater deceit perpetrated on an electorate?

He also used the expression "farcical explanation", and "contempt of parliament". He also said:

> The man who cannot make a speech without boasting how he has restored the rights of parliament.

That reference was to the prime minister of that day, made by the leader of the opposition, now the Prime Minister of this country; yet in the face of these facts the Minister of Transport now makes a sanctimonious and righteous appeal to hon. members to refrain from references to motives. I suggest the hon. gentleman should pause and reflect on those phrases used by his own leader before he makes such an appeal. I should like to remind the house that the Minister of Transport rose to interject by asking a question when the right hon. Leader of the Opposition was discussing what Sir Wilfrid Laurier said about obstructionism in past years. In reading over the debates of the past week I have noticed the use of the word "filibuster" by the Prime Minister, and on many occasions by hon. members opposite and to my left, who have also shouted "ques-

tion" and "filibuster" across the floor. Mr. Speaker, I should like again to put something on record which was said by the Minister of Transport in respect of freedom of speech and the right of discussion of all members of the house. He referred to all questions, and I assume not the least of which is before us.

On November 29, 1963, the Minister of Transport said:

> So far as I am concerned no one in the government has made any such allegation.

He was referring to obstruction. He then said:

> Certainly I have not, and I want to make that very clear. I have not made any such allegation at any time about the opposition. I think there has been a reasonable measure of co-operation—

Sir, I suggest there still can be co-operation if those members will back down from the stiffnecked opposition that they have adopted, and perhaps consider a suggestion which I will make this evening.

Mr. Speaker, in the short time available to me before six o'clock I should like to refer to what the minister said in respect of obstruction in the debate on redistribution. As recorded in *Hansard* at page 5268, the Minister of Transport said:

> Perhaps the hon. gentleman will remember—and here perhaps I am breaking the rules myself by referring to the debate on redistribution the other day—that I am one of those who think there ought to be debate in parliament, and I do not regard debate as obstruction. I have not said and I have not thought that, taken by and large in this session of parliament, particularly since we met in September, there has been anything I would be inclined to describe as obstruction.

Mr. Speaker, obviously in view of the applause given by the backbenchers on that side of the house to the remarks of the Minister of Transport, he has some following when he says that a minority has a right to express its views. I have gained the impression from his remarks that he feels the discussion should be limited to the main motion. He knows very well why that could not be allowed to take place. I know he does not exercise this kind of control over the backbenchers, to prevent their doing what obviously could be done. He knows that once the subamendment and the amendment are out of the way any one of the members opposite or on my left could move the previous question and have the whole matter removed from free discussion and free debate. That is why we are discussing the subamendment now, and that is why we on this side of the house have the vehicle of free expression of opinion in respect of any matter as important as a national flag for Canada.

Mr. Speaker, may I call it six o'clock?

At six o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, before six o'clock I was putting the remarks of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) in their proper perspective and also drawing the attention of members of the house to his remarks concerning what he called the domination of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) over his party. I had also referred, I believe, to the servility and slavishness of the backbench members of his own party none of whom except two, as far as I am aware, have risen to speak in this debate. They cry about being a minority government. Every time something arises where they feel the weight of the opposition and the justice of the criticism coming from the opposition side they start crying that they are in a minority position. It seems to me it ill behooves the Minister of Transport to speak of domination of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) over the members of the opposition having regard to the control—

Mr. Moreau: Would the hon. member permit a question? I understood him to say that only two members of this party had spoken in the debate thus far. I would ask him if he has read the press report in the Edmonton *Journal* in which the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) is quoted as saying that there is no filibuster in parliament and that out of four members who have spoken so far 19 have been Conservatives and 18 have been Liberals. That was as of August 17.

Mr. Nielsen: He was referring to the first six days of the debate. I do not think the hon. gentleman would like a serious comment on that statement. That all happened in the first six days of debate. Let the hon. member get up now and tell us what his views on the flag are. Let him and all his colleagues on the back benches on that side get up and speak about the views of their constituents on the flag instead of crying about their minority position, relying on the control that the government exercises over the Social Credit party in the house, and leading a good many members to view with some suspicion the very uneasy position that exists

between the member for Winnipeg North and the government. Every time the government wants a change in the rules or a compromise suggested, where does it come from? Does it come from the government? Does it come from a cabinet minister?

Mr. Knowles: The hon. member had the wrong constituency and the wrong idea.

Mr. Nielsen: I always have the right constituency, I might inform the hon. member, because he has come to be known as the constitutional conscience of the house. Why is not some of this leadership—

Mr. Barnett: The hon. member referred to the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow), who sits back here.

Mr. Nielsen: I meant Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is always on cloud nine as far as the conscience of the house is concerned, so he will forgive me if I was a little confused.

Mr. Webb: He is working to become permanent Speaker. That is his objective.

Mr. Nielsen: Rather than all this crying about a minority position I think we should have some leadership displayed by cabinet ministers on the other side. The Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) is in Charlottetown today and is reported in both the Ottawa *Citizen* and the Ottawa *Journal* in this way:

Prime Minister Pearson today called on Canadians for "political realism, a passion for justice and a gift for compromise".

Where are all these things? Are they being displayed by the Prime Minister with regard to the issue before us? Where are the suggestions for compromise?

Mr. Orlikow: What is yours?

Mr. Nielsen: I have one.

Mr. Orlikow: It will be the first one we have heard from your party.

Mr. Nielsen: That is not true either, because suggestions have been made by the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt), the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Hamilton) and by the Leader of the Opposition just this afternoon.

Mr. Webb: He just got back. He does not know.

Mr. Nielsen: It seems to me that all these suggestions are just being sloughed aside. The government, typical of Grits, feel that because they are the majority their views and only their views should be accepted. This is traditional with them. They have never been any different. They think that because they as the government say something is so, it should be believed it is so. Nobody else is entitled to have an opinion. They believe that because we dare oppose anything, whether it be the flag or any other measure before the house, it is obstruction, and the propaganda conspiracy they have with the press of the country is giving the Canadian people a slanted view of the true facts as they exist. Simply because opposition members have views to express on a matter as important as a national flag for Canada and simply because they do not coincide with their own views or rather with the views of one man, it becomes obstruction. It does not become opposition at all, simply because it does not coincide with their views.

I referred, as did the Minister of Transport, to the announcement of a design. The Minister of Transport tries to have us believe that the Prime Minister and the Liberal party as a whole during the election campaign made it quite clear to the Canadian people that there would be a three maple leaf design. That is not true.

Mr. Walker: It is true.

Mr. Nielsen: The government whip says it is right. It is not right. It is not true at all. Not once before the government took office did the Prime Minister or anyone else in the Liberal party say that when they were elected they would introduce in parliament a three maple leaf flag. I think this is important because what the Liberal party is trying to do now is to say there is no need for a plebiscite because this design was put before the Canadian people before they elected the Liberals, and therefore they say they have a mandate from the people to insist that it be adopted as the flag.

This simply is not true. It borders on fraud. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) has quoted from statements made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) on June 21 and 27, 1960. I have in my hand an excerpt from the Amherst *Daily News* of Amherst Nova Scotia, of December 29, 1961. It is headed: "Liberal Leader Pearson Expresses His Views on Distinctive flag". I think it is illuminating, to say the least. This excerpt begins:

Wide interest has been taken in the remarks of Hon. Lester B. Pearson concerning a distinctive Canadian flag. The Liberal leader's comments were made during a press conference November 9 held

in the Fort Cumberland hotel in answer to questions by John Andrews, a Halifax radio commentator.

In view of the letters and inquiries received a transcription of the interview has been prepared as follows:

Andrews: Mr. Pearson, how do you feel about a distinctive Canadian flag?

Pearson: I feel very friendly toward a distinctive Canadian flag. In fact, it's been on our program now for some years....a distinctive Canadian flag....

Andrews: What particular design do you have in mind?

Pearson: Well, I haven't any particular design in mind; but I certainly....you can't advocate a distinctive Canadian flag without being willing to take the responsibility for deciding in parliament what the design shall be.

Andrews: Would you have the union jack in it?

Pearson: I would have a distinctive flag which would not be mistaken for the flag of any other country....that's as far as I've got.

That is a fine, evasive answer by the Prime Minister. And the hon. gentleman would have us believe that the Prime Minister never left the impression that the union jack would be eliminated from any flag finally selected. It is not true. The interview goes on:

Andrews: Then you wouldn't have the union jack in it?

Pearson: Well, I just made that statement that it couldn't....I think the present red ensign can be mistaken for the flag of other countries. It's the British mercantile marine flag, almost; indeed, I noticed in the advertising the other day, it's very much like the Bermuda flag.

Andrews: You say the Liberals are working on a design. What...

Pearson: Oh, there are hundreds of designs. But it would be the responsibility of government to make up its mind which design it would submit to parliament.

Andrews: How would you poll the people on this?

Pearson: We would poll the people when we have a general election. And if they don't like the idea of a distinctive Canadian flag which can't be mistaken for that of any other country, they'll let us know in no uncertain terms.

Andrews: Which of the present flags would you retain? Anything at all from one of these?

Pearson: Oh....I'm not going to get into the question of flag design tonight.

This was in 1961, a year after the quotation put before the house by the Minister of Transport. The interview goes on:

Andrews: But you do think the country needs this symbol to hold us together?

Pearson: Yes. I think it would be a good idea to have a distinctive Canadian flag in the interest of national unity.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nielsen: Hon. members opposite applaud. But newspaper articles expressing Canadian opinion in all parts of this country, not only from coast to coast but from north to south, have said there is no greater factor contributing to disunity in this land than the design which the Prime Minister has selected and the manner in which he has placed it before us. The article continues:

Andrews: How about unrest in Quebec? Do you think it would help to quell that?

Now we come to the real reason for the Prime Minister's unseemly haste to ram this issue down the throats of the people of Canada.

Pearson: It's one of the things they talk most of in Quebec...the necessity of having the symbols of our nationality and unity in flags and national anthem, and that we should try to solve these problems in a manner which would create the minimum of division and the maximum of unity. That's a good way of putting it.

It is a pity he could not have thought of a better way of putting it before he placed this plumber's nightmare before parliament.

Andrews: Do you think Quebec would oppose anything else except a part of their fleur-de-lis in it? Must they have this part in it?

A very interesting answer was given to this question and I ask hon. members to ponder it.

Pearson: Well, we would have Quebec members in our cabinet decide what the design would be, and they would make their views very clear at that time, I'm sure.

That takes a bit of interpreting, it seems to me.

Andrews: What do you think they might say?

Pearson: Oh, I haven't picked the members for my cabinet yet from Quebec....

Andrews: Then you won't be having a parliamentary committee like your predecessor?

Pearson: I think we've had quite enough in the way of designs submitted over the last 25 years. I can't imagine any new kind of design. I've got about 50 in the last year submitted to me... some very startling ones, too.

Further on, it says:

Andrews: Well, as a Canadian, Mr. Pearson, what is your conception of a new Canadian flag?

Pearson: I'm not going to tell you what the design should be.

That is as far as he was prepared to take the Canadian people into his confidence in December, 1961.

How did the Prime Minister proceed when he finally got around to action? I have a lapel pin here which came into my possession. It is an exact replica of the Pearson design and it was in production at the time the Prime Minister made his speech to the Canadian Legion at Winnipeg. There is no manufacturer's name to be found on it, though manufacturers' names do appear on those lapel pins which can be bought in airport jewelry stands, newspaper stands, and so on, across the country, now. It makes one wonder who was so privileged as to have obtained prior

information which enabled him, obviously, to make several thousand dollars, because this is not a pin which has been cheaply manufactured; it is coloured in three colours and it is gold plated. Obviously a good deal of profit has been made by the manufacturer of this pin.

Mr. Moreau: Would the hon. member permit a question? Can he indicate the manufacturer of this pin and, if not, how can he say it was in production before the speech was made in Winnipeg?

Mr. Nielsen: No manufacturer would be foolish enough to put his name on a pin manufactured before the flag was introduced in parliament. In the second place, I know it was manufactured before the speech which was made to the Legion because it was in my possession before that speech was delivered and before the resolution was introduced in parliament. That is very simple. I wonder how many other people were able to make a profit from manufacturing flags, bumper stickers, and so on, before the information was given to parliament.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): It had to be popular to make it profitable.

Mr. Nielsen: The Toronto *Star* carried an article on May 20, 1964 in connection with a certain news conference. It was engineered, probably, by the Liberal organizer—at any rate the Prime Minister has given him credit for it. I think this article is extremely interesting, and it begins:

> At a few minutes before 6 p.m. last Thursday, eight men, all members of the parliamentary press gallery, left their desks in various parts of town and made their way to the Sussex drive home of Prime Minister Lester Pearson where they had been invited to discuss the issue of Canada's national flag.

This was on May 20, 1964. It goes on:

> The eight, all editors, reporters or magazine writers, were shown into the newly decorated, gray-green living room where the Prime Minister relaxed with a scotch and soda, waiting to try his hand at "kite-flying" or, as some who attended the session called it later, "news management." Kiting a news story is a long-established political technique. Certain newspapermen are fed information from what they believe is a responsible source, and are encouraged to write it without attribution.
>
> Government or party higher-ups then can judge public reaction and take this into account when they decide to go ahead or withdraw from the course they are considering.
>
> The eight who had been summoned—Walter Stewart of the Toronto *Star Weekly;* Tim Creery and John Walker of Southams; Bob McKeown of *Weekend;* Ron Collister of the *Telegram;* Stan Westall of the *Globe and Mail;* Geoffrey Scott of CHCH-TV: Hamilton, and Chris Young, editor of the Ottawa *Citizen*—expected a flag discussion. It is doubtful whether any of them anticipated the "hard" news they got—

The Minister of Transport would have us believe that it is not a personal choice of the Prime Minister.

> —that he had sent a telegram to the Queen informing her;

And we remember the questions asked of the Prime Minister as to whether or not the telegram had been sent, and the denials we received.

> —that the red ensign would not be on a new Canadian flag, and that he was going to lay the whole matter before the Royal Canadian Legion convention in Winnipeg the next Sunday.

This was all before parliament was told about it.

> As drinks were served and the newspapermen nibbled on sandwiches, Mr. Pearson brought out several flag designs on cardboard, selected one with a cluster of three maple leaves and two blue bands and placed it on the mantelpiece as his choice.
>
> He said he was prepared to have the government stand or fall on the maple leaf flag.
>
> The Prime Minister was careful, however, to make clear that the flag on the mantel was his personal choice.
>
> Needless to say, with that kind of a kite in the air, the newspapermen lost no time, an hour and a half later, in rushing to their typewriters and giving the Prime Minister's views on the flag exactly as they heard them.
>
> Despite the fact that two of the biggest news media—the Canadian Press and the C.B.C.—were not invited to 24 Sussex drive, the Prime Minister presumably got exactly what he was after: widespread debate on a specific flag design, for which he could not be held responsible.

That is the type and level of responsibility we have come to expect from the Prime Minister and his colleagues in the cabinet.

> In the House of Commons next day, Prime Minister Pearson denied emphatically three times that any decision had been made by the government on the flag, and he was technically correct.
>
> Most political reporters considered it came dangerously close to trying to shape the news that appeared in the newspapers, although the conference included representatives of some which opposed him on this issue.
>
> But the Prime Minister certainly didn't distort his views, nor hold anything back to make the government look good. In fact, he said too much.
>
> But next time he wants a kite flown, he'll likely allow someone just a little lower down to hold the string.

I think he needs a little more string to hold this kite.

Before my time runs out I have this proposal to make, and it is based on what I read in the debates, but particularly on the contribution of the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Hamilton) made on August 20,

1964. In that speech he set out very capably and lucidly four principles for the guidance of members of the house and Canadians, as elements in selecting any flag design which is to be Canada's national flag. He suggested, as did others on this side of the house, the setting up of a committee.

We have heard members speak of the desirability of a recess so that they could go to their constituents and ascertain their views. I wonder if the government might consider proposing for agreement by all parties that such a committee be established, its terms of reference to be along the lines already suggested, that is to say, its decision or selection of a design should be a majority decision, and I have heard 80 per cent discussed as an acceptable indication that there is a majority opinion.

Let us assume that the committee was set up and the agreement was reached now. If all party leaders would say, "We will agree to set up this committee as soon as parliament returns from its recess," then a recess could occur if members wish, on the understanding and agreement that the committee would be set up immediately upon their return, let us say at the end of the month, and that it would immediately tackle the problem of selecting a design.

Some have suggested three months, others two, and other periods of time have been suggested during which the committee should be limited to its discussions. But rather than attempt a compromise as to a time limit within which this committee must reach a decision, how about the committee's terms of reference including an instruction to report back within 30 days as to whether or not its members feel they will be able to reach a decision on the design?

If the committee members after 30 days of deliberation find that they cannot, or feel that they cannot reach accord by an 80 per cent majority, let us say—

I hear a chuckle over there. That is as much as the hon. member is prepared to give this suggestion. It might even be a giggle. But if members of the committee report back, in that interim report to the house, that they do not feel the matter can be decided by a majority, then back comes the issue into the house immediately without any more delay. This suggestion is a compromise and it is a compromise which will work. It is a compromise that will not prejudice any members either on the government side or on the opposition side.

[Mr. Nielsen.]

However, if within that 30 days committee members find they are making progress and that there is every likelihood they will come to accord on a design, then the interim report will so disclose and they will be free then to return to their work and complete it, and make their final report to parliament, which would be subject only to limited debate, say, by the party leaders. In this way a great deal of time would be saved. It is possible that a design acceptable to all parties would be reached, a design which would reflect more accurately the feelings of all Canadians than this debate over one particular design. There would be more likelihood of coming up with a design acceptable to all parties, in a manner in which this should be done, in which views can be sought and the feelings of all ascertained.

This is the suggestion which should find at least sufficient merit in the minds of all members of the house to compel the party leaders to consider it.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): Would the hon. member permit me to ask a question.

Mr. Nielsen: Yes.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): Supposing a committee did come to an agreement on a certain design and it came back to the house, then after a limited discussion would the hon. member then say that we should go for a plebiscite, or that it would be accepted as a flag right after that?

Mr. Nielsen: Assuming that the terms of reference instruct the committee to select one design, it seems to me—and again I express a personal opinion—the terms of reference in themselves would exclude the plebiscite idea. But I express this as a personal idea and a personal view, and I want to make that clear. It is a possibility however that if the party leaders were to agree that there would be a definite understanding that the committee would be set up, and would be set to work immediately after the recess, which would commence in a day or two, and if it was understood that it would immediately start work, let us say by October 1 or 2, or whenever it might be, and that within 30 days it would report back to the house as to progress made, and if such report indicates that there is definite progress being made, then let them be sent back to complete the job.

If the report indicates there is no possibility of unanimity or majority acceptance, like the last committee had to the extent

of 23 to 1, and if the committee reports there is no possibility of coming to agreement, then the terms of reference in setting up the committee would bring the matter back into the house without any further delay. I submit to members of the house that it is a suggestion which might meet with favour by the party leaders and they might compromise to that extent. Nobody is prejudiced if the idea does not work out, and there is everything to gain if it does.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Nicholas Mandziuk (Marquette): Mr. Speaker, we have had some very interesting speeches this afternoon and this evening. It was gratifying and interesting to see the Acting Prime Minister (Mr. Pickersgill) express some views and make some revelations, because we have had very little contribution from the government side during the last 10 or 12 days of debate. He justifies the introduction of the flag resolution by the fact that this was in the Liberal platform. I have tried to check with hon. members from various parts of Canada and have found that when it suited the convenience of the Liberal party, it was in the platform; but when it did not specify, when it did not spell out that any flag that would be introduced was going to do away with the union jack, it was not said that the flag would not have the union jack on it.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberal members and the government should have been frank with the people of Canada. They were not. They have no mandate to introduce a flag and to try to ram it down the throat of this parliament. We have no reason to accept it, because we have no mandate from the people of Canada to accept or reject that flag. The Acting Prime Minister (Mr. Pickersgill), if I understood him correctly—although he was quite excited and tried to say a great deal in the short time at his disposal, and I think tried to answer the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) in as few words as possible—said that the amendment is not so important, but that the resolution is very important. However, Mr. Speaker, if the resolution is very important, what justification has the hon. gentleman for saying that we are wasting the time of this parliament and the time of the country? If it is important, it should receive every consideration and this question should be referred to the people. In this regard the official opposition has been consistent. This party has said that the question should be referred to the people of Canada, and the subamendment has set out certain questions which the people of Canada should answer before they decide on the particular design of their choice. I realize that there are people in Canada who are in favour of the flag proposed by the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson). We know very well that there are thousands of people and many organizations who have appealed to us by way of petitions, telegrams and letters which indicate that they are behind the red ensign. So, Mr. Speaker, it is not becoming for the Acting Prime Minister to throw out this charge, that we are the only ones who are obstructing the passage of this resolution. The Acting Prime Minister says we are withholding approval of the maple leaf flag from the people of Canada. But I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Canada are just crying and dying to have a choice in this regard, although the government says they want the flag proposed by them.

We have to admit that there are people who wish neither, if we can judge by the letters and other communications we have received. I have received such letters, and all hon. members on the government side of the house have received this type of letter. We have received requests for three leaves, four leaves, five leaves or more; rectangles, diagonals, and all sorts of designs. Everyone has a different design and interpretation of the flag we should have. But the people of Canada, together with us on this side of the house and those on the government side, have one thing in common, and that is that we want a flag that would have a legal status in this country.

We have such a flag, Mr. Speaker. I maintain that it has a quasi-legal status, because it was established by order in council. I believe the people of Canada want a flag which is established by legislative enactment, by a bill of parliament. Some countries have no legal enactment which legislates that such and such a flag is the flag of their country. But the union jack of the British Isles has come into being and has been accepted as the flag of that country by usage, although our neighbours to the south, who pride themselves on the stars and stripes, did pass an act of congress declaring this to be the design of their flag.

We are in agreement that we would like to legalize a flag for this country. Let us be reasonable in this matter, Mr. Speaker. We are not saying that there are not people who are in favour of the three maple leaf design. I am among the first in this house who would not want to smear the maple

leaf design; I have a great deal of respect for it. However, something has happened in this house. I admire the courage of the hon gentleman who sits behind me, the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen), who charged that nobody on the Liberal side of the house has spoken on this matter with any authority. I remember that in the first six days of this debate there was speaker for speaker put up from the Liberal benches. There were even a few speakers from the splinter groups, who have since become the silent allies of the government. But since then, what have we had? There have been one or two gentlemen who have agreed with the Prime Minister, and one or two who have had the courage of their convictions to rise and express contrary views. What have we had from the rest? We have had groans of agony; we have had jeers; we have had childish grins on some of their faces; we have had questions of privilege raised and questions asked—and nothing more. There has been general silence from the other side of the chamber. In spite of this, Mr. Speaker, the Acting Prime Minister has the gall to say that this party is dominated by the right hon. Leader of the Opposition. Who dominates the members of the government? Who has clamped their mouths shut? Who is behind the Berlin wall in this regard?

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Mandziuk: Who is responsible for this Mr. Speaker? Is it fear of their leader, or is it because they have nothing to say and have no principles of their own? In the first six days of the debate we learned that they have wonderful talkers in that party; men pleasant to listen to. We know they have talked to the press and have talked in the country. They have written letters of apology to their constituents and have tried to impress upon them their support for this flag. But, Mr. Speaker, it would be nice to hear from them in some way other than by interjection from a seated position. We would like these gentlemen to speak up; to have some courage and stand up on their feet and speak of the petitions, and so on, that they have received. Then their constituents would know what attitude they are taking and would realize these members are not afraid to speak up.

The Acting Prime Minister has said that the right hon. Leader of the Opposition dominates this party. In this connection the Acting Prime Minister was vehement and roared away. He said that the Leader of the Opposition was obsessed with power and dominates this party. I ask, Mr. Speaker, has he dominated thousands of legionnaires of the Royal Canadian Legion? Does he dominate the Legion branches in my constituency, to which I shall make reference? Does he dominate the I.O.D.E.? Does he dominate the Orangemen? Does he dominate the Protestant league? If he does, he must indeed be a great man, and I would love to have that power. This is a ridiculous silly statement for the Acting Prime Minister of today to make. We hear from time to time that they shall indicate their wish by a vote. We have requested that a plebiscite—

An hon. Member: You are afraid of a vote, are you?

Mr. Mandziuk: I shall come to that, Mr. Speaker. I hardly dare take a moment off to partake of a sip of water, because I hear "Question, question, question" or, "Carried, carried, carried". That is the sort of chorus any parrot could learn, especially the parrots we have on the other side. If it were not a musical falsetto we might even enjoy it. But that is all we hear: They are going to give their decision when they vote. I would assure them that those who voted them in are liable to give their decision as well. We do not mind the silence on the other side and we rather enjoy these interjections. But I would like to see one hon. member opposite recognized and stand up on his feet. If he asks me a question, fine; I will try and answer it and if I cannot I will say so. If he wants to speak afterwards, then he can do so. But we enjoy their silence and I think the country does also. Their constituents must enjoy their silence and wonder where they stand. One can draw his own conclusions from their silence. Is it not an admission that they have nothing to say? Is it an admission that if they have anything to say they are afraid to say it. Of whom are they afraid, Mr. Speaker? I will tell you: They are afraid of their leader, the Prime Minister. If they are not afraid of their leader they are afraid to tell their constituents where they stand. I know every hon. member on the opposition side of the house who has taken part in this debate, and I know that I will stake my political future on what I say. I have to live with myself. I have to live with my principles and I have to live with my conscience; I cannot just sit on the fence. I should like to see some of the letters written by hon. members opposite to their constituents. They must be marked "Personal", "Confidential", and so on, but I expect we are going to come across a few. I

have heard rumours, but I do not want to base any argument on rumour.

Since the Acting Prime Minister (Mr. Pickersgill) has once and for all spiked the argument that we are wasting time on this very important issue, let me say it is important to us that it be discussed, and that is why we feel it should be handed over to the people. I think the Prime Minister too must consider it a very important issue because he has shelved everything else, all the important legislation and promises hon. members opposite had made to the electorate of Canada. All this has been put aside and is gathering dust or has been put into cold storage because this present issue is an important matter. I realize that it is important and I have already told the house that I think it is important. The Acting Prime Minister said that the resolution is very important. While it contained the two flags it was most important; but fortunately the resolution was split in two, providing for one flag for our association with the British commonwealth of nations and the other for association—with what? With the ambitions of the Prime Minister.

I ask the government, or those who support this flag, to consider the question why they are afraid. Why do they not trust the Canadian people? Why do they not permit the Canadian people to have a voice in deciding the flag they want? We have quoted witness after witness from various organizations who have gone on record as saying they want a plebiscite. Why is the government afraid to submit this matter to a plebiscite? Why are they afraid to go to the people at the time of the next general election on this issue? Are they afraid of their decision? How can they be when I have heard some hon. members on the other side of the house give statistics to show that the three leaf flag carries a majority of support in Canada? In this case we who support the red ensign are in a minority. But, Mr. Speaker, even if the supporters of this new flag are in a majority, and even if they, the government, are in a majority in this house, thanks to that unholy alliance with certain splinter groups, has a majority the right to trample on the feelings or principles of a minority? If they have, then tell our French Canadian boys in Quebec—

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): We are defending the rights of minorities.

Mr. Mandziuk: I am talking about holding a plebiscite.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): You are talking of the red ensign.

Mr. Mandziuk: I am saying that the plebiscite should decide; and if the hon. member wants to make a speech after I am finished then it is his privilege to get to his feet.

For the first three months, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister staked the life of his government on the decision on the flag he proposed. This hung like the sword of Damocles. A lot of those who were not supporters of the three leaf flag, being afraid of an election, got on the bandwagon and decided to support it.

Mr. Orlikow: Is that why some of your members are going to vote that way?

Mr. Mandziuk: Mr. Speaker, I really think that if a member wants to ask a question he should receive your recognition by asking for it.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): He does not answer.

Mr. Mandziuk: The question was not properly asked.

Mr. Peters: He does not know the answer.

Mr. Mandziuk: For three whole months the sword of Damocles hung over us. I feel that the reason for this was that the Prime Minister was sure that if he did call an election he would win it. However, like the good politician he is he reads the press, not only those papers that flatter him but the others as well, and he must have read the article by Patrick Nicholson, a respected pressman, who wrote an article which appeared in the Quebec *Chronicle* of August 12. It was headlined "Election of flag could kill Liberals". The Prime Minister, having seen that, then withdrew his threat and said: "Boys, you can have a free vote as long as you leave me alone".

What Patrick Nicholson says, Mr. Speaker, is so interesting that I think it is worth while putting some of it on record. I have a lot of respect for the opinions of this man. He says:

> The campaign strategists have been halted in their tracks—stunned.

I include in those campaign strategists, of course, the Prime Minister, as the chief strategist.

> As most, but not all, Canadians know very well, parliament has long been stalled in its work largely because of "the flag issue". As the majority but by no means all, of Canadians are uneasily conscious, this is dividing the country—

This news must have disturbed the Prime Minister. The article then continues:

—this is dividing the country even more disastrously than the stormiest issue recorded in our history books—the execution of the leader of the Metis revolt, Louis Riel, in 1885.

That is what Patrick Nicholson had to say. He then went on to state:

There is a parallel between Riel and the flag. The public uproar about the punishment of the chiefain of the French half breeds gravely divided Canada's two main ethnic groups, and changed the balance of federal politics for three quarters of a century.

The Prime Minister must have realized the situation and, as this article states—

—stepped in where Diefenbaker failed to tread.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest he did so because he could not foresee what this situation would do to this nation.

The article then refers to the French language newspaper, *Le Droit*, in which much has been said about this poll that was carried out. The article which I have been quoting continues as follows:

This poll discovered that a majority of Canadians, in every province except Quebec, prefer the Canadian ensign—

This is a long article and I do not intend to take up the time of the house to read it all, but Mr. Nicholson ends up by stating:

The significance of these figures, in the eyes of all Liberal strategists thinking in terms of an election—

Yes, an election is important.

—is that they clearly show that the flag issue would bring disastrous Liberal losses in nine provinces, and leave that party largely as the political arm of French Canada.

I suggest it was because the Prime Minister realized the situation as outlined by this article, rather than out of the goodness of his heart, that he freed his members taking the bit out of their mouths, allowing them a free vote. The Prime Minister became aware of these statements, which appeared in a great many more than one newspaper. I am sure that hon. gentleman is a politician to the extent he can appreciate the meaning of such statements.

Mr. Speaker, since I spoke last on June 30, at the time the sword of Damocles hung over our heads when, if we had voted against the resolution, we would be forced out on the hustings, I have received a great number of letters and petitions. I do not intend to read the personal letters I have received, because of an impression I have that the Acting Prime Minister objects. I do however intend to read some representations made by organizations.

I received a petition from one Royal Canadian Legion branch in Elphinstone, Manitoba, which was signed by 50 members. This is not a large Legion branch, but I am sure if you check the names on this petition you will find that these members represent a great number of racial origins. We even have a few Indian veterans who are members of this Legion branch.

I intended to be generous to the Prime Minister in sending him a photostat copy of this petition, and like a gentleman he acknowledged receipt. Since his acknowledgement is not personal or confidential I hope hon. members will permit me to put it on record. The Prime Minister's letter is dated August 13, 1964, and is on the stationery of the office of the Prime Minister. The letter states:

The Prime Minister has asked me to acknowledge receipt of your letter of August 12 enclosing a copy of a petition that you received from the Royal Canadian Legion branch at Elphinstone, Manitoba, and to advise that he has noted it.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,—

I treasure the signature, Mr. Speaker. It is that of Jules Pelletier, secretary to the Prime Minister.

I received another letter from the Prime Minister's office, actually signed by his own hand. I received a telegram from the strongest Legion branch in my constituency, the branch in Minnedosa. I usually call this the capital of my riding. I received the telegram dated August 18 and, to be fair to the Prime Minister, thinking he would be interested to know that we were not just talking through our hats, as some hon. gentlemen opposite have suggested, I passed it on to him. He sent me this reply dated August 19, 1964:

Thank you for your letter of August 14 enclosing the telegram that you received from the Minnedosa branch of the Royal Canadian Legion, advising that the branch membership supports the red ensign as Canada's official flag, and which I have noted.

Apparently the Prime Minister decided that valour was the better part of policy and retreated, deciding to give a free vote. The vote has always been free as far as we are concerned, in spite of what the Acting Prime Minister has suggested.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that any party that does not listen to the opinion of the grassroots cannot know what is taking place and will lose out in the end. I have attempted to keep in touch with the grassroots in my constituency to find out how these people feel about putting this issue to a plebiscite or referendum. I have written many letters to my constituents, although without the same

influence as bumper stickers have, financed by the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Dupuis), or those large buttons, of which I have seen little in the past months.

A small weekly newspaper in my constituency, the *Gazette Reporter* of Rivers, Manitoba, published an article under the heading "Flag Fight". Rivers, Manitoba, is in an area very close to C.G.A.T.C., which is the largest air training centre in western Canada. This newspaper is read by a great number of people in this area who cannot express themselves because they belong to Her Majesty's armed forces. This newspaper is published by Mr. Larry Bell. During the past four elections I have attempted to find out which political party he supports, but to no avail. He always greets me pleasantly but refuses to disclose his affiliation. He stated this in his editorial dated July 16, 1964:

> A writer in the Toronto *Star* waxes exuberant in describing Prime Minister Pearson's handling of the "flag issue."

As that T.V. star, Hazel, would say when something of excitement takes place: "This is a doozie". The article continues:

> Recalling how the great Mongol conqueror, Genghis Khan, stormed out of the east in 1215 waving a banner of nine yak tails, he pictures Pearson similarly storming out of Ottawa in 1964 holding aloft his gonfalon of conjoined maple leaves.
>
> The most remarkable thing about the Big Flag Fight (says the writer) has been the transformation of Mr. Pearson from a mild, diplomatic, even hesitant leader to a purposeful commander, storming the bastions of public opinion with a new battle banner and a strident cry of "Excelsior!"
>
> Somehow, other news media reports and comment just don't back up the picture. Pussy-footing, cat-and-mouse tactics, backing and sidling—all duly headlined in the public prints—have overtook the original "Excelsior", marred its brightness. In any event, it is to be hoped "Mike" doesn't meet the same fate as that cryer and his banner with the strange device.

I think that is a masterful editorial which reflects accurately the thought of the people in respect of the tactics used by the Prime Minister and those who support him in trying to hoist this flag on the Canadian people. In a close circle of friends let us do it with as little debate as possible—that is what the Prime Minister hoped. The less the people know about it the better it is for us, because they only campaigned on the flag issue when it pleased their fancy, where they figured they were on safe ground. They did not dare to mention the flag in my constituency, I assure you. I never heard it mentioned during the last two election campaigns or before that.

Here is an anonymous poem which appeared in the Hamiota *Echo* which is published by one, Fred Venables. I must admit he is a supporter of mine but I do not think that was the reason for publishing the poem. He is not a poet so it must have been written by someone else. It is a real masterpiece. It is titled "Freedom of Choice" and reads as follows:

> Little boy blue come blow your horn,
> Your flag's in the making, an era is born.
> What matters the people you swore you would serve.
> Just show them you still have an unholy nerve.
> You know that the ensign is loved by us all,
> Especially those who answered the call.
> We fought and we died for the old union jack,
> And wherever it took us we never looked back.
> Those flags bravely flutter all over our land,
> From ocean to ocean, and many a strand.
> From Arctic's cold shore to the southernmost seas,
> They proudly unfold themselves in the breeze...
> But you L. B. P. think you know what is best.
> You've made up your mind so to heck with the rest.
> But let us remind you just what is at stake.
> We don't give up easy for something we hate.
> You look to the people to keep you in power,
> But your own lack of judgment turns everything sour.
> You dream of your three maple leaves on a stick.
> No wonder you've edged it with blue, good and thick.

It is a rather long poem and I know some people do not appreciate good poetry. I say that because I see they are talking among themselves, but I will give copies to those who really want to read the whole poem.

Mr. Knowles: Is that part of the poem?

Mr. Mandziuk: It does not rhyme. I can say that much to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). The poem ends this way:

> We know you are badgered but never say die.
> There are things in the offing that will make it quite clear,
> You can't fool with people nor what they hold dear.
> And if you are wise you will draw in your horns,
> And go to the people as you should have done.
> Our freedom of choice that we fought to retain,
> We have it before, we can do it again.

You know now what the threat consists of, Mr. Speaker. I think this poem written in August gives a clear indication that the propaganda of stamps, bumper stickers and press releases which wasted the time of the house has not caught fire in any part of Canada to any extent. If it were not for the remarks of the Acting Prime Minister I might read two short letters, but perhaps I will anyway. They are very short. One reads:

I hope you will do all you can to save the red ensign.

The letter is signed and if you want the name I will give it. It is a beautiful girl.

An hon. Member: Give it.

Mr. Mandziuk: You are married. I do not think I should. I have another one which reads:

I am in favour of keeping our Canadian red ensign flag.

I could bring dozens and dozens before the house. Today's Ottawa *Citizen* has a very interesting headline, "Pearson Can't Escape Flag". That is interesting. Here is what the article says in part:

—in a city which has decked itself in hundreds of red ensigns and union jacks—in about equal numbers—for the confederation centenary celebrations. Even the Maple Leaf bakery flies the red ensign here.

Mr. MacEwan: Where is that?

Mr. Mandziuk: Charlottetown. That is in today's Ottawa *Citizen,* and it is very interesting.

Mr. Peters: Order.

Mr. Mandziuk: Is somebody out of order?

An hon. Member: You are.

Mr. Mandziuk: We have heard nothing but "order, order, order", "question, question, question", "carried, carried, carried". We have heard nothing else during the last 12 days of debate. I have told you the reason why and you can guess the rest. I want to refer the house to an editorial in the *Telegram,* a Toronto paper—good old Toronto. It appeared in the issue of August 22 last. Apparently the *Telegram* is not sick and tired of our obstruction.

Mr. Drouin: We are.

Mr. Mandziuk: You see, there is another member who is glued to his seat. I sympathize with him. I know that the tongues of many on that side are aching because they want to get up and say something, but an order is an order and the discipline of an army must be obeyed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the hon. member rising on a question of privilege?

Mr. Drouin: If the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Mandziuk) had attended more regularly the house sittings he would know that I have delivered a speech on the amendment and the subamendment now under consideration.

[*Text*]

Mr. Mandziuk: It must have been all right, Mr. Speaker, because some members applauded but this device does not work and I did not catch a word. If the hon. member would care to repeat it after I am finished I would appreciate it. All I can do is blame the government.

An hon. Member: It has not worked for six months.

Mr. Mandziuk: I was about to refer to an editorial in the *Telegram* headed "Ask the People". I am only going to quote a few sentences. It starts by saying:

The Canadian ensign must not be lowered without the consent of the people.

That is what we have been trying to tell the house for the last 17 or 18 days that we have been debating this matter. It must not be done without the consent of the people. If a majority of the people prefer to have the three leaves I will be the first one to salute the new flag, because a law is a law. We are a civilized nation. I quote further:

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.

Those who are pushing the new flag, Mr. Speaker, did not even receive a majority of the votes in the last election. They do not have a mandate any more than we have. The editorial goes on to say that certain legislative programs are introduced by the government and the government takes its responsibility for its plans and policies. Then the editorial continues:

But the flag issue is different. Here is a matter that touches the hearts, the emotions, the loyalties of virtually all Canadians. A parliamentary vote that would destroy the country's flag would leave deep and festering scars for years to come. It is far too important to be settled by parliamentary compromise.

Even if a compromise were arrived at by members of parliament I feel that it should be put to the people in a plebiscite or some other way to find out whether they accept that compromise. I read further:

There was no suggestion that parliament would be presented with a single, peculiar pennant design and be told that this must be our flag. If there had been such a proposition, it is quite possible that Mr. Pearson's minority representation in the House of Commons would have been considerably smaller.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I regret having to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. P. V. Noble (Grey North): At the outset of my remarks I should like to draw to the attention of this house a gross exaggeration which appeared in the Toronto daily *Star* last Friday to the effect that this debate had cost the Dominion of Canada half a billion dollars up to that date. I hope the *Star* corrects this mistake. Even if one accepts its own figure of $33,000 a day as the cost of running the House of Commons and multiplies it by the number of days we have been sitting on this issue, it becomes apparent how far from accuracy this figure really is.

My first observations will be on the subject of the government's proposed flag. The weak position of the proposed three maple leaf flag has been revealed by the lack of support from the government benches. If government members were enthusiastic about it and were sure of their constituents' backing I would think they would be on their feet speaking of its merits and advantages. They have passed up many opportunities to tell this house and the country why they prefer the three maple leaf flag and why they think the Canadian red ensign should be pulled down and discarded. Some of them have expressed their opinions fluently and I will make reference to these deliberations later.

I would like to dwell for a few minutes on incidents that indicate further the weak position of the three leaf flag. We are all aware of the many and varied schemes which were used to no avail to promote this flag. When it appears on cars it is now a sad spectacle—it has become a tattle-tale gray. Much of the promotion must surely have been embarrassing to the Prime Minister, especially when one of his ministers lowered this flag to the position of a bumper sticker. This three leaf flag has taken a terrific slide—from the top of a pole in front of the parliament buildings to a bumper sticker, which is just about as low as it can get. Indications coming in from across the country verify that its popularity and support have slipped about the same degree in the opinion of the vast majority of our people.

Surely by now, after this vain effort to break the will of the Canadian people, the Prime Minister will get his political ship back on course and go along with the wishes of the majority by allowing a plebiscite.

Some of his backbenchers have seen the handwriting on the wall and have so expressed themselves. On August 19 the hon. member for York East (Mr. Otto) said:

> We on this side have wondered how it is that so many people in Canada are staunchly entrenched behind the red ensign, a fact we did not expect; people who would otherwise have fondly and readily welcomed a new distinctive flag.

There are many reasons for this attitude and reasons why it is gaining strength with each passing day.

Many people across Canada did not take the Prime Minister seriously when he talked of adopting a distinctive flag for Canada. This is so, first, because many of the government promises still remain promises or died within the 60 days of decision. Second, others fully believed that the new flag would be a modification of the red ensign. Of course, when the three leaf flag design was given its back door introduction the props were knocked from under this line of thought. It was then and there that the backers of the Canadian red ensign took their stand. Their ranks were substantially increased when the Prime Minister announced the method by which he hoped to force his flag on this nation. More people took up the fight from resentment of the brainwashing methods by which he hoped to influence opinion in support of his three leaf flag.

Now, referring again to the observations of the hon. member from York East, I can assure him I am in full accord with the last statement of his speech when he said: "so that we may give the Canadian flag back to the people to whom it belongs". This is all we are asking. Give the people of Canada the flag of their choice. This problem can be settled just as easily as that, by way of a plebiscite.

There are many reasons why the three leaf design did not catch on as anticipated by the Prime Minister. One need only look at it to realize it lacked anything that would create enthusiasm. It is destitute of magnetism which would encourage the people to rally around and give support. It is too bad the Prime Minister had not taken heed of these words of Henry Ward Beecher:

> A thoughtful mind, when it sees a nation's flag, sees not the flag only, but the nation itself; and whatever may be its symbols, its insignia, he reads chiefly in the flag the government, the principles, the truths, the history which belongs to the nation that sets it forth.

The three leaf flag does not embody these things which are essential.

We need only read the speech of the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) when he spoke on August 24 as reported at page 7178 of *Hansard* to find more reasons for the failure to create any fervour for the three leaf flag. Some of the hon. member's statements have been refuted in the press by a letter signed by six of his colleagues, but to my knowledge only one of those six has spoken in this debate, and that member, when he made his speech just a little later the same day, did not contradict any of the statements made by the hon. member from York-Humber. So we must believe the statement made by the hon. member for York-Humber when he told us that the government caucus had no voice in the decision on the three leaf flag. There must have been very good reasons for keeping Liberal members excluded from information so vital to the government and to the country. This is the usual procedure for all conspiracy. Here was the beginning of the disunity which has now fanned out across this nation.

The introduction of the three leaf flag was no doubt as shocking to supporters of the government as it was to millions of Canadians, particularly to those Canadians living in constituencies where the flag was given the silent treatment during the election campaign and where they were told there were so many other goodies in store for them. After the silent treatment given government members prior to the introduction of his personal flag there must surely have been much quiet, as well as open, resentment when the three leaf flag appeared on the scene. Handcuffed as they were from the start, the government members on hearing the resolution read, at once realized they were still shackled because they could not speak out against the two top men of their party—the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau)—unless they had a lot of intestinal fortitude. The die was cast. They had no voice, so very few of them have spoken.

Now I ask this house, could anyone expect the Canadian people to accept this three leaf flag with open arms, conceived as it was in secrecy by a few individuals; introduced to the house like a cold clam with no history or tradition; and since that time promoted by ways and means that did nothing more than build up more resistance to its approval?

Furthermore, much information has been brought to the surface during this debate which has had a telling effect across the country. Many people are giving the matter a second look and have come to realize that a flag given approval at this time will be the flag as long as we stand as a nation. I would venture to say that if the Prime Minister had unfurled this three leaf flag during the election campaign he would have saved Canada this present embarrassment because he would not have had the opportunity to form a government.

My constituents are asking me, "If the government forces this flag on the country, who will fly it?" This is a good question and I would think the only place we could be sure of having it flown would be on federal property. Also, I find much opposition to the two flag idea. A flag we are not ashamed of in any company should be our flag, and that flag is the Canadian red ensign, which to this date has never failed to rally support in peace or war, and we will not fail it now. We want one country and one flag.

I will at this time quote from an editorial from the Owen Sound *Sun-Times* of May 25, 1964 headed, "Will Quebec fly New Flag?" It reads:

> Midst all the turmoil over the "new Canadian flag" there can be no more moot question (nor uncertain one) than whether a new standard for the nation will bring about greater or lesser unity. And of topmost importance in this regard must be the ultimate results on relations between French Canadian Quebec and the rest of Canada.
>
> Will, for instance, the people of Quebec accept Prime Minister Pearson's new flag as their national standard? Or will the Quebec flag, in several forms but always exclusively featuring the fleur-de-lis, continue to be flown throughout that province, along with the tricolour of France, but seldom, if ever, Canada's present colours?
>
> Unless Quebec accepts as its own any new flag Mr. Pearson may have parliament approve, then all the Prime Minister's efforts are in vain. He will have failed to promote that unity so vitally needed for the continued progress of this young nation. In fact, it may well be that disunity has been promoted. The hard core at least of the Canadian Legion is not likely to easily give up their support of the red ensign which has come to mean so much to them as they have served their nation. Nor, if the new flag is an unprofitable compromise to Canadians of French ancestry, will it be viewed kindly by other provinces which see themselves as distinctively important to Canada as a whole as in Quebec.

We have heard members opposite say we should forget our past and our history, which is embodied in the red ensign. They say that it is insignificant and would be better forgotten. Now, it is most difficult to accept this sort of thinking because, as individuals our own past can mean so much to us. When one applies for an important position, his past record is very thoroughly investigated, and

rightly so. It is usually, if I may use another example, the deciding factor when an investor is speculating on which company or corporation he will invest in. If he is a wise investor he examines closely the record of the president and the directors of the organization. He looks into the financial statement and all the past history of the said company before investing. The same principle applies to any nation. Many decisions made by its own people and other countries are based on that country's past performance or its history. We cannot ignore history or wash it out. Some may distort it, but we can never obliterate it.

Therefore, it is just nonsense to say that the history and tradition in which the Canadian red ensign is involved and so interwoven should be forgotten. If we are to believe this, the prospects for our future have reached an all-time low. It would be a sad day for this nation if we were to sit idly by and let this calamity overtake us. We cannot let our people down. We will continue to fight until a suitable solution is presented or until it is agreed to let the Canadian people decide.

I quote from this short editorial from the Sudbury *Star* because it is relevant:

> Quebec is only one province in the dominion of Canada. But it elects 75 members to the 265 member House of Commons. The Liberal government is a minority government. It has only 128 members in the Commons of which 46 come from Quebec. Without the support of that province the Liberals could not form a government—and this has been demonstrated time and time again in Canada's political history.
>
> The Liberals need Quebec and Quebec needs the Liberals. Politically, it is as simple as that. Behind all the high-sounding platitudes about "rights" and "unity" can be found hard-faced politics where power and the retention of power are the rewards.
>
> Canadians might ask themselves if there is any other country in the world where a minority group dictates to the majority to the same extent? Or where a government bends over backwards to please the minority and tries to convince the majority that they should agree to domination by the minority. That is what is happening in Canada today.

Mr. Speaker, the brunt of the attack in this flag debate has fallen on the shoulders of one man. That man is the Prime Minister of this country. Perhaps this is justified as he has made statements indicating his willingness to take the responsibility. We know he had the help of two or three people in selecting the three leaf design. We know he promoted it by way of a press release to a selected group of news reporters. We know he took it upon himself to make an appeal to the Canadian Legion rally in Winnipeg. In fact he has played the leading part in the act, but I am convinced that he has taken some direction from his braintrust on some of the methods used in trying to sell it to the Canadian people.

The Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Dupuis) made his contribution by way of bumper stickers. The Postmaster General (Mr. Nicholson) made sure of good coverage with the three leaf postage stamp. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) broke the sad story to the Queen. Other ministers no doubt took a hand in the regrettable incident which has upset Canadian people more than anything in our history, outside of war itself.

The Prime Minister has shown good judgment on many occasions in the past during his years as a diplomat. He has been honoured many times. He has commanded much respect on numerous occasions. If I may, I will cite a recent event, a report of which makes special reference to him. This is an excerpt taken from a report in the Ottawa *Journal* of July 16 on the commonwealth conference held recently in London:

> Pearson emerged—in the opinion of observers from Australia to Zanzibar—as one of the most effective participants in this conference. His experience in commonwealth and empire meetings goes back to the 1930's.
>
> His speech Monday was regarded as a turning point on the Rhodesian issue when—as representative of the senior white dominion—he put forward his declaration on racial equality and called for release of political prisoners in the African colony.

Right now a great opportunity is being presented to him, whereby he can render a great service to his country. He can play the leading role in a new act with every Canadian playing a part. He can settle this flag turmoil quietly and to the satisfaction of the majority by letting the Canadian people select their flag. It is the only way he can settle the issue and keep the high respect of his fellow Canadians. He must surely see the folly of following the course leading to disunity. We know, Mr. Speaker, he is exposed to great pressure from within his party by people who do not fully realize what the consequences will be if the three maple leaf flag is forced on this nation.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) must surely realize that he would not have the support of the communists and many known radicals on this issue if he were acting in the best interests of this nation. I implore him to free himself of these millstones which threaten to strangle him and, in the interests of unity, assume the role of a free thinking prime minister who will not be intimidated

or influenced by people who would rejoice at the breakup of this young nation.

My personal contacts with the Prime Minister have been pleasant and in the past he has given me the impression that he would listen to reason. Why he takes such an adamant stand on this issue, which means so much to so many Canadians, is hard to understand. If he would recognize the folly of his ways and would agree to a unifying compromise, the Canadian people would give him full credit and the respect due to him, and he would command full marks from this House of Commons. As I have said before, Mr. Speaker, the democratic way out would be by way of a choice by the Canadian people.

I do not think the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) impressed any one very much this afternoon. His remarks did nothing more than strengthen the barrier preventing any compromise. The attitude he took this afternoon is not shared by all government members. I know quite a number over there who would be willing to consider a compromise.

Miss LaMarsh: Who? Name them.

Mr. Noble: I could name them. As a matter of fact, last night as I walked from this building with a minister of the crown we chatted about problems under his jurisdiction. Finally I said, "This debate on the flag has turned out to be a tough nut to crack". He replied, "We must reach an agreement; we must compromise"; and, of course, I agree with him. I think this is the attitude of a good many members on the other side of the chamber, which they would express if they had the opportunity to do so.

It is not necessary, Mr. Speaker, that I speak at any length in defence of the Canadian red ensign. It is becoming more respected, more loved, and is flown by more Canadians right across this country, including those in the province of Quebec, with every passing day. On a recent visit to Montreal I saw more Canadian red ensigns flying than at any time over the years. Speaking of the French, Mr. Speaker, I noticed a newspaper write-up recently about a young Canadian by the name of Joseph Côté, who by his name, I assume is French. The report spoke of an extended hitch-hiking trip which this young university history student took through Europe, Africa and Asia lasting over 300 days. To make sure he would be properly appreciated and recognized, he wore the Canadian red ensign on the outside of his packsack.

An hon. Member: Was he from Quebec?

Mr. Noble: Well, the name would indicate that he was. I would also like to say that I stood in front of the United Nations building in New York with some American friends, and there in front of that impressive building flew the flags of all member nations. The Canadian red ensign stood out among those flags and I was proud to point to it and say, "There flies our Canadian flag". I have another quote here from our daily paper, Mr. Speaker. I understand that it claims to be independent, and I know this is the case because they have never given me any favours. This article says:

> We Favour the Red Ensign
>
> The *Sun-Times* makes a very honest, and we believe successful effort, to be independent in our political viewpoint. Helpful in this regard is the fact that staff members connected with opinion voiced are quite diversified in the political field, including those who honestly attempt to remain free of party bias of any kind because of the paper's policy of independence.
>
> We view the flag issue as most unfortunate at this time, as has been pointed out in these columns previously. Nor is it an issue that should bring on an election, if Mr. Pearson has such a thought, as has been suggested.
>
> The *Sun-Times* editorially favours the red ensign, a flag of which Canadians of all ancestral background can be proud in that it has been born out of the experience of a young, aggressive and farsighted nation.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that regardless of what happens as a result of this debate, I predict that the red ensign or a compromise of that flag will fly over Canada long after our time.

Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, it is with a great feeling of pride and a deep sense of responsibility that I rise to take part in this historic and important debate. In doing so I would like to take this opportunity of bringing to the attention of the house the views of constituents whom I am honoured to represent, as well as some views of my own. At the outset I should like to state that I am not only quite satisfied with the flag that is universally acknowledged and accepted as Canada's flag, the red ensign, but I am strongly in support of its retention.

Constituents of mine with whom I have discussed this matter, as well as the numerous ones who have taken time out to send me their views in letters, have with one exception indicated in no uncertain terms that they

also wish to see the retention of the Canadian red ensign. Knowing them as I do, however, and being aware of their keen interest in the all important matter of Canadian unity, I feel quite certain that they would be more than willing to accept some variation of the present flag if it were felt desirable by a majority of the people of Canada. But, Mr. Speaker, I am also quite certain that the great majority of them would insist that in any new flag which may be decided upon there should be some recognition of our two founding races.

After those brief observations I should like to deal with one particular aspect which has come to the forefront not only of this debate but during the past few years when certain people in many parts of Canada have talked over the possibility of a new flag. The point I should like to deal with at this time is the emphasis which has been placed by most speakers in this house on a distinctive Canadian flag. The speakers who have preceded me have dwelt upon this point. Some have referred to the definitions of the word "distinctive" which are found in various dictionaries. Therefore, like many other hon. members I have been quite interested to try to get to the bottom of this idea of a distinctive Canadian flag, and I have found from looking through various dictionaries that the definitions show little variation. In the latest dictionary I consulted I noticed that "distinctive" is defined as "marking or expressing distinction". When I looked up the meaning of "distinction" in the same dictionary I found three definitions were given. The first variation was "an act of distinguishing a difference or differences"; the second one was "a difference"; and the third "a distinguishing quality or mark".

After looking at the red ensign flying above the peace tower, atop public buildings across Canada and many private dwellings, I would defy anyone to convince me from the definitions in the dictionary of the two words "distinctive" and "distinction" that our present red ensign is not a distinctive flag. Be that as it may, I will return to the subject I mentioned a while ago and say that I am sure that the constituents in my area would be more than willing to compromise on some variation of our present flag in respect to the all important subject of the unity of our nation. Before going further let me say that, despite the speeches we have heard in this flag debate, and no matter how long it goes on, I hope all of us realize that the unity of our country is by far the most important fact.

Before giving the house any further views on the red ensign or the possibility of coming to some agreement on an acceptable alternate design, I should like to deal briefly with some of the points which have come out in the debate so far, as well as some of the charges which have been made in the articles which have appeared in various newspapers and in statements made on television. First of all, I should like to say a few words regarding the charge, which I say is unfounded and unjustified, that the official opposition is obstructing the business of this house. Many speakers have mentioned this and many of our newsmen have given their version as to what has been going on during these last two or three weeks. I have been very interested in one or two of these observations.

Another charge which has been made is that we are filibustering. In this respect I should like to mention the speech delivered in this house by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp). In his speech he roamed the field far and wide, and I noticed that on seven or eight occasions, while looking up to the ceiling and possibly bowing to any members of the fourth estate who might be within his vision, he mentioned the word "filibuster".

Mr. Orlikow: How many days ago was that?

Mr. Simpson: That was a few days ago.

Mr. Orlikow: Then it is not a filibuster.

Mr. Simpson: Well, let us take a look at some of the observations from our worldly wise newsmen. I would like to quote an article which apeared in the Toronto *Star* on August 31, which is not too long ago, from the pen of Mr. Peter Newman. In reference to the unfounded reports of the obstruction of parliament he stated:

> The Liberal administration, unaccountably, has no major bills ready for debate.

Hon. members opposite may say "So what?" They may ask: "Who is this gentleman to say that we have no legislation ready for parliament?" I recall when he penned a recent fictional edition for them, at which time he was considered the fountain of knowledge; but somehow or other when he talks in this way they seem to want to turn off the water.

I do not think by any means we need to stop at Mr. Newman's observations, because here is another one on Preview Commentary by Mr. Blair Fraser under date of August 20. He stated:

Canadian Flag

People are getting so bored with the flag debate, and so cynical about it, that it seems to me we're beginning to accept as facts a number of things that aren't true.

One is the charge that the Progressive Conservatives are blocking the business of government by their filibuster on the flag resolution. This is not true. Parliament has got through all the work that the Prime Minister stipulated must be done before the house could adjourn for a summer recess, with the lone exception of the flag resolution; if the resolution were brought to a vote tomorrow, parliament would adjourn and probably wouldn't come back until October. The only thing that's being held up by the filibuster is a holiday or the tired M.P.'s—a holiday and a chance to get back to their ridings and attend to the useful work they do there.

Another charge that I don't believe to be true is that the Conservative campaign against the maple leaf flag is a mere political ploy, just a device to force an early election on an issue they think they could win on—or, alternatively, that the Liberal determination to have the maple leaf flag is no more than a piece of electoral strategy for the recapture of Quebec. This cynical view has no factual support that I know of. I don't know any reason to doubt that the people who have spoken are saying what they really believe, and furthermore that they think they're speaking for their electors.

This is the man who has seldom if ever lauded the work of the Conservative party. I can only say that it is possible his recent trip through the beautiful country of Churchill constituency, which he made by canoe, gave him for once in his life a much clearer picture of the situation. We have also heard this charge made by other people.

I will conclude my remarks in respect of this subject by saying that in my capacity during the last few days as acting whip I can unequivocally state that in the main our members are extremely desirous of speaking during this debate. Many of them have told me that they have been unable to place all their views before this house in the allotted time. In answer to some of the criticisms directed toward some members on this side who have spoken twice during the debate, I should state that many have said they have not used their allotted 40 minutes and wish to put further statements on the record. Many others who have not spoken as yet have not spoken because they have given way to other members who wished to speak on a specific date. I suggest that the charges of obstruction are false, and charges of filibuster can only be taken for what they are apparently worth.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first opportunity I have had to enter this debate and I can state here and now there are other members who still wish to speak, probably at some length.

[Mr. Simpson.]

I also wish to deal briefly with some of the remarks made today by the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate (Mr. Pickersgill). He followed the lead of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp) and took part in an unwarranted attack on the leader of the official opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker). It might be of interest to note, for the benefit of those members not present at that time, that the Minister of Trade and Commerce took part in an unwarranted attack on the Leader of the Opposition, until that right hon. gentleman entered this chamber, and then completely changed his speech and said no more in that vein. That performance can only be compared to children in primary school, grade five or six, who fall silent when a teacher who has been absent for some time returns to the room. The tune certainly does change.

Mr. Speaker, as far as the remarks of the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate are concerned, I should like to say that I am in disagreement. That hon. minister referred to the 1940's in an attempt to suggest that the Tories did not support the red ensign. Having read that committee report I understand the official vote was 23 to 1, and there were several Tory members on that committee. That committee was established to study and recommend a Canadian flag.

The Minister of Transport made one statement with which I am in agreement. He said he was a stupid Anglo-Saxon. I agree with him, of course, if he is speaking only for himself.

Mr. Knowles: Do not deprecate the whole race.

Mr. Simpson: That was certainly not my intention, and I am sure the minister was speaking for himself.

Mr. Speaker, having talked with a great number of people I am convinced that many Canadians are perturbed about the way this flag issue has been brought before parliament. Many members have made this statement before during this debate, and it hardly needs repeating. However if the government is not aware of the situation as yet, I should like to say on behalf of my constituents that they are strongly in support of retaining the red ensign as Canada's flag. They also feel that any change in the Canadian flag involves far more than the presentation by government of a resolution, such as is before this house, followed by a vote by members of parliament, which in all likelihood will be in acceptance of a proposed national flag which will re-

main as such for more than 100 years. These people certainly disagree with that procedure.

Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned that I personally support with vigour the Canadian red ensign, as do the people I represent. During the course of this debate many speakers have mentioned some of the history behind the red ensign. I have a few notes here I should like to refer to in an attempt to illustrate why my constituents support retention of the red ensign. It is true that the Canadian red ensign is in grave danger of being discarded as Canada's national flag. That danger is intensified by the lack of knowledge on the part of a great many Canadians who know nothing of the historic symbols and tradition. Recorded history actually contradicts many of the things people take for granted about the red ensign. Past generations of Canadians have asked for and proudly adopted the red ensign. They used it in defiance of restraining orders. Today, sanctified by the blood of our fighting forces, steeped in our traditions, the red ensign by common acceptance and long usage has become known to every nation and country as Canada's flag. Despite all the evidence of common approval, the Prime Minister has stated that he fully intends to write the obituary of the red ensign as Canada's identifying flag.

We all know that by order in council No. 5888, dated September 15, 1945, the red ensign was declared Canada's distinctive flag. It was adopted at that time because Canada's history has been established under that flag, and there was then no question in respect of its worthiness. Why are we now faced with this sudden reappraisal in 1964?

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note about the history of the red ensign that one pamphlet published by the Canadian Legion which, as is well known, is an extremely strong supporter of this flag, contained the following very interesting observations. This is a very interesting observation.

General H. D. G. Crerar, the distinguished commander of the first Canadian army in world war II, recorded an incident of great historical significance for all Canadians when, recounting an official welcome to him in Ottawa on August 8, 1945, by our wartime prime minister, the Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King, he wrote in the March, 1963 issue of *The Legionary*:

"As we moved away from the central entrance of the parliament buildings, Mr. King turned sideways in the car and looked upwards to the peace tower where, at the top, the Canadian red ensign waved. He then said, 'And that, General, is another problem which your Canadian army has solved for Canada—the matter of our national flag.' "

Little did he know at that time that this debate would be taking place in this year 1964. To get back to some of the history of the ensign, we find that ignorance of the Canadian flag is alarmingly prevalent and it begets misunderstanding, prejudice and bigotry. These are all weapons in the arsenal of the proponents of a new flag. This lack of knowledge is not confined to the man in the street. It is found at all levels. Some school children and school teachers know little or nothing about the flag. When it is explained to them they are amazed. Why is not this information made public, they ask. They are susceptible to the clamour for a new flag only because they are uninformed about the old one.

The trouble is that our flag suffers from underexposure in our country. Poor publicity and indifference are responsible for this. Anyone interested can find an abundance of historical and pictorial material showing use of the red ensign in Canada long before confederation. It came here with Prince Rupert and the Company of Adventurers trading into Hudson's bay. The archives of the Hudson's Bay Company have numerous references to the flag from 1670 on.

The Hudson's Bay Company was not a mere trading company. It was the government of that day. It controlled trade, settlement and the building of forts. It armed ships and soldiers, passed and enforced laws and punished offenders. Its powers could scarcely have been more sweeping. For two centuries a large part of what is now Canada was governed under the company's charter and flag.

Canada holds the west today because she fell heir to the achievements of the Hudson's Bay Company and the Nor'westers with whom they united in 1821. All that area drained by the rivers flowing into Hudson's bay was controlled by the company until Canada formed a dominion capable of taking it over. The flag of that company was the red ensign.

This is just a little of the history of the flag which of late has been in danger of being removed as Canada's national flag. There are many other points of view I should like to bring before the house at this time, but I see my time is getting on. As many speakers today have said, I think we should endeavour to arrive at some means of settling this issue, and several means have been suggested. I have mentioned the views of my constituents and my own personal views in relation to the

Canadian red ensign. I have also put on record the fact that I am quite sure the people of my area would be only too willing to compromise to the extent of a variation in this flag if they could be assured that this in itself or the flag chosen by the people of Canada would bring national unity. This, of course, is the most important aspect of the whole subject.

We have suggested that a plebiscite be held but there does not seem to be unanimous support for this idea. Another suggestion has been made that a committee should be set up. The hon. member for Wellington South (Mr. Hales) mentioned the committee idea in his speech as did the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) today. I feel that this suggestion is worthy of the full consideration of the house. As has been said, if the view of that committee was almost unanimous they could then so report to parliament and if they were not unanimous they could probably be instructed to lay down the rules or terms on which a plebiscite would be held, in which each and every citizen of Canada would have an opportunity to select one of several designs which he or she felt would be suitable as a national flag. However, this, of course, is up to the house to decide.

In speaking of the committee aspect of the matter there has been considerable support to the effect that a time limit should be imposed on the committee. I think that some of the suggestions as to a time limit have been quite unreasonable. Some of our members have mentioned three or four months. I do not know if this would be acceptable to those on the government side. However, it is possibly enlightening to recall that a few days ago I asked the Secretary of State (Mr. Lamontagne) if he had received any report from the advisory committee on broadcasting which was set up, and he said no and went on to say that when he outlined the terms of reference last May he had mentioned that he expected a report early in 1965. So if a committee is set up I do not see why there should be any attempt to place a rigid time limit on it.

I should like to conclude my remarks tonight by stating once again that I am fully in support of the retention of the Canadian red ensign and that the people I represent, those with whom I have talked and those who have written to me, have with one exception advised me that this is their feeling as well. However, I want to emphasize again, as I mentioned at the start, that knowing them as I do and knowing of their interest in the unity of this great nation I am sure I can say tonight that they would be willing to accept a new Canadian flag if it should be felt by a majority of the people of Canada that such a flag would bring unity to our country. I want to leave one further point with the house. My people definitely have strong feelings that any new flag should give recognition to our two founding races.

Mr. Speaker: Is the house ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

The house divided on the amendment to the amendment (Mr. More) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken	McCutcheon
Alkenbrack	Madill
Bell	Mandziuk
Cantelon	Mather
Cardiff	Millar
Churchill	Monteith
Coates	Moore
Cooper	More
Danforth	Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria)
Diefenbaker	Muir (Lisgar)
Dinsdale	Nasserden
Doucett	Nesbitt
Enns	Nielsen
Fairweather	Noble
Fane	Nowlan
Flemming (Victoria-Carleton)	Nugent
Forbes	Ormiston
Hales	Pascoe
Hamilton	Pigeon
Harkness	Pugh
Herridge	Rapp
Horner (Acadia)	Ricard
Horner (Jasper-Edson)	Rynard
Horner (The Battlefords)	Simpson
Howe (Wellington-Huron)	Smith
Jones, Mrs.	Southam
Jorgenson	Starr
Kennedy	Stefanson
Korchinski	Stenson
Lambert	Thomas
Loney	Vincent
MacEwan	Wadds, Mrs.
MacRae	Webb
McBain	Weichel
	Willoughby—69.

NAYS

Messrs:

Addison	Béchard
Armstrong	Beer
Asselin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce)	Benidickson
Asselin (Richmond-Wolfe)	Benson
Badanai	Berger
Balcer	Blouin
Barnett	Boulanger
Batten	Brewin
	Brown
	Cadieux (Terrebonne)

Division

Cameron (High Park)	Klein	Rouleau	Tremblay
Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)	Knowles	Roxburgh	Turner
Cantin	Konantz, Mrs.	Ryan	Valade
Cardin	LaMarsh, Miss	Sauvé	Wahn
Caron	Lamontagne	Scott	Walker
Choquette	Lamoureux	Stewart	Watson (Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie)
Chrétien	Laniel	Tardif	Webster
Côté (Chicoutimi)	Laprise	Teillet	Whelan
Côté (Longueuil)	Latulippe	Temple	Winch—118.
Crossman	Laverdière	Thompson	
Davis	Leduc		
Deachman	Legault		
Deschatelets	Lessard (Lake St. John)		
Dionne	Lessard (St. Henry)		
Douglas	Loiselle		
Drouin	Macdonald		
Drury	MacEachen		
Dubé	McIlraith		
Dupuis	McLean (Charlotte)		
Éthier	McMillan		
Eudes	McNulty		
Forest	McWilliam		
Foy	Moreau		
Francis	Morison		
Gauthier	Munro		
Gelber	Nicholson		
Gendron	Nixon		
Girouard	O'Keefe		
Godin	Olson		
Grafftey	Orlikow		
Granger	Otto		
Gray	Paul		
Guay	Pepin		
Habel	Perron		
Hahn	Peters		
Haidasz	Pickersgill		
Harley	Pilon		
Hellyer	Prud'homme		
Howe (Hamilton South)	Richard		
Kelly	Rinfret		
	Rochon		

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment to the amendment lost.

Mr. Laing: Mr. Speaker, I was paired. Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. Skoreyko: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the hon. member for Victoria (B.C.) (Mr. Groos). Had I voted I would have voted for the subamendment.

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the hon. member for Kings (Mr. Mullally). Had I voted I would have voted to support the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. Smallwood: Mr. Speaker, I was paired. Had I voted I would have voted in favour of the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

At 10.50 p.m. the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to special order.

APPENDIX

ADDRESS OF PRIME MINISTER IN OPENING CHARLOTTETOWN CONFERENCE

It is a great honour to speak in this chamber on this centennial anniversary of Canada's first confederation conference; to meet with the premiers of all the provinces around the same table where those men of vision conceived a great new nation a hundred years ago. I think today of the words of the 60th chapter of Isaiah. "A little one shall become a thousand and a small one a strong nation. The Lord will hasten it in his time." The Lord has hastened it in our time.

I share in the gratitude we all feel to our host, Premier Shaw, for the delightful and uniquely "Island" welcome we have received. History tells us that our forefathers from Canada were not met by any such welcome when they first arrived here for the conference 100 years ago. But it also shows that when they left Charlottetown, exhausted by hard work and open-hearted hospitality, they were happy in the warmth of a new fraternity and the hope of a new nation. That hope has been realized, and the fraternity is also with us today.

[*Translation*]

It is of course most fitting that a federal-provincial meeting should have been convened here to commemorate the centennial of the Charlottetown conference. This was the point of time and place at which the grand but distant vision of Canadian confederation emerged as a desirable and attainable goal.

[*Text*]

The Charlottetown conference was also the first of the intergovernmental meetings of which today's is a direct descendant; meetings which have in effect become a permanent part of our national governmental structure, through which, by co-operation, we can keep our federal system effective and acceptable.

Today, a hundred years on, there are constitutional and racial and regional tensions in Canada. At times they seem to endanger our very survival as a nation, for strains of the present always create doubts about the future —in a nation no less than in an individual. This doubt is seized by the cynics, and the faint-hearted, to belittle the Canadian experiment and diminish its achievements. To counteract such defeatism we should spend more time rejoicing in our achievements; less in moaning about our difficulties.

Social unrest—economic pressures—federal-provincial differences—difficulties of the kind that are felt today; these have tested every Canadian generation, and no generation has failed to meet the test. Nor will we fail—we who enjoy riches and resources beyond the wildest dreams of those men who met here in 1864—if we face up to our problems in the spirit and with the resolve of our forefathers.

The fathers of confederation combined a remarkably clear and sure sense of purpose and direction with a single minded dedication and determination to reach a goal. Within three years they converted their dream into the reality of a federal state, now grown beyond their imaginings.

If it is to continue to grow—as it will—we must acknowledge the realities of the strains imposed by our times on the national structure bequeathed to us; we must acknowledge them without being daunted by them. We must define them. And remove them.

For that purpose, we must have a sense of political realism, a passion for justice and a gift for compromise. We must also recognize that the basic partnership of our two founding peoples—and the enriching diversity of our national pattern—remain our greatest source of strength and progress.

We must not over-dwell on yesterday—or even on today. We plan for the future—and it is the future on which we have to agree.

For we cannot turn back the clock. We cannot by our wish or our command restore to our problems the simple shapes, the neat, black and white alternatives of simpler times.

To solve them we must recapture the faith of our predecessors and restore their purpose in our national life. We must reaffirm those principles on which they agreed—and which are still valid—but be willing to modify procedures unsuited to our own times.

First among our national goals—prerequisite to all others, economic, social or cultural, is national unity. This does not mean and cannot mean uniformity. It does mean Canadian identity, with the symbols and even

more the spirit and the pride to foster such identity.

It does not mean subordination in any way of provincial rights, nor the alienation of provincial authority. It does mean a government at the centre strong enough to serve Canada as a whole.

Let us here agree and let our accord be broadcast for all men to know, that this nation—conceived in the hearts and minds of those who met in this place a century ago; nurtured through 26 parliaments and into its fifth generation to embrace half a continent and 10 provinces—that today this nation has no intention of falling apart; and every intention of moving forward to greater things.

Let us agree that whatever may be the difficulties facing our federation, whatever our differences, we are resolved to keep our union strong, our federation healthy and our nation one before the world; that we accept our responsibility to the past, but even more important we will discharge our obligations to the future.

Gathered here in confederation chamber on this the 1st day of September, 1964, let us declare our vow to do our part to lift our country beyond the jeopardy of forces or factions which would divide it; to strengthen and safeguard its federal system; and to regard our highest purpose to be our trusteeship over the concept of a Canada fortunate in the duality of its origin and the diversity of its development, but a Canada greater than the sum of its parts.

Let us acknowledge freely that these goals will not be easy to reach; that in their pursuit we must show tolerance and patience as well as strength and determination. But let all Canadians know that these are our goals. Their acceptance can itself be a strong unifying force.

Finally, let us ask God's help and His blessing in our task.

In this spirit, Canadians will never betray the trust of those we honour today, nor the heritage of those into whose keeping we pass our trust tomorrow.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, September 2, 1964

The house met at 2 p.m.

COMMONWEALTH DAY

DESIGNATION OF MONDAY PRECEDING MAY 25 TO HONOUR QUEEN AND COMMONWEALTH

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe East) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-117, respecting Commonwealth day.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to establish by statute a sovereign's birthday and Commonwealth day to pay our respects to the Queen as head of the commonwealth and to celebrate our Canadian membership in the commonwealth of nations.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the creation of a new holiday but rather the renaming of an old one. The monday preceding May 25 each year is set aside by the nation as a public holiday. It is called Victoria day by some, the Queen's birthday by others, and even Empire day in some parts of the nation. It is a remarkable fact that whatever the forms of government in the various parts of the commonwealth, every nation agreed to retain, in the royal titles, the designation "Head of the Commonwealth". It is together with their common ideals, the real link among the various members of this extraordinary association.

In 1951, when Her Majesty visited Canada as Princess Elizabeth and made a memorable tour of the country from coast to coast, she made the following declaration in her farewell broadcast:

> The crown is a thing of real and tangible strength, and one of the most important factors in uniting the people of the commonwealth into one great brotherhood.

These words are just as true now as they were then.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

INCREASES IN COST OF GOODS AND SERVICES

Question No. 1,644—**Mr. Douglas:**

What are the percentage price increases in the costs of goods and services procured by the federal government for each year since 1956 in the following categories (a) current expenditures (i) wages and salaries of federal government employees (ii) services provided by non-government employees or by private businesses, and (iii) goods purchased by the federal governemnt (b) capital expenditures?

Mr. L. T. Pennell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): No price indices are kept or can be readily compiled to show the percentage price increases in the cost of goods and services procured by the federal government in the categories (a) (ii), (a) (iii), and (b). It can probably be assumed, in the absence of precise evidence to be the contrary, that the index numbers for prices published by the dominion bureau of statistics would be applicable to goods purchased by the federal government as well as by others; but there are no data readily available to confirm or contradict this assumption.

With respect to category a(i), the following information, subject to two qualifications noted hereafter has been supplied by the dominion bureau of statistics:

Federal government salaries and wages implicit price index 1957=100: 1956, 93.2; 1957, 100.0; 1958, 104.3; 1959, 106.8 1960, 114.7; 1961, 120.5; 1962, 124.1; 1963, 132.3.

1. It is pointed out, with respect to the foregoing index figures, that no wage rate data are available with which to deflate expenditures on salaries and wages. The price series for this category of expenditures are therefore, for the most part, those which are implicit when a comparison is made between total employment and total wages and salaries. Thus, the price series may change, not only because of a change in wage rates but also because of a change in the proportion of, say, professional to clerical staff.

2. It is also to be noted that the implicit price index figures here shown relate solely to salaries and wages paid by the federal government, and so not necessarily represent price movements for other categories of federal government expenditures.

WAGES OF SEAMEN ON EAST COAST

Question No. 1,646—**Mr. Crouse:**

Do seamen serving on ships operated by the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys on the east coast receive equal wages for the same duties carried out by seamen serving with the Department of Transport in the same area and, if not (a)

what is the disparity between wage scales (b) what is the purpose of such a disparity, and (c) what steps are being taken by the Department of Labour to eliminate any such differential?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (President of the Privy Council): Rates of pay for ships' personnel are determined by treasury board on the recommendation of the appropriate deputy head which in turn is based on the recommendation of the Department of Labour following an examination of rates of pay prevailing in the appropriate area of employment for similar classes of work.

The treasury board has delineated the appropriate areas to be used in determining the prevailing rates for ships' personnel as follows: (a) Where government vessels are confined to one of the following areas of operation, (i) Newfoundland, (ii) lower St. Lawrence-east coast, (iii) upper St. Lawrence-great lakes, wage rates are to be determined on the basis of rates prevailing in companies operating in that one area; (b) where government vessels operate in any of the above areas and are not confined to any one area, wage rates are to be determined on the basis of rates prevailing in those companies that operate in any or all of the areas and that apply the same wage rates and conditions to their employees irrespective of the areas of operation.

The treasury board has made an exception to this policy in the cases of relief personnel and personnel serving on eight vessels of the Department of Transport because the numbers involved represented only a small portion of a total number of personnel employed by the department on its fleet of 55 vessels. The exception provides for payment of wage rates arrived at under (b) above rather than (a). It was felt that by placing all employees of the Department of Transport on the same wage rates, the department would have more flexibility in moving crews from one vessel to the other which would allow for better career planning.

The effects of this exception on wage rates applicable to personnel serving on Department of Mines and Technical Surveys vessels operating in the same area as vessels of the Department of Transport are presently under consideration with a view to eliminating any resultant unwarranted differences in rates.

MARITIME COMMISSION SUBSIDIES, ATLANTIC COAST

Question No. 1,740—**Mr. Barnett:**

What, for each of the fiscal years commencing with 1950-51, are expenditures made through the subsidies branch of the Canadian maritime commission for services (a) between ports or places in Newfoundland (b) between ports or places in Newfoundland and other parts of Canada (c) for inter-provincial services between other provinces on the Atlantic coast (d) between ports or places in Quebec (e) between ports or places in Nova Scotia (f) between ports or places in New Brunswick (g) between ports or places in Prince Edward Island?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport):

Years	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)
1950-51	$1,250,000	$ —	$301,625	$ 887,500	$297,000	$ 97,000	NIL
1951-52	1,590,000	—	298,625	890,500	290,000	97,000	NIL
1952-53	1,536,000	—	326,625	890,500	255,922	95,000	NIL
1953-54	1,903,116	—	396,625	890,500	265,255	95,000	NIL
1954-55	1,956,262	—	390,000	891,565	248,000	95,000	NIL
1955-56	2,117,847	—	380,000	827,200	228,000	95,000	NIL
1956-57	2,501,038	80,000	375,000	827,700	207,400	95,000	NIL
1957-58	2,740,597	80,000	441,500	1,085,200	215,900	95,000	NIL
1958-59	2,990,878	97,305	820,141	1,122,350	194,944	95,000	NIL
1959-60	3,707,654	72,000	833,284	1,225,200	196,900	95,000	NIL
1960-61	4,069,002	72,000	827,024	1,056,900	193,186	95,000	NIL
1961-62	4,830,178	72,000	982,879	1,196,145	176,150	95,000	NIL
1962-63	4,901,988	72,000	980,500	1,376,700	173,650	101,500	NIL
1963-64	4,975,389	84,500	994,498	2,301,892	173,275	112,700	NIL

NATIONAL DEFENCE AUTOMOBILE LICENCE 27120F

Question No. 1,745—**Mr. Millar:**

1. Does the Department of National Defence own an automobile bearing a 1964 Ontario licence plate No. 27120F and, if so, to what branch of the department is this automobile assigned?

2. Under whose control was this automobile during the hours of 10.30 a.m. and 11.30 a.m., on Monday, August 17, 1964?

3. How many persons were occupying the vehicle

during this period, to which service do they belong and what are their ranks?

4. What assignment was being carried out for the Department of National Defence by this automobile and its occupants during the above-mentioned period of time?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): 1. Yes, on strength of No. 9 transport company, Royal Canadian Army Service Corps, Ottawa.

2. 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.

3. Two assignments were carried out during the hours of 10.30 a.m. and 11.30 a.m.; (a) the driver, a private of No. 9 transport company, R.C.A.S.C., and an officer of the Department of External Affairs assigned to the secretariat of the third commonwealth education conference proceeded from 140 Wellington street, Ottawa to the queen's printer in Hull and returned to the same address; (b) the driver, accompanied by a messenger, proceeded to a local business establishment to obtain supplies for the commonwealth education conference.

4. Not applicable.

FAMILY ALLOWANCES

Question No. 1,751—**Mr. Latulippe:**

1. What was the monthly rate at which family allowances were paid to children eight years of age and of 14 years of age as of July 1, 1934, July 1, 1944, July 1, 1954, July 1, 1964?

2. Has the government given consideration to the desirability of increasing family allowances in order to keep them in line with the increase in the cost of living as compared with 1944?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. On July 1, 1934 and 1944 the family allowances program was not in existence. On July 1, 1954 and 1964 the rates were the same: 8 years of age, $6; 14 years of age, $8.

2. The government is continuously studying ways and means of improving Canada's social security programs. Any changes decided upon will be announced by the government at the appropriate time.

POSTAL FACILITIES, RED ROCK, ONT.

Question No. 1,762—**Mr. Fisher:**

1. When was the post office facility at Red Rock, Ontario, obtained?

2. In summary, what space does it provide in terms of boxes and working room?

3. Is the facility close to the standard or average for a community of this size?

4. Has any consideration been given to erecting a new post office and, if not, for what reasons?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): 1. September 25, 1950.

2. 700 square feet.

3. Yes.

4. Yes, but as the existing space is satisfactory for the present, it is not proposed to recommend the provision of improved accommodation at this time.

WATER FLOW, WELLAND CANAL

Question No. 1,768—**Mr. Ryan:**

1. Since inception of the seaway, what has been the annual seasonal average in cubic feet per second of the flow through the Welland canal?

2. What is the estimated increase of such flow that will be caused by the planned twinning of locks on the Welland canal?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): The St. Lawrence seaway authority advises as follows:

1. Since the inception of the seaway, the annual seasonal average of the flow through the Welland canal has been 6,800 cubic feet per second.

2. The estimated increase of such flow that will be caused by the planned twinning of locks on the Welland canal is 1,000 to 1,200 cubic feet per second.

POINT EDWARD NAVAL BASE—EMPLOYEES LAID OFF

Question No. 1,773—**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria):**

1. How many employees have been relieved of their employment at the Point Edward naval base since the announcement by the Minister of National Defence on December 5, 1963?

2. How many of these employees have been re-employed through the offices of the national employment service?

3. How many are still without employment?

Hon. Lucien Cardin (Associate Minister of National Defence): 1. 229. Of this number 55 left voluntarily to accept other employment and 48 were transferred to other government departments.

2. 28 and an additional 6 are training in local trade schools.

3. The number of personnel without employment is not known as not all registered with the national employment service. However, 73 are in receipt of unemployment benefits.

DEFENCE PRODUCTION CONTRACTS TO NORTH SYDNEY MARINE RAILWAY CO.

Question No. 1,774—**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria):**

What was the dollar value of contracts awarded to the North Sydney Marine Railway Company

Questions

Limited by the Department of Defence Production for each of the fiscal years 1954 to the present time, for repairs, refits and conversions?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): The value of contracts awarded to North Sydney Marine Railway Company Limited by the Department of Defence Production for the years in question is:

Fiscal Year	Amount
1954-55	$ 26,874
1955-56	94,969
1956-57	Nil
1957-58	218,600
1958-59	142,744
1959-60	158,498
1960-61	137,988
1961-62	239,398
1962-63	139,420
1963-64	155,603
1964-65	38,839*
Total	$1,352,933

* Information on the value of contracts placed in 1964/65 is available only to the end of July.

SPRINGHILL, N.S.—PENITENTIARY CONSTRUCTION

Question No. 1,782—**Mr. Coates:**

Is it the intention of the government to have construction initiated on the young offenders' institution at Springhill, N.S., in October, or will construction be delayed until the spring of 1965?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): Tenders for this project have been advertised and are due October 7, 1964. Subject to acceptable offers being received construction should start this fall.

WHARF EXTENSION, PORT PHILLIP, N.S.

Question No. 1,784—**Mr. Coates:**

1. Is it the intention of the government to extend wharfage facilities at Port Phillip, Cumberland co., N.S., in the fiscal year 1965-66?

2. What would be the estimated cost of wharf extensions for Port Phillip?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): 1. Matter is under consideration.

2. Between $20,000 and $25,000.

*CANADIAN FLAG—SUPPORT FOR RED ENSIGN OR PLEBISCITE

Question No. 1,798—**Mr. Coates:**

What is the total number of names attached to telegrams, letters, petitions, etc., in support of the retention of the Canadian red ensign as Canada's national flag or requesting that a national plebiscite be carried out to determine whether any change should be made in our present flag?

Mr. J. B. Stewart (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): The Department of the Secretary of State has received 134,196 names attached to telegrams, letter, petitions, etc., in support of the retention of the Canadian red ensign; 25,096 names requesting that a national plebiscite be carried out to determine whether any change should be made in our present flag.

COMMEMORATIVE STAMP ON DISCOVERY OF SALT

Question No. 1,814—**Mr. Irvine:**

Has the Postmaster General recently received representations or submissions that a new stamp be struck to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the discovery of salt in Canada in the year 1866, inasmuch as one recently was struck to commemorate the discovery of oil in Canada and, if so, what is the result of his deliberations?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): Yes, and the suggestion will be considered when the 1966 program is under study.

DEATH RATE FROM LEUKEMIA

Question No. 1,817—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

What has been the death rate, per thousand, from leukemia in each province in each of the last ten years?

Mr. Jean-Luc Pepin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Trade and Commerce):

Death rates from leukemia and aleukemia, Canada and provinces, 1954-1963
(per 100,000 population)

Year	Canada	Nfld.	P.E.I.	N.S.	N.B.	Que.	Ont.	Man.	Sask.	Alta.	B.C.	Yukon	N.W.T.
1954	5.0	2.0	5.0	2.8	3.5	3.9	5.6	6.1	6.3	6.0	7.0	—	—
1955	5.4	5.9	8.0	6.1	4.4	4.4	5.2	4.8	7.2	5.8	7.5	—	5.6
1956	5.2	4.1	11.1	4.6	5.0	4.4	5.7	5.2	6.6	4.8	5.6	—	—
1957	5.4	3.5	8.1	6.4	4.6	4.6	5.5	5.0	6.7	6.1	6.3	—	—
1958	5.6	3.2	6.0	6.2	6.3	4.3	6.0	7.0	5.6	5.6	7.6	—	5.0
1959	5.7	3.6	5.9	8.1	3.3	4.9	5.8	6.5	5.8	7.1	7.2	—	4.8
1960	5.7	3.8	7.8	6.6	5.3	4.7	6.1	6.7	6.7	5.1	7.1	—	9.1
1961	5.7	2.0	6.7	5.7	5.9	4.6	6.3	5.9	7.8	5.6	7.0	—	—
1962	6.1	5.7	3.8	4.6	5.8	5.3	6.0	6.2	8.3	7.5	7.2	—	4.2
1963	6.1	5.4	9.3	4.8	5.0	5.2	6.5	7.3	9.1	6.0	6.8	6.7	—

[Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria).]

CANADIAN LIFE EXPECTANCY

Question No. 1,818—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

What was the life expectancy of Canadian males and females in 1954, 1959 and 1964?

Mr. Jean-Luc Pepin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Trade and Commerce): Life expectancy at birth, by sex, Canada, 1951, 1956 and 1961*

	1951	1956	1961
Males	66.3	67.6	68.4
Females	70.8	72.9	74.2

*Life tables available for census years only.

LIFE EXPECTANCY

Question No. 1,819—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

What proportions of the Canadian population can be expected to survive to (a) age 60 (b) age 65 (c) age 70 (d) age 75 (e) age 80?

Mr. Jean-Luc Pepin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Trade and Commerce): Survivors of a cohort of 100,000 persons at specific ages, by sex, Canada, 1961*: age 60, males, 77,546; females, 86,387; age 65, males, 68,774; females, 80,916; age 70, males, 57,517; females, 72,746; age 75, males, 43,791; females, 61,052; age 80, males, 28,936; females, 45,161.

*Life tables available for census years only.

*POSTAGE STAMP COMMEMORATING BATTLE OF PLAINS OF ABRAHAM

Question No. 1,825—**Mr. Hahn:**

1. Was a postage stamp issued to commemorate the bicentenary of the battle of the plains of Abraham and, if so, what was the principal pictorial feature on that stamp?

2. Who was the head of the government which authorized that particular stamp?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, this question is in two parts. The answer is: 1. Yes, a postage stamp was issued on September 10, 1959 to mark the bicentenary of the battle of the plains of Abraham. The principal pictorial feature on that stamp is three green maple leaves, joined on a single stem, on a red background.

2. The head of the government which authorized that particular stamp was Right Hon. John G. Diefenbaker.

Perhaps I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the right hon. gentleman referred to this stamp yesterday as having been issued while his government was in office, and I might say he also referred to some remarks I had made about the three maple leaves stamp issued earlier this year.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, is this a proper exercise of the minister's right? I raise a question of order. If the hon. gentleman wants to take part in the debate we will be glad to hear him, but up to the present time he has been one of that great gathering over there who are gagged.

Mr. Nicholson: I was answering the question, and I said the right hon. gentleman had also made reference to this matter. I would also say—

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, this is very irregular. This is using a starred question for the purpose of getting in some gratuitous suggestions and answers which the minister has not got backbone enough to do in the course of the debate.

Mr. Nicholson: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Monteith: He answered the question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Nicholson: —to complete my answer, the press release issued by the government of that time stated that the three maple leaves are similar to those on the coats of arms of several provinces and represent the two original groups as well as people of the many other nations who joined in the task of building our country.

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. J. B. Stewart (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, motions 158 and 159 are acceptable to the government. I ask that motion No. 134 be allowed to stand.

Mr. Speaker: Does the house agree that motions 158 and 159 should be carried?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

INDIAN AFFAIRS—CORRESPONDENCE FROM ATLIN, B.C.

Motion No. 158—**Mr. Howard:**

That an order of the house do issue for a copy of all correspondence, telegrams or other documents exchanged between anyone in Atlin, B.C. and the office of the superintendent of Indian affairs at Whitehorse, Y.T. since January 1, 1962 dealing with any aspect of Indians affairs.

Motion agreed to.

BELLA COOLA, B.C.—ELECTRICAL FACILITIES ON WHARF

Motion No. 159—**Mr. Howard:**

That an order of the house do issue for a copy of all correspondence, telegrams and other documents exchanged between the government and any agency or department thereof and any other

person, group or organization since January 1, 1963, relating to the need for the installation of electrical facilities at the wharf or floats at Bella Coola, B.C., and also to the levying of fees under the government wharves regulations.

Motion agreed to.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

HAL BANKS—INQUIRY AS TO WHEREABOUTS

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 Labour whether he was interviewed recently by Mr. Robert Reguly regarding the S.I.U. Has he read the article in the Toronto *Star* of yesterday, and is he the cabinet minister referred to in the report who stated that Hal Banks was in New York?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): I did have a meeting with Mr. Reguly and I did discuss, I think, rumours as to the whereabouts of Mr. Banks. I repeated to him the statement which I think I gave to the House of Commons, that there had been rumours that Mr. Banks was in the United States, possibly in New York. This is a rumour, of course, to which I referred recently and in which connection I indicated that there was no firm knowledge so far as I was concerned; it had been merely a rumour.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

INDIA—RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR FOOD

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Qu'Appelle): About a month ago I directed a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs in which I requested him to ask the high commissioner for India about the need for food in that country. Today I should like to address my question to the Acting Prime Minister. In view of the urgent appeal put forward by our sister commonwealth nation, India, requesting food and asking Washington and London to divert grain ships to that country, will the Acting Prime Minister take some steps to let the Indian government know our shipping is free on the St. Lawrence at the present time and we do have grain available for hungry people?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Acting Prime Minister): I shall be glad to bring this matter, which has been raised by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle, before my colleagues tomorrow when the Prime Minister will be back. I am sure that appropriate action will be taken.

[Mr. Howard.]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

REQUEST FOR SEVERANCE PAY FOR CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES LAID OFF

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): May I direct a question to the Minister of National Defence. In view of the reorganization of his department which will involve further layoffs, and in view of the fact that severance pay is provided for military personnel, is the government giving any consideration to some type of severance pay or compensation for civilian employees whose services are to be dispensed with as a result of the reorganization?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): I think that question has been asked once or twice before. Perhaps I could look up the reply in *Hansard* and make it available to my hon. friend.

Mr. Douglas: I believe the question has been asked, but I do not think it has been answered. I was wondering if the minister would undertake to give some thought to this problem and give the house a definite reply as to whether his department is prepared to give such severance pay to civilian employees.

Mr. Hellyer: Yes, I would be very happy to give it some additional thought. As I have pointed out to the house before, this is a large problem and would not apply to the Department of National Defence alone. Any solution which was arrived at in respect of our department would have to apply to all other departments of government, and for that reason there are restrictions which we cannot easily overcome.

Mr. Douglas: May I ask the minister if he knows of any other department which, according to its own press release, intends to cut its headquarters staff in Ottawa by half?

Mr. Hellyer: No, offhand I could not say that I do, Mr. Speaker.

CANADIAN CONFEDERATION

FAILURE TO USE FRENCH LANGUAGE IN RECREATION OF CHARLOTTETOWN CONFERENCE

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State.

Would he care to comment on the statement made yesterday by Mr. Lesage to protest against the unilingual re-enactment of the Charlottetown talks, organized by the centennial commission?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, first, I would point out that the government itself had nothing to do with the contents of that program. However, I am told that those who did organize it merely meant to respect the historical truth and that not a single word of French was spoken in Charlottetown, at the 1864 conference.

Be that as it may, I can assure my hon. friend that the program for the confederation centennial celebrations, in 1967, will fully respect Canada's bilingual character.

Mr. Georges Valade (St. Mary): I have a supplementary question for the Secretary of State.

Is he aware of the corrective statement made by Senator Connolly, government leader in the upper chamber, with regard to Mr. Lesage's statement, in support of the latter's protest?

Mr. Lamontagne: I am not aware of the statement made by the senator concerned.

Hon. Théogène Ricard (St. Hyacinthe-Bagot): Must one conclude then that the remarks made by the Quebec premier were unfounded?

[*Text*]

WATER RESOURCES

CONSIDERATION OF CANADIAN REQUIREMENTS IN SALES TO U.S.

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources, based on my lifelong appreciation of the value of water. My question is also based upon a press report, that caused me some concern, of a recent announcement by Mr. Ralph M. Parsons of Los Angeles with respect to plans for the diversion of Canadian rivers in the Arctic watershed to Mexico and the great lakes, and upon another recent press report of a statement by the hon. member for Coast-Capilano to the Vancouver board of trade in which he said that "he could foresee the time when water will become one of the most important items of trade between Canada and the United States."

Can the minister assure the house that the present and future water requirements of the Canadian people will be protected before the government undertakes to sell any more water to the United States?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for having given me notice of this question, because it enabled me to prepare a few notes. I want to compliment him again, as I have in the past, for his continuing interest in this subject, and I want to say that in my view he is dealing with probably the greatest issue that will confront Canada during the next several decades.

I have been stating recently that water is at least our second greatest asset, next to soil; and as the years go by may even exceed the value of our soil. It is true that we are having indications of water shortage in parts of the United States. As a matter of fact in some places the problem appears to be reaching critical levels; and dependant entirely on the increase in population and the expansion of industry which might depend upon the multi-use of water, it is possible that the so-called Parsons plan will in the years ahead appear as something other than the cloudy dream it might be today.

That being the case, it is imperative that in Canada we give an increasing amount of attention to water, and I want to assure the house that one of the first measures I took when I became minister of this department was to ask for an increase in the personnel and expenditures of the water resources branch. In addition, we have encouraged the three prairie provinces which are now meeting together to decide on a plan for the diversion of northern rivers into the Saskatchewan system. This was initiated by the former premier of Saskatchewan, Mr. Lloyd, on September 20 of last year.

Mr. Grafftey: This is a Rotary club speech.

Mr. Laing: Mr. Speaker, there seems to be something wrong with the hon. member. Perhaps someone can help him.

Mr. Grafftey: You are abusing the rules.

Mr. Laing: At the present time it is under the chairmanship of Hon. Mr. Strom, who is minister of agriculture for Alberta. In addition, we have joined with the province of Manitoba in studies of the Nelson river.

I am quite certain that in the years ahead this government, and indeed any government dealing with this matter, will look upon our water resources as a prime element in negotiation with our United States friends; that

we will regard it as an important element of our national greatness and make sure it will never become a badge of bondage.

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Qu'Appelle): I should like to ask the minister whether he has any progress to report with regard to the long range transmission of hydro power; because without this there can be no such thing as selling off our water resources. We must have regard to our domestic needs.

Mr. Laing: I would hope we are dealing here with the multiple use of our waters and not with power alone. I hope in a few days we shall be announcing a contract dealing with this matter which the hon. member has raised, namely long range transmission of power.

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): Is the minister also giving active consideration to the Kierans plan for the diversion to the great lakes of waters flowing north into Hudson bay?

Mr. Laing: We have on the order paper at the present time a motion to refer the matter of the level of the great lakes to the committee on mines, forests and waters. I hope action will soon be taken in this respect, and it may be expected that the subject to which the hon. member referred will be dealt with by that committee. The committee might well wish to call Mr. Kierans as a witness.

Mr. Martineau: As a final supplementary on this matter, I should like to know, for the information of the house, whether the minister is still praying for rain.

Mr. Laing: Yes, and I hope the hon. gentleman is, too.

Mr. J. H. Horner (Acadia): In view of the minister's interest in water and the discussions he has held recently with the Alberta government, can he say whether there has been any indication from the government of Alberta that they are now prepared to proceed with the Red Deer river diversion scheme?

Mr. Laing: I was informed by Mr. Strom less than a week ago that discussions with the other two provinces concerned were going magnificently, to use his expression.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): On that particular project, or on water use generally?

Mr. Laing: There was no special reference to that particular project.

[Mr. Laing.]

IMMIGRATION

CONSIDERATION OF AMNESTY PROGRAM RESPECTING CHINESE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. K. H. More (Regina City): I should like to address a question to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. Will the minister take this house into his confidence and tell us what consideration he and his colleagues are giving at the present time to a new policy with respect to Chinese immigrants? I ask this question because of news reports on radio and television within the last 24 hours that the government is considering a new policy. If this report is not spiked or denied now I am afraid it will adversely affect the present policy, which has been gathering momentum.

[*Translation*]

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the hon. member for giving me this opportunity to state that the news published in the last few days about a new policy could only refer to the two statements I made previously about Chinese immigration. Therefore, there is no question of a new government policy. The whole policy about Chinese immigration was announced when my estimates were discussed and in the correction I made in the house on August 19.

[*Text*]

Mr. More: Does the minister say, then, that no consideration is being given to a general amnesty program? This was the news report. I ask him to confirm or deny it, because I am afraid the Chinese people will be affected until this is done.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay: No, Mr. Speaker. It is out of the question to consider a new amnesty. The statements made in the house are the only ones that count.

[*Text*]

[*Later:*]

Mr. S. Perry Ryan (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. In view of the report from Vancouver that the Chinese amnesty does not cover those who have entered Canada by means of forged passports, would the minister consider issuing a statement clarifying the situation with respect to eligibility for amnesty?

Mr. Tremblay: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would be very glad to clarify any point which may not have been cleared before.

QUEBEC—MOVEMENT OF NEW CANADIANS TO U.S.

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Henri Latulippe (Compton-Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. We are noticing, with regret, that many Canadians and new Canadians from Quebec are moving to the United States. Could the minister tell the house whether anything is being done to find out the reasons behind this mass moving of Canadian citizens to the United States?

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: That is a question for the order paper.

NATIONAL REVENUE

SASKATCHEWAN—STATEMENT RESPECTING SERVICE AT REGWAY

On the orders of the day:

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue): I should like to reply briefly to a question raised in the house yesterday by the hon. member for Regina City concerning the port of Regway, Saskatchewan.

Traffic figures for Regway during the current summer months have been carefully analysed, and the results of this analysis indicate that the volume of traffic between 12 midnight and 8 a.m. barely justifies the 12 midnight to 8 a.m. shift during the summertime. I might point out that the average has only been four cars for that shift during this summer, 1964. Since traffic always declines greatly after Labour day week end, the volume which can be forecast for this shift after September 14 does not support its retention. Twenty four hour service will, however, be provided between May 15 and September 14 each year. I might point out that this is the first summer that such service has been provided at Regway. The situation at Regway will continue to be kept under close observation to ensure that appropriate action is taken as warranted.

INCOME TAX

DEDUCTIBILITY OF CONTRIBUTIONS TO "UNDERDOG" ORGANIZATION

On the orders of the day:

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, a question was raised by the hon. member for Hastings-Frontenac concerning the deductibility as charitable donations of contributions to an organization known as Underdog. This organization was recognized for purposes of the Income Tax Act as a charitable organization by the previous government on April 15, 1962. Subsequent to recent events I have asked officials of my department to contact officers of this organization to determine whether a continuation of this privilege is warranted.

BROADCASTING

APPROVAL OF TRANSFER OF WINDSOR RADIO STATION

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Secretary of State. It has to do with Mr. Royce Frith, reputedly a member of the inner strategy board of the Liberal party, who secured a radio broadcasting licence in Windsor and has now made application to the board of broadcast governors for permission to sell after only four months of operation.

Would the minister ascertain from the B.B.G. whether the B.B.G. has received letters opposing the transfer of this station; the reasons for the curious change of circumstances which now lead Mr. Frith, having secured the licence, to endeavour to rid himself of it; and whether there is any foundation for the statements made in the *Globe and Mail* by Mr. Dennis Braithwaite that Mr. Frith was able to make a secret application and secure his licence on the basis of such an application?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I will certainly try to secure from the B.B.G. the information which the right hon. gentleman is seeking. Meanwhile I should like to remind him that the B.B.G. granted the application of Mr. Frith at their meeting on March 26, 1963 and the public announcement was dated April 11, 1963.

[*Later:*]

Mr. D. M. Fisher (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Transport, which relates to the question put to the Secretary of State by the Leader of the Opposition. An answer to my question might clarify the other answer given. I should like to ask the minister whether the actual licence for CKWW, Mr.

Frith's station, was issued by the Department of Transport after the change of government in 1963, and if so, did the minister at that time have a report before him in respect of the financing of Mr. Frith by Mr. Stirling?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, as I am sure the hon. gentleman knows quite well, the licence was of course issued after the change of government pursuant to a recommendation made by the board of broadcast governors, as the Secretary of State has already told the house, before the change of government. Precisely what the minister of transport of that day may have done to satisfy himself that he should send the recommendation of the board of broadcast governors to the cabinet for approval, I cannot say. This is one of those things that is done by the minister on his responsibility. There is no question that on his responsibility he did send it to the cabinet, and on their responsibility it was approved.

Mr. Fisher: May I ask a supplementary question just to clarify that answer. Is it ever the practice not to approve the issuance of such licences if they have been recommended by the B.B.G.?

Mr. Pickersgill: I believe I would be right in saying that there has only been one case; none under the previous government and one under the present government. I therefore doubt if one could call it a practice.

Mr. Fisher: Perhaps I should ask the question of the present chairman of the treasury board, who then was the minister. Did that minister have before him a thorough review of the financing of CKWW?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I do not remember the particular application, but I would not expect I would have, because that would be a matter for the board of broadcast governors.

AIRPORTS

VANCOUVER—FEDERAL PARTICIPATION IN PROVISION OF SECOND ACCESS ROUTE

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 Transport regarding a matter of immediate concern to the city of Vancouver. In view of the fact that Vancouver is the third largest city in Canada but has only one approach to the international airport, via a bridge which has been breaking down for certain reasons, and as recently as the last two days, thereby affecting not only flights to and from the airport but creating a grave danger to those using the bridge in the event of accident, is the Minister of Transport now giving immediate consideration, in collaboration with the Minister of Public Works and the provincial government, to providing an alternative route between Vancouver and the international airport?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I believe that just at the time I was last in Vancouver a joint announcement was made by the government of Canada and the government of British Columbia that an engineering study, which is being paid for jointly by the two governments, is being made of this proposal. In saying this I think I should repeat what was said at the time; that it is not a normal part of the functions of the government of Canada to provide access from great cities to their airports. That is regarded as a municipal function, and where it transcends municipal boundaries a provincial function, since it is the provision of roads or roads and bridges. However, it was our opinion that the problem the hon. gentleman referred to is of sufficient importance that we should join in this engineering study.

Moreover, I am sure that the hon. gentleman's friends would wish to address to the government of his province, which I understand claims to be debt free, urgent representations on the same subject.

Mr. Winch: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry the minister made that statement. I have never known that the premier of British Columbia was considered a friend of mine, because I was the first opposition leader to face him. However, I would ask the minister whether he and the government would be prepared to recommend, in view of the situation, a federal contribution toward a new access route to the international airport, which is under the jurisdiction of the minister, be it a bridge or a tunnel. Would the minister mind answering that?

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I apologize both to the hon. member and to the government of British Columbia. I think the hon. gentleman did not hear what I said. I suggested that perhaps his friends would wish to make representations to the government of British Columbia, and I was using the word "friends" in the usual parliamentary sense of those people in his own party which I

believe is the official opposition in that province.

The question as to whether or not there should be a federal contribution to the road to the airport in Vancouver, I think would have to be considered in the light of similar situations in Toronto, in Montreal and in Ottawa, where the situation is not very satisfactory, as well as in a great many other places. There does come a point where one has to consider whether and to what extent the federal government should be spending money collected from the taxpayers all over Canada to perform functions which normally fall, under our constitution, within other jurisdictions.

Mr. Winch: A further supplementary question. In view of the minister's statement is he prepared to give the same consideration to a federal grant to British Columbia as he asked for and got for the maritimes?

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I should think that where the circumstances are equal there should always be equal treatment.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

QUEBEC—DELAY IN PAYMENT FOR WINTER WORKS

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Chapleau): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Labour?

Would the minister consider the possibility of reaching an agreement with the state of Quebec in order that unemployed persons participating this year in the winter works program may be paid periodically instead of six months after the jobs are completed, as was the case these last few years?

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: This is a question for the order paper.

ARTS, LETTERS AND SCIENCES

TORONTO—CANADA COUNCIL GRANT TO CREST THEATRE

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. Is the minister now in a position to tell the house why the Canada Council has revoked the grant to the Crest theatre in Toronto, thereby wrecking one of Canada's principal and outstanding cultural projects?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I would remind the hon. gentleman that the Canada Council is not an agency of the crown and is therefore not responsible to parliament. The position I am taking at present was confirmed by the former prime minister of Canada, the present Leader of the Opposition, when he refused to answer a similar question in the house in the fall of 1957.

Mr. Nesbitt: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a supplementary question. I believe only two days ago the Secretary of State, in answer to a question by another hon. member, said he would answer this question or he would make inquiries of the Canada Council, implying that he would give an answer when he had done so. I do not see why this question cannot be answered. The Secretary of State certainly replies to this house, on behalf of the Canada Council, and I think he should provide this house with an answer.

Mr. Lamontagne: Mr. Speaker, I have reexamined the relationship that exists between parliament, the government and the Canada Council, and have come to the same conclusion as the former prime minister, that as it is very clearly stated in the act, the Canada Council is not an agency of the crown and therefore not responsible to parliament.

Mr. Nesbitt: I have a further supplementary question. Is there any way, then, in which replies to questions concerning the disposition of funds by this entity can be obtained?

Mr. Lamontagne: Mr. Speaker, I will always be very pleased to transmit the grievances or questions of hon. members to the Canada Council. As far as the members who want to direct questions to the Canada Council are concerned, they have an opportunity each year to do so when the Canada Council appears before the public accounts committee.

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I have a further supplementary question. In view of the apparent shortage of funds available to the Canada Council to carry on their very important duties in preparing for the centennial celebrations in various performing arts centres, is the government giving any consideration to a special grant to enable the council to carry out this responsibility?

Mr. Lamontagne: Mr. Speaker, I should like to remind the hon. gentleman that the Canada Council is not responsible for preparations in respect of the centennial celebrations. The centennial commission is re-

sponsible and is preparing very good projects indeed to celebrate that great event.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Speaker, I have another question.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Aiken: I thank the hon. gentlemen for obtaining order for me. Mr. Speaker, in view of the last response of the Secretary of State may I ask whether he has read the annual report of the Canada Council for 1963-64, and particularly page 12 wherein they state they feel it their responsibility to obtain competent actors and directors for the centennial celebrations, and complain about the shortage of funds? They have accepted this responsibility in their latest report to the minister himself.

Mr. Lamontagne: Mr. Speaker, the government, and I am sure also the centennial commission, will welcome the collaboration we will receive from the Canada Council in this respect.

FINANCE

REPORTED DISALLOWANCE OF INCREASES IN DEPARTMENTAL ESTIMATES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. W. Monteith (Perth): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the President of the Privy Council, in his capacity as chairman of the treasury board, whether special notices have been sent to most departments informing them that the increases in estimates originally planned or expected will not now be allowed, or will not come about; and is this a step preparatory to a tax reduction?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the hon. gentleman has forgotten all the knowledge he is assumed to have collected when he was an active privy councillor; because it is quite inappropriate for him to attempt to anticipate the budget address which presumably will come next spring.

Mr. Monteith: Mr. Speaker, is it inappropriate for me to request the minister to indicate, by simply saying yes or no to my question, whether special notices have been sent to most departments suggesting that the various increases in the department estimates would not now be allowed?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, that is a matter of cabinet business. It is quite a wrong statement in any event.

[Mr. Lamontagne.]

PUBLIC SERVICE

LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS IN ADVERTISEMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Maurice Côté (Chicoutimi): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Secretary of State. Has the civil service commission the right to ignore the present government's established policy concerning bilingualism in the civil service? I am referring especially to the poster dealing with competition No. 64875 for the position of legal officer (international law) which states that knowledge of English will be compulsory and that knowledge of French, while an asset, will not be necessary, even though French is one of the greatest international languages in the world.

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I will reply to the hon. member's question tomorrow.

[*Text*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF NEW ZEALAND OMBUDSMAN AND HIGH COMMISSIONER

Mr. D. S. Macdonald (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether I may call to your attention and that of the house the fact that we have just been joined in the Speaker's gallery by two distinguished visitors. I refer to Sir Guy Powles, the New Zealand parliamentary commissioner or ombudsman, who is accompanied by the New Zealand high commissioner, Mr. John Reid.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

CANADIAN FLAG

OFFICIAL ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW DESIGN

The house resumed, from Tuesday, September 1, consideration of the motion of Mr. Pearson:

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 the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Diefenbaker.

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Winch: Mr. Speaker, may I ask whether during the 19 days of this debate, the clerks have kept a record of all speakers and know whether they have spoken on the motion, the amendment or the subamendment, so we will know that a member is in order?

Mr. Speaker: I am glad the hon. member raised that question. I have checked the records. The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre is in order.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, first I should like to welcome back to the house the hon. member for Vancouver East and acknowledge his interest in this debate, to which he has apparently given no attention up to the present.

Mr. Winch: Mr. Speaker, the House of Commons assembled on February 18 and I have missed only nine days since that date. I have been here at all other times.

Mr. Churchill: Confession is good for the soul. I have missed two days this session. I hope the hon. member will participate in the debate, because I recall him saying that all he would have to do to be re-elected in the next election would be to march up and down carrying the red ensign in his hand. That is the support he has in his constituency, and he should so indicate to the house and declare himself by word of mouth and also by his vote.

When I was speaking last week I said it was my intention to discuss the plebiscite and to indicate why people should not give their support to the personal choice of the Prime Minister. I said I would give reasons why they should give their choice, if a plebiscite is held, to the Canadian red ensign. I had time to complete only about a third of what I wanted to say, and I welcome this opportunity to deliver the remainder of the speech I had prepared for that occasion.

This debate, which has gone on for a reasonable length of time, is serving a great deal of good so far as the country is concerned. No matter what the outcome is, the people of Canada will have a better knowledge of our history, our traditions and the meaning of national symbols than they ever had before, because our educational system has never had to deal with this particular problem. I have not been able to find in any of our Canadian history books any reference to Canada's flag, and in the 17 years I was engaged in the educational profession I never had occasion to draw attention to Canada's national flag because the issue never arose. In fact, throughout my lifetime the issue did not arise until I entered the federal political field. It was only then I became aware that there was a movement on foot in this country to take away the Canadian red ensign.

At that time, several years ago now, I thought it was not a really serious movement; but now in the year 1964 we discover that it is a serious movement, and people are attempting to take away from us something that we, as did our forefathers before us, have treasured all our lives.

In a series of articles in the Toronto *Star* this debate has been labelled "the great flag farce". It is not a farce at all. It is a serious matter. Thanks to the freedom enjoyed in this country, people who have been here one day or six weeks or a dozen years may comment upon our parliamentary institutions, tell us how they should be operated and give us advice as to what we are to do. They are free to comment on our history and our traditions in so far as they understand them; but those of us whose ancestral roots in this country go back 150 years, as mine do, and those whose ancestors were here 200 years ago or 400 years ago also have something to say with regard to our history and our traditions. Our opinion is entitled to be considered by those who are perhaps viewing our country for the first time.

That is why I say this debate is not a farce. It is a serious matter, and we on this side of the house in the Conservative party have been taking it seriously. The Prime Minister is quoted in the *Star* of August 31 as saying "Every good flag has to be born in a battle and this one is no exception". I will deal with that later. This is not a battle in the sense that any blood is going to be shed, except for cow's blood which comes down from the gallery sometimes, but it is a contest between opposing forces in our country; and thanks to our parliamentary system and freedom of speech we can express these differing points of view.

I noted in the remarks of the Minister of Transport yesterday that he said his party favoured a distinctive flag, and claimed that this was widely disseminated across the country during election campaigns. Not in Winnipeg; I can tell him that. I would have had no trouble at all in 1962 and 1963 in the city of Winnipeg had I been told by the Liberals that they were going to take away the Canadian red ensign or remove the jack from the

flag. They did not tell us that. They concealed that from the people. They will not be able to conceal it in the next election.

There has been talk about a distinctive flag, and I will just gloss over this very quickly because other people have mentioned it. You have only to go to the front of the west block and view the flags of the commonwealth displayed there in honour of the commonwealth educational conference to see that Canada's flag is distinctive and cannot be mistaken for any other flag. The same is true of the NATO nations. I have seen all the flags of the NATO nations. We have had them flying here on parliament hill. There is no possibility of mistaking Canada's flag for that of any other nation in that group; and the same is true of the United Nations.

I commend the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce for a display they have in the airport terminal at Toronto, opposite the newsstand. They have on display there 105 flags of the nations of the world, and I challenge anybody to prove that Canada's flag is not distinctive. It stands out there as clearly as half a dozen other distinctive flags. You do not have to look twice to see whether it is Canada's flag. I commend the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce for their public interest in putting these examples of flags on display for the benefit of the people.

I intend to speak about the long history of our flag. The evidence is quickly assembled. On page 593 of *Hansard* for October 1, 1945 you will find a reply by Mr. Ilsley to a question on the red ensign, and the second part of the answer reads as follows:

> The red ensign flew from the tower of the houses of parliament from the days of confederation until 1904.

You will find in *Hansard* for November 8, 1945, at page 1934 a statement by Hon. Ian Mackenzie, a minister of the crown, which reads as follows:

> Prior to 1867, the flag in general use was the union jack, which was flown in all the colonies. Upon the establishment of confederation, however, it was felt desirable to have a symbol of the new country that had been created, and this was achieved through the use of a flag made up of the British red ensign with the Canadian coat of arms in the fly, a flag which became known as the Canadian red ensign. The ensign was flown from all public buildings after 1867, and achieved quite general use. In a governor general's dispatch of December, 1891, on the question of the issuance of a formal warrant for the use of a flag on Canadian merchant vessels, Lord Stanley wrote:—

These are his words:

> Though no actual order has ever been issued the dominion government has encouraged by precept and example the use on all public buildings throughout the provinces of the red ensign with the Canadian badge in the "fly". I submit that the flag is one which has come to be considered as the recognized flag of the dominion both ashore and afloat, and on sentimental grounds I think there is much to be said for its retention.

We had further evidence given during the course of the debate. We have had statements and quotations from Mr. Mackenzie King, from Right Hon. Mr. St. Laurent. The hon. member for Calgary North drew our attention to an election poster used by Sir John A. Macdonald in 1891, showing the Canadian red ensign. The hon. member for Victoria (Ont.), drew our attention to the Fenian raid medal of 1866 showing the Canadian red ensign. It has been the accepted flag for Canada since confederation. It is disturbing to find people saying now that we have no distinctive Canadian flag. We have one, and we have had one for almost 100 years.

Now, I suggest that we should give serious consideration to the union jack in that Canadian red ensign in relation to the exploration and settlement of Canada and the significance of that flag to Canada. Sometimes it is overlooked that Canada is not just the two central provinces which are so prominent in the news. It is overlooked that Cabot came to Newfoundland in 1497; that in 1583 that island was annexed by Sir Humphrey Gilbert, and that for a period of from 381 to 467 years —you could say for over 400 years—Newfoundland has known nothing but the union jack.

With regard to Nova Scotia, it is overlooked that for 250 years since it was annexed in 1713, that province has known the union jack. Little mention is made of British Columbia. British Columbia had no connection with the other parts of Canada. It was explored and settled by people from the British isles. In 1778 Captain Cook was there, and in 1792 Captain Vancouver. In 1793 Alexander Mackenzie crossed into British Columbia by land. For almost 200 years, therefore, British Columbia has known no flag except the union jack or the Canadian red ensign.

Now, even more important is Manitoba and the prairie country of the west. In 1610 Henry Hudson sailed into Hudson bay and touched the shores of what is now the province of Manitoba. At that time there were only 2,000 people living in Quebec by the shores of the St. Lawrence. In 1612 Captain James Button was there with two ships, the *Resolution* and the *Discovery*, and remained there during the winter of 1612-13. In the next few years Captains Gibbons, Bylot and

Baffin sailed into Hudson bay and again touched those shores. James Munk in 1619, wintered at the mouth of the Churchill river. The flag of the country he represented was flown at that time. In 1631 Luke Foxe and in 1632 Thomas James wintered on the shore of James bay. In 1668 the *Nonsuch* carried back a cargo of furs with such results that the Hudson's Bay Company was formed in 1670 and sent two ships into that territory. On September 1, 1670, Governor Bayley formally took possession of that territory and the adjoining area for a company under the protection of Great Britain, and the union jack was flown there. The province of Manitoba, therefore, can claim a far longer association with the union jack than any other province of Canada with the sole exception of Newfoundland.

Mr. Pickersgill: I wonder if the hon. gentleman would permit me to ask him a factual question. Has the hon. gentleman forgotten that the union jack was only established in its present form in the year 1801, after union with Ireland?

Mr. Churchill: Yes, I am quite aware of that. After all, like the hon. member, my ancestors came from England. Originally they were reputed to be a Norman family but intermingled with Anglo-Saxons, and therefore enjoy some of the stolid characteristics of the Anglo-Saxons to which my hon. friend referred yesterday.

Mr. Nowlan: Any Irish in the background?

Mr. Churchill: There was an ameliorating influence of 200 years in Ireland and then my ancestors came out to Ontario to settle in the Huron tract when it was opened. I quite understand, therefore, that it was the union flag, the cross of St. George and St. Andrew, during the period of which I was speaking, and it was subsequently that the cross of St. Patrick was added. Permit me to call it the union flag or the union jack because I mean both; I mean the flag which represented those countries from which our ancestors came.

Still dealing with Manitoba and the west, I may say that in 1690 and 1691 Kelsey was at The Pas and he was the first white man to venture into the parklands and the grasslands of these areas. It was only for a 15-year period from 1697 to 1713 that the French controlled Hudson bay. By the treaty of Utrecht in 1713 it came back under British control, so for 350 years Manitoba and the west have known the union jack or the Canadian red ensign. This illustrates the importance of that flag to other parts of Canada.

Although I was born in one of the central provinces, I had the great fortune to move out west at a very early age before too much damage had resulted. I suggest there is more to the history of Canada than just the history of the two central provinces. When the Prime Minister says that every good flag has to be born in battle, I was reminded how true that was with regard to most national flags. Most national flags have had their origin in conflict and in bloodshed. It is for this reason most national flags are so highly treasured and respected.

I think one of the great omissions in our country is the way in which the military history of Canada is treated. We play it down all the time. In a very recent history of this country of over 500 pages there are six paragraphs devoted to the first and second world wars. These six paragraphs are devoted to two wars which changed the whole nature of our civilization, changed our lives and are affecting them today.

The military history of our country has been neglected, yet it is in this military history that you find the use of a flag. We do not know, as Canadians, enough about the threat to our country in 1776. We think it is not right to talk about what the United States tried to do to Canada because we may offend them, just as 100 years ago the fathers of confederation would have chosen the name "Kingdom of Canada" for this country but a weak-kneed colonial minister in England thought the Americans would be offended, so it was changed to the less offensive term "dominion."

There is nothing wrong in recalling our history of 1776 and the resistance of our people to the invaders from the south. Our existence is based largely on the fact that they were defeated, and they were defeated by the action of English and French standing together behind the bastions of Quebec. Is it wrong for us to recount the story of the conflict of 1812 and 1814? I do not hear much about it now. I heard about it when I was a schoolboy many years ago, but no one hears much about it now. It is something we should consider, because once again English, French and Indians standing together defended this country from a very serious invasion, and back of them stood the power of Great Britain.

We do not hear much about the Fenian raids in the 1860's; yet the fathers of confederation, when they were making their

plans in 1866 to complete their organization for confederation, had those plans seriously delayed and upset because of the threat of a Fenian invasion from the United States, and that Fenian invasion or threat did not receive the restraint from the government of the United States that it should have. We play all these things down.

We do not talk much about the uprising in the northwest in 1885. We hear very little about South Africa. There was no national recognition here in Ottawa with regard to the veterans of South Africa until two years ago, on the sixtieth anniversary of the peace that was signed, when we had the surviving South African veterans in the capital city. The first world war, the second world war and Korea are better known. Our activities in NATO and in the peace keeping operations of the United Nations are much better known, but in all of these the flag plays some part.

We overlook the fact that from 1763 to 1870, for over 100 years, Canada was kept inviolate from attacks from the south, and from threats from the south, by British regular troops stationed in Canada and Canadians enlisted in the British regular army and, in the distance, the protection of the British navy. We forget that the cost of all that was paid by the British taxpayer. Why don't we say something about what the British navy did for us in all those years, and under whose protection we rested, including the years 1914 to 1918, up to 1939 and 1945?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Churchill: Had it not been for British military forces we could not have survived or won in those two great world wars, and it was the union jack that represented British protection. In 1891 Sir John A. Macdonald said this:

> For a century and a half this country has grown and flourished under the protecting aegis of the British crown.
>
> Under the broad folds of the union jack we enjoy the most ample liberty to govern ourselves as we please.

That is how Canada began; that is how Canada was maintained; that is how British North America was established. It was under the ample, broad folds of the union jack and the might that was represented by it. Yet we have people saying to us nowadays, "Remove from your flag that jack in the corner." It represents our history. It represents the fact that we have an independent country.

[Mr. Churchill.]

Let me draw your attention to the importance of the union jack in the history of the world. In this debate we have heard people expressing their deep emotions concerning the flag. I do the same. I am presenting to you today my feelings with regard to our Canadian flag and that jack that is in the corner. I grant that, as with everyone, a person is affected by his experiences in life, and I grant that my experience in life has been largely influenced by warfare. It may be I take a different view of some of these problems from some of my friends, but the union jack to me represents something in the history of the world.

I recall, reading from history, what happened during the course of the Napoleonic wars when Britain, so frequently during that 20 year period, had to stand alone against a world conqueror. It was Nelson at Trafalgar and Wellington at Waterloo, with their supporters, who saved the day for us. But it was under what flag? It was under the union jack.

It is not difficult for me to remember the period of the first world war, 1914 to 1918, I know so well the experiences that our country went through then and the threat to our survival. People have forgotten that in 1917 we were almost throttled by the submarine menace. They have forgotten that in March, 1918 Haig sent us this message in the field: "Our backs are to the wall." And they were, and we were sent into action with orders to "hold your position to the last round and the last man." I well remember that occasion. The threat of world domination by Kaiser Wilhelm and imperial Germany was resisted for three full years by France and Britain, with some assistance from Italy; but they virtually stood alone against that threat, and it was some time before American assistance reached us in 1918. Millions of casualties had occurred before that time.

I think of the union jack with regard to the last world war. In the period from May, 1940, when France fell, until the invasion of Russia in June, 1941, what countries stood against that menace? What countries resisted the world conqueror? Think of it. It was the British commonwealth.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Churchill: It was the British commonwealth standing alone for one year. Under what flag? The union jack, the flag of Australia, the flag of New Zealand, the flag of South Africa and the flag of Canada, each of them containing the union jack in its fold;

and it was another six months before the United States came to our assistance.

What does that union jack mean with regard to the history of the world? What flags had disappeared? The flag of Czechoslovakia, the flag of Austria, the flag of Poland, the flag of Norway, the flag of Holland, the flag of Belgium, the flag of Luxemburg and the flag of France were gone, succeeded by the crooked cross of Hitler; and it was under that flag that western Europe lay prostrate.

There may be some members in the house who had the experience of liberating villages and towns at the conclusion of the war. It is something you never forget, the excitement of the people and their joy at being set free. I saw this in 1918 in Belgium and France, and again in 1945 in Belgium, France and Holland. After the first exuberance is over, what happens? The flag of the conqueror is torn down, taken to the market square and burnt or otherwise destroyed. Then, out comes the flag of the country. Out comes the flag of France, or of Belgium, or of Holland, and people wave it as they welcome the liberating troops. These are experiences which no one who has seen them can ever forget. This is what a flag means to people—a flag borne in battle. And our flag has been borne in battle.

The flag of the United States means a great deal to the people of that country. We are all admirers of the freedom, the justice and the liberty which result from the activities of that great neighbour of ours. What do the people of the United States say when they take the oath of allegiance, the pledge to the flag?

> I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

I wish we had some pledge like that here in Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Churchill: To me, the Canadian red ensign means as much as does the stars and stripes to any inhabitant of the United States of America.

We have fought shoulder to shoulder with men of other countries. I can say, as a machine gunner in the first world war, and just a corporal, a member of my team came from French Canada. And in the second world war, when I had the opportunity of commanding a regiment, I had under my command people from French Canada and from the various other races which make up the Canadian population. There was no distinction; we stood shoulder to shoulder. In the first world war when the troops of the British commonwealth were coming to the aid of France, *Le Temps* or the *Times* of Paris penned these words on October 27, regarding the arrival of troops from the commonwealth. This is what it said:

> Today what a remarkable development in history. The Indian troops are in France, the Canadians are coming. They will come under the British flag, and that will not cause any bitterness amongst us. For they come to defend France as well as England. The blood of English Canadians will flow for France; French Canadians will shed blood for England. And among those who fall, none will know whether he dies for the motherland of yesterday or that of today, for the two former rivals are closely united to protect the liberty of the world. There is, perhaps, no better lesson, no brighter chapter in the history of civilized peoples than this final reconciliation after ancient wars. It was prepared by the equal and parallel development of two liberal civilizations.

This sums up my feeling with regard to the flag. This is why I hope and pray that the symbol of the union jack in the red ensign will be maintained in any flag which may be suggested or approved in this country in the future. I cannot do less than express, as we have been invited to do, my own feelings with regard to this matter and I hope I am also expressing the feeling of my constituents in the city of Winnipeg. The letters they write to me say these things. But this is how I feel, myself, and by this I stand.

I hope that as this debate continues, or when it reaches a conclusion, there will be a meeting of minds with regard to this issue. Let us continue shoulder to shoulder in days of peace as we did in war. We can have our political differences, but these are pretty largely on the surface until the emotions of the people are touched. In this particular question, the emotions of the people have been touched and serious harm may result unless we are very careful. But I have expressed my point of view and I hope the Prime Minister will take a second look at this problem and recognize the feelings of those people in Canada who have a regard for their history and their traditions and who see in the Canadian red ensign something of that history and of those traditions, and who have respect for the jack in the corner because it represents so much in the history of the world—justice, liberty, freedom, parliamentary institutions. This is part of the heritage we have derived from our ancestors, the ancestors of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) and myself, on whose necks was placed the heel of the Norman conqueror. But we survived. We intermarried with them and we subdued them, and we have progressed to be one of the

great colonizing races of the earth and one which has brought freedom and liberty to mankind.

Mr. Speaker, that concludes my expression of opinion with regard to the flag question. I have now to propose, seconded by my hon. friend from Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert):

> That the amendment be amended by adding thereto:
>
> "and that in conducting such a plebiscite, provision be made, *inter alia*, in the interests of national unity that the results be published on a national basis only and not by regions or provinces."

I will leave it to others to develop the thought which is contained within that subamendment. But our hope is that if a plebiscite is decided upon, that plebiscite in itself will not be used to create in any way disunity in this country but that, as a result of the method by which the plebiscite is conducted, unity will be preserved. It is with this thought in mind that I present the subamendment to the house.

Mr. Pickersgill: I am rising to speak very briefly on a point of order and I hope I can do so in a non-controversial way.

The hon. gentleman has moved a second subamendment. Your Honour made a decision with respect to the first subamendment which has been honoured mainly in the breach by all speakers, including myself. I might be allowed to say that the speech of the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat found much more favour in my eyes than have some to which I have listened because he did do as I suggested, yesterday—he spoke about his own views and did not in any way attempt to depreciate those of others.

I would hope that now, if, as the right hon. gentleman said yesterday, we are seeking to have a debate—and there is no thought or element of obstruction in this—that we will, in debating this subamendment, obey the rules of the house.

Mr. Skoreyko: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

Mr. Pickersgill: This is a point of order.

Mr. Skoreyko: On the same point of order, just to correct the impression left on the house by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill), does he not remember that the first man in this house to transgress the rules was the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp), and then everyone else followed suit?

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, can I go further than to blame myself? That I did.

[Mr. Churchill.]

Mr. Pugh: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, it seems to me there are a number of members who have not put forward their views on the flag. All who have not spoken so far would want to speak for their constituents and for themselves, and it seems to me that the sum total of their thoughts on the flag should be made available to the house and that they should not be curtailed in any way. In much the same way as the debate on the speech from the throne, I feel that suddenly in the middle of this debate it would be wrong to start curtailing speeches. If precedent is required, I do not believe that the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp) should be singled out. It would seem to me that almost every speaker who has spoken in this debate so far has had the fullest leniency with regard to what he wishes to say. It seems to me that Your Honour must rule that the debate will continue within reasonable bounds. If we were to limit it at this stage I believe it would be wrong, and particularly wrong as far as those who have not yet had an opportunity to speak are concerned.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I would underline the fact that I was not asking Your Honour to make any ruling whatsoever. I was just raising the point and I did not express any view that the Chair should take any particular attitude. I merely suggested a little self-restraint on the part of hon. members. I think the hon. member for Okanagan Boundary (Mr. Pugh) has said something which makes a lot of sense. If the debate is kept within reasonable bounds, and if those speakers who have not yet spoken, wish to put all their speeches together in one place, I think that would be highly acceptable to the house.

Mr. Speaker: I do not want to prolong this debate but the Chair has acted on this general principle, which seems to me right and proper and which I could perhaps restate. Beauchesne's fourth edition, 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. 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.

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. On the other hand, I do count on the co-operation of members to be as relevant as possible.

Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent, Ont.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this subamendment. Before I begin the subject material of my discourse I should like to pay special tribute to the previous speaker, the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill). He is a man who all of us in this house will recognize spoke from the heart, a man who merited this privilege, and who pointed out in no uncertain terms that we have in Canada a heritage of which we can be justly proud, regardless of our political faith.

There is one sentence in the subamendment just proposed particularly important to me and to those I represent. It deals with national unity. In the area where I come from in southwestern Ontario this is of particular interest owing to the peculiar aspect of our geographical location. Perhaps hon. members are not aware that in my area at least nine tenths of the television programs, three quarters of the radio programs and at least three quarters of the newspapers and periodicals originate from United States and its activities political and economic have a distinct bearing and leave their mark on the area I represent.

We are particularly flag conscious and have always been so. I have been trying to determine why this is and I think it is because for many years there has been a very welcome influx into this area of tourists from the United States who take advantage, especially in the summertime, of our many resorts and summer playgrounds. When these tourists come in they bear, either on their cars or on their boats, the flag of the United States of America. When they go to their cottages in Canada, on their flagpoles flies this flag of which they are so very proud and have every reason to be proud. These people exhibit a courtesy that is an example to all nations. Very seldom do they erect in front of their cottages the flag of their nation without unfurling with equal prominence the red ensign of Canada. This to me shows with what respect these visitors to Canada view our national symbol.

This has an effect, Mr. Speaker, on the people in my area. We see the respect held by these visitors from the United States for the flag of Canada. We also try to emulate them in this regard. We too, whenever possible, display the red ensign of Canada; and when we take advantage of going to their beautiful country to the north of us in the state of Michigan and take advantage of their hospitality, we display in no uncertain terms the red ensign of Canada and are also very careful indeed to repeat the courtesy shown to us and to pay equal respect to the flag of their nation.

The people in my area are very conscious of flags that affect them in other ways. It does the heart good to visit the various agricultural fairs in the area, where one of the highlights is the school parade of students from the various schools, who parade down the main street following the band and their drum majors. Without fail every school bears on its standard, and bears proudly, the red ensign, Canada's flag. Also peculiar I think to our area are the many roadside stands where the high quality fruits and vegetables grown locally are displayed for sale to the tourists and local people. Sir, invariably displayed in the stands is one or more red ensigns. Also displayed are red ensigns by the hundreds for sale as souvenirs, and they are eagerly purchased by visitors and tourists travelling through this area. This little red ensign represents the courtesy and hospitality displayed to those tourists and visitors in this great Canada of ours.

Sir, that area is 500 miles from Ottawa. We do not receive daily broadcasts in detail of the happenings here in parliament. We do not hear the daily commentators discussing the pros and cons of the actions taken by parliament. The every day actions in parliament do not make the headlines or front pages of every newspaper in this area. The people, because of that fact, and because their television broadcasts are mainly of United States origin, are perhaps not as quick to sense the ebbs and flows of feelings generated by debate in this house.

I never make a practice of putting letters or newspaper clippings on *Hansard*, but I should like to beg the indulgence of this house to make one exception. We in southwestern Ontario are ordinary people. I have here a letter written by an ordinary man, and I think this reflects the deep feelings of the people in that area. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I should like to read that portion of it which states:

> There are many problems that this country faces and we know that one man just cannot solve them all, and we wonder just what the individual can do to help solve them. I realize that it doesn't

do any good to sit home and beef and the only other way I know of to do something is to write to my member of parliament and let him know what at least one person thinks.

He then goes on to state—and this is the part I am very proud of:

I am, like a lot of people, short on the history and background but my wife and I are both veterans and this is the flag we served under. I understand that the Canadian Legion is backing this flag, and who has a better right to make the choice.

Mr. Speaker, please mark this portion:

As far as I am concerned I am not a fanatic about good old England or good old France or good old any other country, but what is mine and my country's I don't want changed when it will serve no useful purpose. Our lives are full of changes, our jobs change, our way of living changes, people change, religion changes but one thing must remain the same and that is our unity. All around the world there is a mighty struggle for something called freedom but there is no such thing until people learn that united they stand divided they fall, give a little, take a little. Yes, I would be disappointed to see our red ensign disappear and a totally different flag wave over our country but if that is what the majority of Canadians wanted I would be the one to support it.

Sir, if there is anything that would make me want to support and fight for a plebiscite it is sentiment expressed from the heart such as in this letter. This country is indeed fortunate to have ordinary citizens, with a love of human dignity in their hearts, who will write such letters as this. Mr. Speaker, I was more than proud to receive it and repeat it in this House of Commons.

Because of the number of days that this debate has continued the people in this country, and in that area I represent, are beginning to sift the wheat from the chaff in their assessment of the basic principles we are discussing here in this house. They are beginning to get over the emotional shock that the action taken by this government created. They are beginning to assess coldly the pros and cons and formulate their own opinions. The one thing I have noticed is the way in which the editors of the various newspapers in that area are taking a very keen interest in the procedings of this house. Without exception they are putting down in black and white the thoughts, as near as they can, of the people with whom they are coming in contact day by day, the people they serve and the people to whom they broadcast the news as honestly and factually as they can.

Sir, the tenor of their writings is in this vein. Nothing is as important to this country today as its national unity. Anything sir, that tends to drive a wedge into any segment of this country should be discouraged, should be frowned upon, should be blocked and should be fought at every opportunity. That is what we in the Conservative party feel we are doing at this time. We are confident that our action is directed towards preserving the unity of this country, and I say this with very deep conviction.

We in our party have requested that the government refer this matter to the people of Canada in the form of a plebiscite. We feel under the circumstances that this is the only way the people of Canada will have an opportunity to express their own personal views. We also feel that this is the only way this country and government will ever determine what is the wish of the majority of Canadians.

Many polls have been conducted, including newspaper polls, Gallup polls and polls by members of parliament. We have had opinions expressed, directed and influenced by bodies, pro and con, but I still fail to see how anyone can stand up in this House of Commons today and say that we know what the majority of Canadians prefer. We do not know that. We have no idea in that regard. That is why this party is putting this proposition to the government. Let us try to assess what the majority of the people in this country want. Let us find out for once and for all what the preference is.

Mr. Speaker, we are all Canadians and we do not want disunity. We want national unity as we have never wanted it before. We are now approaching the 100th anniversary of confederation. This issue must be settled, and I am very confident that the government itself, on calm reflection, would not want to force a flag on this country today, if they were sure the majority of the people did not want it. They are Canadians too; they are Canadians first; and I am certain they do not wish to take such action.

This country today wants a distinctive flag. This is not the question. We all want a distinctive flag. The problem facing Canada today is, what goes on this distinctive flag? How do we create this distinctive flag? It is the opinion of the people I represent that never in the life of this country will we by partisan politics evolve a flag that will be suitable to fly on our flagpoles. We must have a flag that is not manufactured, a flag that is not sold, a flag that is not plucked out of the air because it has a pleasing design. We must have a flag that means something to the majority of Canadians and it cannot be evolved in this fashion. It can-

not be sold to the people by a slogan. It cannot be sold to the people by bumper stickers and other methods. It has to provide something that the people of this country themselves want.

This is why we are asking for a plebiscite. Let the people decide. Never will we have unity in this country if there is a large segment of Canadian citizens anywhere who do not feel that the flag flying on the flagpole is their flag. Minority or majority, we cannot have this division of opinion. Certainly we want a distinctive flag for Canada, but we want a flag for Canada that means something in the world, a flag which the Canadian people will be proud to stand and salute.

I am sure the ordinary people of Canada are watching parliament closely. I am not certain that they care very much whether we debate this matter for two days, 20 days or 50 days. They do not care. What they want us to do is to produce results and this is what we are going to do. We are going to let the people decide, and when we are sure we have something that the majority of the people of the country want, parliament will then be proud of its action. But let us not sit here in deliberation and force on the people a flag which it is already apparent many people are dead set against. If we do such a thing, if we commit such a blunder we will have national disunity in this country such as we have never seen before. In the troubled state of the world today Canada can ill afford such disunity or the risk of such disunity becoming permanent. Harmony is what we want and need. We need harmony, and the only way we can have harmony is to make sure that the people are satisfied. I fail to see how we can have such harmony without letting the people have the opportunity to express their view.

The subamendment deals with the method of a plebiscite. We are all aware that in various parts of Canada there are differing strong feelings. In one part of Canada people want the red ensign. In another part of Canada people want no part of the red ensign. Still another segment wants a compromise of both designs. How are we to know? When we have a plebiscite we do not want to know that province X had a great majority for one proposed design. We do not want to know that province Y had a great majority for another proposed design. This is disunity. The only thing we want to know is, what do the majority of Canadians want in a distinctive Canadian flag? That is why I make no apology for standing in the House of Commons today and pointing this out to the government. That is why I am speaking on this issue. I am confident that the only way we will achieve the unity that is necessary is by letting the people decide. Let the people decide.

It has taken a long time for the people removed from the political battles of Ottawa to get the picture. We cannot fool the people of Canada. Sometimes news takes a long time to reach them but they finally get the picture. They understand the situation. They know what is going on, and this is as it should be. Never before have the people made their wishes known to me as their representative to the extent they are doing today. We are not dealing with millions of dollars or billions of dollars, the size of which they cannot even imagine. They have never seen a billion dollars piled up. They do not know how big it is, how broad it is, how high it is, how deep it is. But when you talk about the flag they know what that is.

I cannot understand the psychology behind the action of the government in saying to the people of Canada: Even though this red ensign has been your flag, down it comes, you cannot have it; this new three leaf design is going to be your flag. You cannot even treat little children that way. We all know that the best way to make a child or adult want something is to try to take it away from him by force. This will never work. Let us have a plebiscite. Let the people of Canada decide. The people are capable of doing so; they now know the facts. They have their minds made up and they have the ability to express their views. Let us not wait for an election. Let us remove this question from party politics; it does not belong there. It should never have been put there but somewhere a cardinal blunder was made.

In Canada today we have a very grievous problem. We are all aware of it; we know this is a fact. But, sir, let us hope that this government and this parliament will take such action now that the people of Canada now living and those of future generations will be able to look back and say of us: They were statesmen, they were men who believed in Canada and believed in national unity as no other parliament did since confederation.

Mr. William Skoreyko (Edmonton East): Mr. Speaker, I rise again to participate in this debate, this time of course on the new subamendment, and I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I intend to be as relevant as

the rules require. I am very pleased to see the loquacious Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Hays) in the house, that part time minister, that part time auctioneer, that expert on sillabub, and I hope that some time this afternoon he will rise in his place and make his contribution to this debate. I am a little disappointed, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Godin) is not in his seat because, like the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), he has adopted a new role as the second Speaker of this House of Commons, or the second master of the rules.

In the light of the wording of the new subamendment, I should like to dwell for the next few minutes on the word "unity". I realize that the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) is a very busy man indeed, and I know that this week he is away attending a conference in Charlottetown. However I have attended the sittings of this house since this debate began some 18 or 19 days ago and I have been a bit disappointed at the amount of time the Prime Minister has spent in this house. The reason for my disappointment is the fact that the resolution under discussion at the moment is in the Prime Minister's name. Certainly the same could not be said of the former prime minister, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker), who spends a great deal of time in the house. I believe all hon. members will agree he is sincerely interested in bringing this matter to a satisfactory conclusion as soon as possible.

Last night, Mr. Speaker, we disposed of the previous subamendment which dealt with the four questions proposed by the hon. member for Regina City (Mr. More). I regret that the vote on that subamendment was not more favourable to the stand of our party, but at least we know where those who have not spoken on this question now stand. The subamendment that was moved today by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) calls for the results of the plebiscite to be published on a national rather than a regional basis. The reason given for this is unity. I agree wholeheartedly with the subamendment. Later in my remarks I will point out why I am in agreement with it.

In the meantime, let me refer to the remarks made by certain ministers of the crown with reference to the problem of getting certain sections of this country to change their attitude towards the province of Quebec, and how the province of Quebec could change its attitude towards the rest of Canada. I say this because the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp) said in this house that the adoption of a flag would be a plum to a troublesome minority. I do not believe the Minister of Trade and Commerce had any right to make such a statement in this house. He used those words and it is of concern to us that certain sections of this country feel this is precisely what this government is doing. The term "massive concessions" to the province of Quebec has been used by many of the western Liberal newspapers. It is this kind of thinking that we have to dispel as soon as possible. It is bad, and it is not true. I do not believe the flag is a concession to Quebec any more than it is a concession to the province of Alberta from which I come. It is this sort of attitude that must be dispelled immediately. The only way that this feeling can be dispelled, I suggest, is through a plebiscite. If I may go further in that regard, Mr. Speaker, the results of that plebiscite should be published on a national basis. If we were to publish the total number of those who were for or against any flag, we would completely dispel this feeling at the constituency level. It would not be known and would not be referred to.

The subamendment uses the words "in the interests of national unity". Those are nice words, Mr. Speaker, and this afternoon I want to deal with unity. The unity with which I am primarily concerned is the unity of all the people of this country no matter from what part of Canada they come. When I talk about unity in a political party I cannot help but be reminded of a speech made in this house not long ago by the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan). He claimed he was a good Liberal and someone interrupted by saying he was the only good Liberal. The hon. member said that his caucus did not see the design for the tri maple leaf flag until *Votes and Proceedings* had been published on May 27. Why was this done by the Prime Minister? Why did the Prime Minister not consult with his colleagues in the caucus? Why should he put himself in the position of having the hon. member for York-Humber recognized by the Chair and then have the hon. member say that the members of the party were not consulted in the caucus and that they were informed of the action taken by the Prime Minister at the same time as the opposition? I am not saying there is anything wrong with that, but the hon. member for York-Humber says he feels he has a special place in the Liberal party. He feels he should have

been consulted and he was not. This does not make for unity within a political party.

Then I may say that not too long ago the Edmonton *Journal* carried an article in relation to this question under the headline "M.P.'s wonder how free a vote on flag choice can be". We are talking about unity, and I will deal with that a little later. However, the Prime Minister certainly did a lot to unite the Liberal party. One day he told them there would be a free vote on the issue. They were told there would be no question of confidence involved; it would not be a matter of the government standing or falling on the decision. Then later he said the government would stand or fall on the result of the free vote. Last night we had the example of a free vote. Those who spoke against the resolution were absent. I am not saying they were out of Ottawa; they were not in the House of Commons. Is that a free vote, Mr. Speaker?

The Conservative party members were in the house, however, and voted as their consciences dictated. I suppose the newspapers across the country will say that the Conservative party is split. Here is a headline in one newspaper just handed to me by my colleague from Okanagan Boundary, "Quebec P.C.'s Split Ranks in Vote". There is no such splitting of ranks. The leader of our party said its members could vote as their consciences dictated. Some of our members could well have stayed out of the house last night, as did some of the members on the other side to save embarrassing the Prime Minister, but they did not. This is what unity means in a political party.

Returning to the article I was referring to a moment ago, headed, "M.P.'s Wondering How Free Vote on Flag Choice Can Be", I wish to quote one little paragraph:

> Around parliamentary corridors there was some grumbling about the strings Mr. Pearson has attached to the so-called free flag vote. All M.P.'s —including certainly the Liberals—are keenly aware that another general election can come at any time. In their concern about this they recognize that while they may not be "read out of the party," they will have to seek re-election and need the backing, financial and otherwise, of party headquarters in the campaign.

What does this mean. I do not want to suggest the Prime Minister would do this, but there are ministers of the crown who are capable of approaching members of the Liberal party and suggesting to them that if they took an opposing stand to the government they would not be "read out" of the party but they could not obtain financial and party support when the next election comes. To me this is certainly not a free vote.

The subamendment refers to the interests of unity, and in that connection I would refer to unity in the services. What about all those servicemen who have made representations to the government and to private members, appealing to them to do what they can to save the red ensign? The Prime Minister went to Winnipeg and told the legionnaires they could not have it, that they were going to be stuck with three maple leaves, that he was going to give them this flag whether they wanted it or not. Is this creating a sense of unity in the armed services? I suggest it is not.

A good friend of mine in the city of Edmonton, in a recent sermon delivered in the United church, used these words:

> Do you wonder that our veterans love the red ensign? After all, they are the ones who learned the hard way what sacrifice and suffering on behalf of others really means. Extract this idea from the armed forces and you extract their strength, their pride, their glory and their effectiveness. But Mr. Pearson says this must go.

You can see, Mr. Speaker, what lack of unity can do to the armed forces, to those who have served in them in the past and those who are presently serving in them. No doubt they wonder what the government's next move will be to disunite them further.

Not making any mention of the tri-service or the statements made by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Hellyer) about the millions of dollars he is going to save—and that has nothing to do with this debate—I simply say that his attitude and that of the Prime Minister with respect to the flag have done as much to disunite the armed forces as any step taken by any government in the history of our country.

When I think of the letter from the Reverend Chubb containing a request that the members of this house look at the discarding of the red ensign very carefully, not only has it shown that disunity has been created in the Liberal party but it has shown that the same thing has happened in the armed forces, and it has shown representatives of religious bodies of this country feel as strongly as those of the armed forces.

One cannot help but think of some of the statements made both inside and outside the house by responsible cabinet ministers, with reference to the flag question. In my opinion a flag that embodies a religious cross in its design serves to unite people, if through no other means than the medium of religion. The new flag does not have a religious cross in it.

What is so surprising about the proposed flag, and I mentioned this in one of my other speeches, is the fact that when the question was posed to one of the ministers of the crown, as to what the three maple leaves stood for, his answer was one that I think would serve to disunite Canada quicker than any other reply he might have made. This is a quotation from a Calgary newspaper:

> Justice Minister Guy Favreau said Tuesday he believes French Canadians will support a national flag bearing a symbol such as the maple leaf.
>
> He told a press conference Quebec residents do not want a symbol such as the fleur-de-lis, representing French history, any more than they want a symbol depicting Canada's British heritage.
>
> He said his feelings and those of Prime Minister Pearson are Canada's flag should "refrain as far as possible from telling the story of any particular part of Canada."
>
> The Quebec member of parliament was here to address a public meeting.
>
> The maple leaf, he said, would be a proper symbol.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it may have been, but he was pressed a little further the following day in Vancouver, when somebody asked him, "Just what did you mean when you said that no particular reference should be made to any part of Canada in the flag?" This is what a newspaper report gave as his answer:

> He said that the simple, three maple leaf design favoured by Prime Minister Pearson was "very indicative of the three groups that form Canada."

He said one leaf could well represent the British heritage, the second, the French heritage and the third the heritage of all Canadians of other ancestry. Yet a day earlier he had said that Canada's flag should refrain as far as possible from telling the story of any particular part of Canada or any particular group. The Minister of Justice may have been a little confused but I wonder how many people who have their origin in countries other than Britain or France have written to compliment him for making such a statement. The question which arises in my mind is this: You are a French Canadian, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I am of Ukrainian origin; which one of the maple leaves on that flag belongs to either one of us? If the Prime Minister had stood up in this house and said this is precisely what these three leaves represent, I would be the first to resume my seat to the end that this matter might be disposed of. But I am not very happy about splitting Canada into three ethnic areas, the French, the English, and then all the others as if they did not matter. The hon. gentleman did not have the courtesy to name the various countries, from which these others came, to make up this great country of ours.

[Mr. Skoreyko.]

Then, to add further to our disunity, an article appeared in the Ottawa *Citizen* not too long ago under the heading "Government Hunts New Design for Flag". I will refer to it shortly. First, they tried to unite Canada with a three maple leaf design which only served to disunite the country further—if we agree that Canada was disunited at any time, and I am not sure it was.

Hon. members will recall we were promised a free vote on the flag issue. We were told that no matter how it turned out, the vote would not be considered a vote of confidence. Then we were told there would be no free vote; that the issue would be treated as a vote of confidence and that if the government lost it would fall. Again, we were told later on that there would be a free vote after all. Hon. members will recall, too, the discussion of the two-flag resolution and of the resolution dealing with the two national anthems. If you will forgive me, Mr. Speaker, there was an unprecedented ruling to split the resolution on the flags. I can foresee that when this question now before us is settled we shall be back immediately debating the pros and cons of a second Canadian flag. Will you tell me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as a Canadian, if really, deep down in your heart, you feel we need two flags in Canada? I suggest it is the last thing we need. If we are to be Canadians united in one Canada, is it not logical that we should have one flag showing our allegiance to the commonwealth and showing our connection with France, if you will, embodied in one design? This could very easily be done with the present red ensign. Canadians united in one country do not need two national flags any more than they need two national anthems.

The splitting of the resolution only served to confuse matters further. Newspapers across the country have criticized not only the opposition but the government, because some 19 days have been spent debating the flag question. I wonder how some of these newspaper writers will feel after the debate has taken place on three more resolutions which will probably be put before us—the second resolution dealing with the second flag and the others, now in one resolution which will probably be split again so that we may have separate discussions, on the two national anthems for Canada. If they think we are in difficulty now, let me tell them I can see a lot more choppy, muddy water ahead.

Last night, I say, we had this free vote—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Would the hon. member kindly resume his seat? I did not wish to interrupt the hon. member; I was following his speech with interest. But a while ago he said he would make some comments about the vote which took place last night. I know he is familiar with the provisions of standing order 35 which forbids hon. members to reflect on a vote in the house, and I am sure he will have this in mind when he refers to what took place last night.

Mr. Skoreyko: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I apologize if I have in any way transgressed the rule. I wanted to point out what disunity will do not only to a political party but to the people of this country if the attitude of the Prime Minister does not change very quickly. I had hoped that when this debate on the flag question was drawing to a close there might be a degree of agreement expressed by the people who correspond with me almost daily. Some two months ago, they said: I will not accept anything but a union jack, or, I will not accept anything but a red ensign. They have written to me subsequently and said: Well, the debate has gone on and on, please do something to get this question settled and get on with the other business of the House of Commons. So I wrote back to say I had done my part; I had spoken in the house and expressed my point of view as well as theirs, and I was hopeful that some compromise could be reached in the very near future. I wonder what thoughts passed through the minds of some people who were hoping for a reasonably acceptable solution in the course of the next few days or weeks when they say this article in the *Citizen*, to which I shall refer later in greater detail. After 19 days of controversy over the flag the government now say they are looking for a new design. The article to which I refer is dated August 27 and the Minister of Transport when he spoke yesterday did not deny what the article said. Do you not agree, Mr. Speaker, that one of the ministers of the crown should rise in his place this afternoon, lay the matter squarely before this House of Commons and let us know precisely what their attitude is?

The Prime Minister on a number of occasions said there would be no free vote, that it would be treated as a non-confidence motion. Subsequently he changed his mind five times; at least that is my count, it may be one more or one less. What do the people of Canada today think when, on picking up the newspaper, they read "Government hunts new design for flag"? Does it mean that a man sitting in his front room tonight reading his newspaper will for the next 19 days after this debate is concluded have to listen to the same thing? Every time one turns on the radio the news is about parliament and the flag. The people of Canada are tired of the flag and will be as tired of it in the next month or two as they are of general elections. I suggest that if there is any truth to the rumour that there is a second design, then someone on the front benches of the government should stand up and say so. If it is the case then let us suspend this debate now. There is no point in going on with it. Let us bring in some legislation. The pension plan has to be dealt with, and the government intends to deal with it. Then they can bring in a new design and we can see what it looks like. Or has the government made up its mind that eventually an opportunity will be given to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) to rise in his place at the opportune time and move that the government adopt a single maple leaf flag? I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, if that is the course of action the government is contemplating, that I will be prepared to make four or five more speeches on the single maple leaf flag.

In conclusion, if the rule of national unity has some meaning to the government I suggest that expressions like "troublesome minorities" and "massive concessions" never be used again in this house. Every time a member of this house uses that kind of language it serves only to put a little more fuel on the fire.

I was going to make reference to an article dated August 22, 1964 by Mr. Charles Lynch of Southam news services entitled "A nightmare in diplomacy". This article is relevant to the subject before us and deals precisely with the matters I have dealt with during the course of my remarks. It commences in this way:

> The Pearson government's stand on the new flag started to soften almost from the moment that the Prime Minister unveiled the three maple leaf design—and today it appears distinctly mushy.
>
> Instead of becoming in any real sense our national emblem, the three leaf flag seems to be receding to the status of just another design, which may or may not come before an all-party committee of parliament.

It was our hope in this party that the government could offer some reasonable solution to the problem by way of a committee. Instead the Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau) had the audacity to come before this house and tell us that he was willing to accept a compromise which would leave Mondays

open for government business and force the opposition to sit in the house from eight o'clock in the morning until midnight. This is supposed to be, in the words of the Minister of Justice, a reasonable compromise. Those words mean only one thing to me, Mr. Speaker, and that is that the Minister of Justice, on instructions from someone, was not interested in finding a reasonable solution to the problem.

The article goes on:

> Government by diplomacy and compromise.
>
> It is sad because it represents one more bit of evidence of Mr. Pearson's determination to govern by diplomacy and compromise—those admirable qualities that more than any other have served to weaken his ministry.
>
> To me, Mr. Pearson's decisiveness in producing the three leaf flag, as a focal point around which new flag sentiment could rally, was admirable. In decisive fashion, he made it clear that this was the new flag and that the government would stand or fall on it. Now was the time for all good Canadians to rally round.

I do not need to tell you, Mr. Speaker, how they rallied round. The hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) practically bolted from his party, although I see he is now back in again. This article continues:

> In the subsequent confusion, the Prime Minister seemed to be saying that he would stake the life of his government on the adoption of the union jack, in its Queen and commonwealth context.

If that is his attitude and if he is determined to have a Canadian flag embodied in a Queen and commonwealth context, then for heaven's sake what is wrong with the plea which some 80 Conservatives have made in this House of Commons with regard to modifying the red ensign. In it you have all those things which the people across Canada seem to want. But the Prime Minister says no, it will not be the red ensign; it is going to be the three maple leaf flag—one leaf for the French, one leaf for the English and the other for all the others who do not matter.

I see my time is drawing to a close but I want to make reference to two western newspapers which are Liberal supporters. Both of them during the early stages of the debate indicated that they could not support the three maple leaf flag because it represented nothing of any meaning to them. Then weeks later after considerable heart searching they found that perhaps if this was what the Prime Minister wanted they would go along with it, although they regretted seeing the red ensign trampled into the dirt. Its most recent editorial adopts the line that we should get it over with. The *Albertan* says that there is deadlock and that the bones are bare. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, what both of these newspapers contend? They contend that if ever there was justification for closure this is it, the government's diffidence notwithstanding. Parliament, after all, is the ultimate place for decisions to be made on proposals advanced by the government.

Mr. Speaker, there is no point in my reminding you that this is a newspaper in the city of Edmonton which favours the Liberal party. This kind of attitude on the part of a newspaper in this country, knowing what the results were of using closure in 1956, is nothing short of disgusting.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Ouellet (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, 2,000 years ago we had a promise of peace on earth and goodwill unto men. Alas, when I consider daily events affecting mankind, do you think, hon. members, I would dare to say that this message from heaven has received enough consideration to provide for the people of the earth the quietness and the stability desirable for the accomplishment of man's natural destiny? Has Canada, this great, rich and young country, reached that degree of Christian civilization desired and visioned by the pioneers of our two main national groups which represent the majority of the Canadian people?

Those of you who know me are aware that I am a farmer concerned about carrying out faithfully the duties of my profession and vocation. They also recognize that I dedicated my life to the protection, the defence and the safeguard of the interests of the farmers. I bear proudly in my heart the flag of farming unionism, mutualism and co-operation. And that is why I want to say here, in passing, that never, since the administration of Intendant Bigot, were the farmers, and especially the settlers, placed in a position as distressing as the one they are in today.

Those noble flags that were our family farms in eastern Canada and especially in the lower St. Lawrence region, are now being replaced by community pastures, and I am sorry to see that serious people consider it as a permanent and imperative solution.

As regards the flag of Canada, which has been the main issue lately, the remarks made by certain hon. members lead me to believe that moderation in our general behaviour might soon be a thing of the past.

Do you believe that I am ready today to give up the affection I feel for the Canadians

in my group? Do you believe also that I refuse to respect actively English speaking Canadians? Not at all.

Tomorrow like yesterday and today, I want to bear witness in support of those who call to the attention of this parliament the need for the flag to represent faithfully our common origins.

I have listened to and read carefully the speeches made in the house and the press reports intended for the information of the public. After serious consideration, I wish to announce that I totally support the Canadian flag design suggested by the hon. member for Nicolet-Yamaska (Mr. Vincent). In my opinion, a flag without any signs representing or symbolizing what the union jack and the fleur-de-lis stand for will not be appreciated by the majority of the Canadian people neither today nor tomorrow.

Yes, a two-cross and one green and vivid maple leaf flag would stress the importance of developing the wealth of the two cultures which have contributed to make Canada a land of hope and promise. Yes, we should approve and adopt that flag design.

I hasten to point out to those who object to my opinion and my testimony that they should at least know how childish it is to feel that to remain faithful to our past is to hold the future in contempt. In my opinion, to assume a wise attitude, it is necessary to consider the opportunity of a compromise on the flag issue.

I have stated as briefly as possible my opinion on the matter and I like to hope that fervent prayers should be heard.

I would like to thank particularly the hon. members for Kamloops (Mr. Willoughby), for Kent (Ont.) (Mr. Danforth), for Saskatoon (Mrs. Jones), for Athabasca (Mr. Bigg), for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Hamilton) and for Nicolet-Yamaska for the kindness and fairness they have shown when carrying out their duty in this house on this very important issue.

I would ask all hon. members to co-operate for the finding of a solution which would respect the pride and nobility of the majority of the people.

Canadians have had hard times in the past, and in the future they will undoubtedly have the opportunity of showing unfailing wisdom.

Our good will is the guarantee of orderly stability. My last word will be: Long live Canada and its citizens.

I should like to add a word of praise about all the Canadian citizens with whom I discussed this delicate issue. They have always shown me great respect even when our opinions were absolutely contradictory.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

Inasmuch as we are dealing with an amendment to an amendment concerning a plebiscite, could the hon. member tell me whether or not he is in favour of such a plebiscite?

Mr. Ouellet: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member for Longueuil would like the member for Rimouski to give him an answer which, in some respects, could raise certain problems.

For his information, I am glad to say that, should all possible negotiations in order to reach a compromise fail to achieve the results we hope for, I would be in favour of a Canadian plebiscite.

[*Text*]

Mr. H. M. Horner (Jasper-Edson): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on this subamendment I should like to state that I feel we have come to the nub of the problem, and that is the preservation of national unity in Canada. It becomes very obvious, and I think it is obvious to most people in Canada, that the best way we can preserve the unity of Canada is to dispense with this debate immediately and work—

Mr. MacNaught: By accepting this flag.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): —behind the scenes on a compromise which will be acceptable to all Canadians.

Mr. Skoreyko: Why does the minister not get up and make a speech?

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): So far as unity is concerned, I say that the action of the Liberal government in bringing about disunity and division within Canada will be a matter of history. We now see in western Canada such newspaper comment as the following in the Edmonton *Journal* of August 25 under the heading "Partition for Canada?":

> Liberal strategists who formulate policy might well have provided their minions with calling cards with the legend "Have tails, will grovel."...
> The Pearson government is indirectly responsible for the chaos that is evident to eastern Canadians.

This is the kind of thing they have created in Canada. Do they want to go on aggravating the situation more and more? Surely the obvious answer is that this debate should be suspended and that we should get on with the business of Canada.

Mr. Peters: You move it and I will second it.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): Stubbornness is no substitute for statesmanship. If the Prime Minister wants to do so he can continue his stubborn attitude. He can try to make a hero of himself which he very nearly did when he first set out on this track. But he has bungled the whole thing so badly. He has failed to acknowledge or accept the views of many millions of Canadians and is continuing with stubborn petulance to try to force down the throats of Canadians a flag that the majority obviously do not want. To suggest for a moment that he has a mandate to do so is foolish, as the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) so ably pointed out. We were a little disappointed he was not with us last evening to back up his able presentation.

This is the general feeling across Canada now. I should like to quote for a moment from the Victoria *Daily Colonist* with regard to the stubbornness of the Prime Minister in pursuing his present policy and trying to force this flag down our throats, in dividing Canada and forcing a division which, if he continues, may take years to heal. The editorial has this to say:

> Where does the blame for the present parliamentary stalemate lie? Solely in Mr. Pearson's obduracy over the flag issue. This is the core that keeps parliament sitting and the normal business of the country held back from speedy progression.
>
> This has been evident ever since he introduced the flag resolution. To begin with he held the threat of an election over M.P.s' heads did they fail to pass the flag measure, which was tantamount to holding a gun at their heads and depriving them of unbiased decision.

I want to say a word a little later with regard to the free vote which we saw last evening.

> He refused a free vote on the subject. While blaming Mr. Diefenbaker for non-compliance he has now prevented the compromise suggestion that would delay the contentious flag bill to a fall session by insisting on an unacceptable time limit to its debate.

It is not so much the question of the time limit that is unacceptable. It is this flag which is unacceptable to a majority of Canadians and we as Conservatives have to see that it is never unfurled on a public standard in Canada, period. There is no other attitude we can take. The editorial continues:

> It is not obstructionism on the part of Mr. Diefenbaker that is at fault but the Prime Minister's insistence on having his own way. Mr. Pearson says he is not prepared to call an election on any of the current issues facing parliament, the flag of course being the main one. Is he afraid of the result?

[Mr. Peters.]

I say he is.

> This would probably be the quickest and most salutary solution to a parliamentary stalemate that grows worse with each passing day.

I too say that if he is going to insist on trying to force this flag upon us then let him call an election. Let him call an election on this issue. I do not particularly care for another election but if he is going to insist on pushing this bunting down our throats at a time when national unity in Canada is precarious, if he insists on choosing this time to push his flag upon us, then surely he must face the consequences. As I said initially, he cannot substitute stubbornness for statesmanship. He should ask the people. If he does not want an election then let him ask the people through a plebiscite, and so that we will create unity let us not have the results announced provincially. Let the results be announced on a countrywide basis. Let us keep it ultra secret. We cannot rely upon the responsibility of the press in this matter because the press of Canada has shown itself in the main to be completely irreponsible.

Mr. Pepin: You have just read from the press.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): That was a private article and I only read it because I agree with it.

Mr. Pepin: There are two kinds of press.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): I will have a few more words to say about the press and particularly with regard to the editorial which was quoted by my colleague, the hon. member for Edmoton East (Mr. Skoreyko). I want to say a few words with regard to the editorial in the Edmonton *Journal* particularly because we in northern Alberta are faced with a monopoly situation. It is the only newspaper and it is thrust down our throats somewhat like Mr. Pearson's pennant. We have got to accept it whether we like it or not.

When the flag issue was first raised this newspaper was against replacing the union jack or red ensign. They wrote editorials saying it was a shame that we were going to have to go to Honolulu to look at the union jack. I do not know whether their conscience is troubling them, but now they are writing editorials saying that we should get it over with, and advocating closure. I wonder whether the publisher is not just covering up for himself or did he get a phone call from somebody else in the Southam organization, which seems to be in the hands of the Liberal party? The hon. member for York-

Humber outlined some of the benefits that can come from supporting your party at the right time. Was the Southam organization told there would be no more senatorships unless they fell into line? Was it a case like that of *Maclean's*, which got rid of its editor and Ottawa correspondent without a murmur from their friends in the journalistic profession? They allowed these men to be scalped without one of them having enough gumption to stand up and protect them. They talk about freedom of the press: They are using it now to cover up their own inadequacies.

On the subject of national unity and the manner in which the government has brought in this flag I want to quote rather extensively from an article in the Winnipeg *Free Press* of August 31 last written by no less a person than Mr. Peter Newman. We who have been here over the past few years have a good knowledge of Mr. Newman's writings. Some of them we did not like because he was a bit inaccurate, but some we had to accept. However, he has a very interesting view with regard to the flag situation and I think it is worth while to put some of his comments on the record. He is talking about the fact that the Prime Minister wanted to become a hero out of the flag debate and the main theme of his article is that the hero of the flag debate may now become the victim. I have to admit that Mr. Newman may be slightly biased because he wrote that the present government was a grey, dismal failure, and he was fired or was told he could not write such things. I am not sure which. In any event, he had the courage of his convictions and wrote what he felt about it, even though it cost him his job. As I say, he may be a little bit upset. He may still feel that any way we can get rid of this dismal grey failure of a government would be worth while. In any event, he goes on talking about the hero of the flag who may become the victim, and I quote:

> But when the actual flag resolution was tabled by Pearson in the Commons it turned out to be a piece of legislative whimsy that defied the laws of political gravity. Instead of being the only major nation in the world without its own distinctive flag, we were urged to perpetuate our unique position by becoming the only land on the earth's surface to fly two official flags. Once again, Lester Pearson had tried to square the circle of political leadership.
>
> This double-barrelled flag resolution apparently grew out of the insistence—

I am sorry the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) is not here.

> —of Jack Pickersgill, who first articulated the idea at a little-reported young Liberal rally in Quebec city on February 2, 1962. Pickersgill suggested then that Canada should have one flag to represent the commonwealth connection as well as a distinctive flag of its own and pointed out that there's no reason "why Canada can't have two official flags just as she has two official languages."

We are talking about national unity and those are the views of the Minister of Transport. The article continues as follows:

> As Newfoundland's chief representative in the federal Liberal hierarchy, Pickersgill in turn was under pressure from Premier Joey Smallwood, who fears that a new flag would become the focal point of anti-Canadian feeling on this island.
>
> In retrospect, it's clear that Pearson's two-flag resolution was a political miscalculation of major proportions.

Then, I wanted to put on the record what this writer has to say with regard to the question of a filibuster, if you can call it that. I quote:

> The Conservatives' filibuster has not (as is generally believed) prevented parliament from dealing with a backlog of essential legislation. The Liberal administration, unaccountably, has no major bills ready for debate.

Is this flag debate being forced upon us because the Liberal cabinet does not have legislation ready for debate? Is this why we are debating the flag? I think some members on the front benches should have something to say with regard to that.

> The pension plan, which was supposed to be the showpiece of the Liberals' first year in office is now in its fourth, sad mutation.
>
> But the Tory filibuster has succeeded in softening Pearson's stand. He has retreated on his pledge (repeated as late as June 18) that his government would fall with the rejection of his flag.

Then he goes on to talk about the proposed alternatives that are available to the Prime Minister, and I think they are worthy of consideration. I quote:

> The Liberal leader now must choose between three alternatives: He can ram his flag design through the Commons by using closure and thereby provide Diefenbaker with a natural election issue; he can allow the flag to go before a parliamentary committee, which might delay a decision indefinitely or force on him a compromise design which he could not accept; or he can let the Tory filibuster continue and hope that public revulsion with Diefenbaker's tactics will force a Conservative retreat.

Let me say here and now that we do not intend to retreat because we represent the majority of the people in Canada. As pointed out so ably by the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan), Mr. Newman ends his article in this way:

> It's a grim choice, but Pearson isn't discouraged. "Every good flag has to be born in battle," he told a friend recently, "and this one is no exception."

Are we having this flag debate so that Liberal ministers may get their legislation ready, and so that we can cover up their faults? Is this the reason we are discussing this emotional issue which may divide this country? Is this government going to continue to perpetuate the division in Canada? How much better it would be if we were to have national unity in Canada and get on with the business before the house, get on with legislation which would bring about improved economic opportunities and improved economic returns to the people. If we do not improve the standards of living in some areas of Canada, how are we going to get unity? We are not going to achieve it through a flag. We are going to get unity in Canada by improving the standards of living of some areas so that there will be equality right across this country. This was the task we of the official opposition set ourselves at a time when we formed the government, and we took many steps toward this goal. This is what this government should be doing now, instead of forcing an emotional issue upon the people of this country and furthering disunity.

How much better it would be if, for instance, the Minister of Industry (Mr. Drury), were discussing legislation to improve the standard of living in some areas of Canada, instead of reading the newspaper this afternoon. How much better it would be if we were discusing legislation which would increase the economic opportunities of all Canadians. Are we discussing the flag because the minister has not done his homework and has not got legislation ready? I understand he has many $10,000 a year men in his department. Let them get busy and draft some legislation to be introduced in this house which will do something to bring about unity in Canada and to improve the standard of living of our people. We have a big job to do.

How much better it would be if we were spending our time listening to the minister of northern affairs introduce legislation to solve the problems of our north country. He is quoted enthusiastically by correspondents about what should be done in our north. So far, we have heard nothing but words. We want to see some action from this so-called decisive government. We have not heard a decision yet except the stubborn refusal of the Prime Minister to do anything except consider the flag, even if it divides this country for years to come. No one said there was anything wrong with the old one. Even the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) said they did not care what kind of flag we had in the west of Canada because they had their own flag. Obviously, the Prime Minister wanted it to go through, and this is clear if one reads Mr. Lynch's report. This is the Prime Minister's personal touch; he wants this moment of glory. However he is now heading down the road toward becoming the victim of his own glorious notion. I think the people of Canada should have an improved standard of living, and then we could come together under one flag that would be acceptable to all the people of this country.

But oh no, we are going to be forced to go on and, as the hon. member for Edmonton East (Mr. Skoreyko) said, this is just a start. This is the first of the bipartite flag resolution. Then we have to go on to the bipartite anthem resolution. Is the Prime Minister going to keep us here for the next year deciding on a symbol? Let us get on with the work that is to be done. Let us make ARDA a living thing. Let it not die, as the government is trying to let it. There is work to be done even in Alberta, in ARDA. There is work to be done in Quebec. These are things which will bring unity.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member. I realize some of his remarks are related to the subamendment, but when he discusses such things as ARDA in Alberta he is straying some distance away from the subject matter before the house.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): Well, Your Honour, I am just pointing out that the subamendment calls for a provision which will create unity in Canada. Goodness knows, we need something. With the government we have in office we need anything we can get if we are to perpetuate unity in this country. I am merely pointing out that rather than have the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Hays) sitting here reading his mail and the Minister of Industry (Mr. Drury) reading the paper, they could be doing concrete things. We in western Canada are waiting for the Minister of Agriculture to bring in his farm machinery bill. That is one of the things we want to get on with.

Mr. Hays: The farmers are waiting too.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): Let's go then, my hon. friend.

Mr. Hays: Let's vote then.

Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson): We are not going to allow the party in power to push this flag on the Canadian people, because it does not have a mandate to do it and, as I

said a moment ago, we represent the majority thought at the moment in Canada on the flag issue.

With regard to the plebiscite and the issuing of federal results, I would point out that the Prime Minister and his cabinet, like all good politicians, are a little bit egotistical. They said this is what we were elected for, to decide a flag for Canada. I dispute that. Many politicians I know are a little bit egotistical. Most politicians get here because they are leaders in some parts of their communities or constituencies, but not for a moment does this mean they have the ability to decide on an emotional question such as the flag. What about all the other people who feel they do not have that political bent but are concerned emotionally about the flag. Are we going to refuse them an opportunity to express their views about a symbol such as the flag? This is something that should be settled by a plebiscite, but I do not agree there are very many other things that should be settled that way.

We were elected to run the country as members of parliament. We were not elected to settle the question of an emotional symbolism. As I said before, we were elected to get on with the job of improving the economic situation in Canada, of providing defence, of passing legislation with regard to taxes, and we have had some evidence from the government of how it can do that. We are charged with the job of making Canada run. We are not charged nor are we suitably equipped to pick an emotional symbol for Canada. I do not believe politicians are emotionally equipped to pick an emotional symbol. We have already seen evidence of this.

At first the Prime Minister said it would be a free vote and each member would be allowed to vote as his conscience dictated. Then he said his government would stand or fall on the result, and the other day he reversed his position and said there would be a free vote, but by that time it was far too late. This is the very reason why politicians cannot decide the flag. Last night we saw that all those people on the government backbenches who were opposed to the government stand did not vote. So, it became an emotional issue and this emotional issue is decided on a political basis. Therefore instead of a national flag we have a political party flag. This is what happens if you allow politicians to decide a flag. It is going to be decided on the basis of political party lines and, as the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) said, "You either vote the party line or you don't get into the Senate". I leave that for your consideration.

I wish to quote from the Toronto *Telegram* of August 22 on the question of a free vote:

> At this stage, with party lines hardened, it is difficult to conceive of a truly free vote.
>
> Having shown, belatedly, a willingness to retreat from his earlier stubborn demands for the banner of his choice, he now should go one step further and measure public sentiment by plebiscite.
>
> Perhaps Mr. Pearson fears the outcome of such a testing of public opinion.

That is my opinion, that he fears the outcome of a plebiscite as much as he fears an election. It is my opinion he should have one or the other, dissolve the house and call an election on the flag issue, or present it to the people in the form of a plebiscite.

> There is no reason why this obstructive and divisive bill should not be shelved pending a reference to the people. There is no urgency. Most Canadians outside Quebec appear to be quite satisfied with the flag we have now. In Quebec, the matter is of little importance as there they fly the Laurentian flag with its white cross and fleur-de-lis.
>
> Until Mr. Pearson softens his stand, the opposition is justified in continuing a modified filibuster. As distasteful as such devices are in parliament, no other method seems practical in the face of Mr. Pearson's stubbornness.
>
> The way out of the parliamentary impasse is clear: a plebiscite to end the long debate and to allow parliament to get on with more important legislation.

With regard to the Prime Minister causing disunity in Canada, I want to say he has even caused disunity in some of our minor parties. The Social Credit league of Alberta passed a resolution endorsing the maintenance of the red ensign as Canada's national flag. People in Alberta are quite satisfied with the red ensign. Most of them would be quite satisfied with a modification of that ensign to denote the history of Canada, so eloquently outlined this afternoon by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill). But most of all people in Alberta are anxious about the government, about its stubborn refusal to get on with the business of Canada. We come from a country out there where we believe there are many things to do, many opportunities for our people, and to get some of these opportunities going we need government direction. We are not getting it from this government. Fortunately the last government which was in power did something. We did get some direction. We are still seeing the benefits of it out there.

Recently the minister of northern affairs went to drive the silver spike at the Northwest Territories boundary of the Great Slave Lake Railway. I wonder why the Minister of

Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) did not go. We sat in this house and watched him vote against the construction of this railway. Now his colleagues have a big delegation to drive in the silver spike. If they really want to name this railway properly, they should call it the Baldwin-Bigg railway for northern Alberta. Here was an example of unity, an example of compromise in order to prevent a split in a certain section of this country. I think this could serve as an example to members of this house, particularly on the government side, with regard to the matter now before us. Here were two members, each representing half of the northern part of a province. A railway was proposed to go through one of these areas. By their ability and statesmanship, these members were able to accept one another's points of view and got this railway going into the north country, leaving aside all pettiness and questions of personal betterment so as to enable the building of this railway to begin. This is a real example of what the government should be doing with regard to these things.

If we raise the standard of living by providing opportunities for all Canadians—I come back to this theme—we shall have unity in this country. If the standard of living is raised to an equal level for all our people we shall have no trouble in finding a symbol. By the time we have done that, as a result of advances in education and communications, we shall be able to sit down and find a symbol which will be acceptable to the whole of this nation.

In conclusion may I repeat that the government owes it to the people of Canada to suspend this debate, to put this resolution back where they have put three or four of them in the past—they have a place for these things—and leave it there until the time comes when there is such unity in Canada that we can have a single flag which will suit everybody. Let us get on with the legislation of the Minister of Industry (Mr. Drury). Let us put some of his $10,000 a year boys to work on contributing directly to the prosperity of this nation. At the same time, we do not intend to submit to the pressure now being applied. We shall not allow this bunting to be unfurled in Canada.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Théogène Ricard (St. Hyacinthe-Bagot): Mr. Speaker, in rising once again in this discussion, I want to say right away that I have no apologies to offer for doing so, because I think I would be remiss as a member of the house not to air my views as well as those of my constituents.

[Mr. Horner (Jasper-Edson).]

It is generally admitted, Mr. Speaker, that the way in which the flag issue was introduced in the house roused a whole gamut of protests throughout Canada which can only result in a threat to Canadian unity. Now, it is with this thought in mind and the idea of doing something to strengthen Canadian unity that I rise this afternoon to explain my position.

I would like first of all to repeat that freedom of action and thought, which is our privilege in this party, entitles me to repeat that I favour a distinctive national flag. Yesterday's events, Mr. Speaker, proved that freedom of action and a free vote only exist on this side of the house. I cannot dwell on this matter, but may I point out the clearly established fact that we of the Conservative party are fully free with regard to the national flag as well as to all other matters submitted to us, and if we come back to the subject, it is because we believe that it is our duty to do so. I would like to ask hon. members opposite, who are so talkative outside the House of Commons, to seize this opportunity of submitting to the house the views of the people who sent them here.

Mr. Speaker, I must say again that the situation has not changed at all since the resolution on both flags was before us. By the way, I want to mention first that we on this side of the house, the members of the official opposition, support one flag, and not two as provided by the resolution now before us.

It is clear that the Conservative party has been supporting a distinctive national flag for many years. I want to repeat before the house that we want only one national flag, and not two flags, with one borrowed from a foreign nation.

Mr. Speaker, since we are dealing with the plebiscite question, I should like to call the attention of the house to the result of a poll I made in my riding—I say a poll, but to be more accurate, I should say two polls, because I carried out two—during the month of May, when we heard that the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) would introduce a resolution concerning two flags. I immediately contacted my constituents to know exactly the viewpoint of those I represent here. On May 22, 1964, I sent 1,600 questionnaires to the people in my riding, who represent all classes of society. Here are those questions:

Are you in favour of keeping the Canadian red ensign as our national flag?

Mr. Speaker, hon. members will be interested to know that in my riding, 62 people answered that they were in favour of keeping the Canadian red ensign while 347 were in favour of other flags.

As a second question I asked them:

Do you think that the flag issue should have priority before the unemployment issue, the pension plan or the farm problem?

The results were as follows: 132 replied that the flag issue should be settled first, while 278 were in favour of the settlement of the unemployment issue, the farm problem and the adoption of the pension plan.

The third question I asked them was:

Supposing that you are in favour of a new flag, would you indicate below which one you prefer:
1. Flag embodying the Canadian red ensign and the fleur-de-lis?

Seventeen were in favour of that design. I carry on:

2. Flag embodying the Canadian red ensign, the maple leaf and the fleur-de-lis.

Seventy four were in favour of that flag design.

The third design I suggested was a flag with three maple leaves. Two hundred people of my riding were in favour of the three maple leaf design.

As a last question, I suggested a flag with one maple leaf only. Only hundred and forty one of my electors were in favour of that design.

Mr. Speaker, in adding together those who were in favour of a flag design other than that submitted by the Prime Minister, we reach a total of 294, whereas those who chose the three maple leaf flag number only 200.

But at the beginning of June, I decided to make another poll. May I read the letter I sent to 1,751 citizens, in which I asked them to enlighten me on the choice of a Canadian flag. I said to them:

Dear Friend:

Once more, I take the liberty to ask your co-operation and I submit a few questions on the flag issue. I am sure you will rush your reply, and I wish to thank you in advance for your valuable assistance.

As you certainly know, the project of the Prime Minister, Mr. Pearson, is to officially establish, as a Canadian flag, a flag composed of three maple leaves on one stem, and to decree that the union jack be flown as a symbol of Canadian membership in the commonwealth of nations and our allegiance to the crown.

He also intends to decree that "O Canada" be considered as the national anthem and "God Save the Queen" as the royal anthem.

In practice, the adoption of Mr. Pearson's project would mean that we would have two flags and two national anthems. I would like to have your point of view on this question and I would ask you to fill in the enclosed questionnaire and to return it to me as soon as possible.

Thanking you for your usual co-operation.

I remain,

Yours truly,
Théo. Ricard, M.P.
St. Hyacinthe-Bagot

The questionnaire included four questions, the first of which read as follows:

Are you in favour of two flags?

464 answered: No, while only 8 favoured two flags.

The second question was the following:

Are you in favour of only one flag?

490 constituents answered: Yes, while only 8 answered: No.

The third question was:

Do you feel that rather than to have two flags, it would be better to maintain what we have at present?

273 constituents gave their preference to the status quo, while 76 answered: No. The fourth question was the following:

Do you feel it would be preferable to have a referendum on that matter?

Mr. Speaker, it is worthy of notice that 216 replied in the affirmative and 155 in the negative.

Mr. Speaker, on the basis of the information I obtained following those two soundings of opinion I have taken the attitude that a referendum, a plebiscite or a popular consultation should be held on the flag issue. I feel I have carried out the mandate my constituents have given me not only on the flag issue but on all other questions of national interest.

Mr. Speaker, to give an idea of the interest shown by the Canadian people in the holding of a referendum, I should like to quote an article which appeared in the Oshawa *Times* and which reads as follows:

[*Text*]

"Taxes and jobs main topics for Canadians". I should like to read a few extracts from this article:

"If you were writing to your member of parliament in Ottawa about the things you think parliament should do, what would you suggest?"

A similar question was asked in the United States recently and what came to the top there was taxes, as well as the civil rights bill. Medicare was cited in third place but only 2 per cent of Canadians mentioned need for a good medical plan and for more hospitals.

We read among the things judged as most important by the people across Canada that taxes are what Canadians would like to see reduced first. Then comes unemployment; the

encouragement of more industry; and then, fourth, a revised unemployment insurance fund. Then finally what is interesting people and is in the minds of the people is the cost of living.

[*Translation*]

This goes to show, Mr. Speaker, that there are several measures to which the house could have given serious consideration before dealing with the flag issue.

To repeat what others have said before me, people are anxious to see that matter settled but, at the same time, they are aware that any hasty and irresponsible action could inflict wounds on our national unity which would take generations to heal.

Mr. Speaker, I was greatly amused to hear the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency (Mr. Marcoux) and the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Frenette) suggest that a motion for closure be passed to put an end to this debate.

However, a few moments before making that suggestion, both members—I am sorry neither one is here at present—had made much of the fact that they were in favour of a distinctive national flag.

By suggesting the passage of a motion for closure, those two members actually recommended the adoption of the three leaf flag as the first national flag, and that the flag of a foreign country, that is, the union jack, be given an official status in the statutes of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, during their private conversation, my Liberal friends from the province of Quebec suggest that the second part of the resolution is merely a gilded pill to have a distinctive national flag adopted, and they claim that after a while, the second part of the resolution would be forgotten and the union jack would no longer be flown in our country.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I should like to dispute the validity of that suggestion of our friends opposite, because I do not believe that by decreeing and entering into Canada's statutes that a certain flag will be the official flag we will force people to forget another flag. You and I—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. May I interrupt the hon. member to remind him that the resolution he referred to is not under consideration at this time. By the same token, I take the liberty of reminding him that we are now considering the subamendment presented by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill).

Mr. Ricard: I thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thought I could follow in the footsteps of the previous speakers.

But, since you are responsible for maintaining order in the house, I have no choice but to accept your ruling, which I do willingly and with respect for the authority you represent in this chamber.

I would now like to give the views of some of our best editorial writers on the flag issue.

But before doing that, Mr. Speaker, like my colleague from Rimouski (Mr. Ouellet), I would like to call on the good will of the members of the House of Commons to reach a final understanding on this burning question.

You will admit, Mr. Speaker, that we have now reached a decisive turn. I do not believe that this national flag issue can be settled without a compromise which would be acceptable by all the parties concerned.

I should like again to commend my colleagues from the other English speaking provinces for the dignity with which they tackled the problem. Each and all of them have risen in the house and expressed the views of their constituents. And they added that they were ready to accept a compromise. I think, Mr. Speaker, that they could not show better cooperation.

I should like to set out this courageous attitude as an example to my friends opposite, and particularly to those from the province of Quebec, so as to prompt them to stand up and to express their views on this matter. Really, I cannot see how they could feel free not to avail themselves of this opportunity to express their point of view as well as that of their constituents.

I pity them much more than I blame them for being bound in such a way by party discipline. Before resuming my seat, I should like to urge them once more to tell the House of Commons about the views of their fellow citizens.

It is important that they participate objectively in the discussion in the same way as we are now doing in an effort to solve this problem. It must not be forgotten that this is a problem that concerns them as much as us.

I am conscious that the official opposition has a very important role in this house. It must be recognized that we have fulfilled this responsibility to the best of our ability and that, in so doing, we have surely rendered the people a service, because if the official opposition had not drawn the attention of the house and of the Canadian people generally to this question of the flags, since the Prime Minister plans to have two, it could, I repeat,

have caused deep wounds to Canadian unity.

I will close my remarks by repeating that I favour a distinctive national flag and that we should all take steps to ensure that this problem is settled in the most agreeable and friendly way possible, in order that national unity, instead of being jeopardized, may be consolidated and this is the wish of all of us on this side of the house.

[*Text*]

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe East): Mr. Speaker, I intend to speak on our loyalties, our unity and our heritage of the past. I want to bring to mind that over the years we have had a cross on our flag that goes back to the crucifixion, the cross that was put there by the English in honour of their patron saint, St. George, who was a Macedonian. The cross of St. Andrew was placed on the flag by the Scots in memory of their patron saint, St. Andrew, who was a Jew and a disciple of Christ. There is also the third cross, the cross of St. Patrick which was added at a later date. St. Patrick, of course, was a Scotsman who was educated in France and then became the patron saint of Ireland.

I also want to direct the attention of the house to the fact that over the years of early history England was invaded time after time by the Scandinavians and the same thing was also happening in Europe. The Scandinavians invaded Europe and established a province in the northern part of France called Normandy. These same Normans were very closely related to the Normans who had remained in England after the Scandinavian invasions prior to 1066.

Then William the Conqueror invaded England and defeated Harold at the battle of Hastings, in which Harold lost his life. It is also interesting to note that Harold's mother was a Scandinavian. Some people will say: Why go back into history? I see some members are smiling. I say to you that if you have no love for your traditions and are ashamed of your past there is something wrong with you and you have something you want to cover up. I for one do not want to cover up the history of Canada and I am going to relate it.

William the Conqueror invaded England and conquered that land. He pillaged and laid waste the land and for 100 miles there was neither a house nor a person left. He brought with him from France the Latin touch not only in politics but in religion, and in the feudal system which he brought to England and established there. That was the last Scandinavian invasion of England, and I think this is an important part of history when we consider it was this man who stopped any further Scandinavian invasions.

As a matter of fact, he laid the cornerstone of the England we know today. He introduced the feudal system. He was a pretty smart man in a great many ways because he set up the barons and knights on the one side, and then had the English doing the work as serfs on the other. But he did not trust the barons and knights and he also appointed sheriffs. He had two bodies, one to watch over the barons and the knights and another whose members went around making secret investigations. He was a smart man.

I also wish to point out that it was from these same Normans that Magna Carta came. As a lawyer, Mr. Speaker, you will recognize that this is the cornerstone of democracy wherever it is found in the world. I say to all members and to the people of Canada generally, what a tradition we have got. William the Conqueror introduced the French language into England. It was used in court, it was used by the gentry and together with Latin it was used by the church. It was the language of politics and political science in that day, while English was the language of the serfs. The combination of those languages, Mr. Speaker, resulted in a common language, the English language of today, the greatest language in the world.

May I call it six o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the acting house leader about the estimates that will be taken up on Friday, so that we will have adequate knowledge beforehand.

Mr. MacNaught: Mr. Speaker, on Friday we will consider the main estimates of the Department of Labour, the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys and the Department of National Health and Welfare.

Mr. Barnett: What about tomorrow?

Mr. MacNaught: We go on with the flag debate.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, September 3, 1964

The house met at 2 p.m.

CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

CONSIDERATION OF REPATRIATION AT CHARLOTTETOWN CONFERENCE

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I am sure I speak for all members of the house in welcoming the Prime Minister back following the celebration of the 100th anniversary of that historic gathering at Charlottetown. In saying that I wish to ask him something about the repatriation of the constitution. Has the formula advanced in December, 1961 by the minister of justice in the government of which I had the honour to be the head been accepted, and what modifications in that formula are indicated? I ask him particularly whether there is any foundation for the press articles which suggest that the federal government is prepared to surrender or diminish its right to amend certain sections of the British North America Act relating to matters purely within the federal jurisdiction. I think a statement from the Prime Minister is necessary in order to have the assurance that such is not being contemplated.

I ask the latter portion of the question on the basis of an article in *Le Soleil* in which the premier of Quebec is quoted as saying that the agreement of the province is subordinated to the abrogation or satisfactory revision of article 91, section 1 of the constitution which, of course, is the one concerning the distribution of legislative powers.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I thank the right hon. gentleman for his welcome back to the house after an interesting and agreeable conference at Charlottetown, where the hospitality was almost as openhearted as it was 100 years ago.

So far as this particular question is concerned, I am happy to inform him that as the statement issued yesterday morning indicates, and I am quoting from a paragraph of it now:

> The Prime Minister and premiers affirmed their unanimous decision to conclude the repatriation of the British North America Act without delay.
>
> To this end they decided to complete a procedure for amending the constitution of Canada, based on the draft legislation proposed at the constitutional conference of 1961, which they accept in principle.

This acceptance, of course, includes the formula to which my hon. friend referred. Then the next paragraph states:

> An early meeting of the attorneys general of Canada and the provinces will be held to complete the amending formula devised by the 1961 conference—

In so far as the specific question he asked is concerned, based on a newspaper report, there is no foundation to the report that the federal government at Charlottetown indicated its willingness to give up its own rights under the proposed legislation in respect of those matters under its jurisdiction which are covered in section 91, subsection 1 of the British North America Act. It was agreed, Mr. Speaker, that at the meeting of the attorneys general to which I have just referred and which is mentioned in the statement, section 91(1) could be examined in order to ascertain if there are any specific matters in that section in which the provinces have a legitimate and direct concern, and if so to decide whether the formula should be applied to the amendment of those particular matters.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Would the Prime Minister allow me to ask which particular matters he has in mind?

Mr. Pearson: I have no particular matters in mind. We are quite content to receive from the provinces any information they may wish to send us concerning that which they may think they have a legitimate interest in amending. We will look at it from that point of view, and this will be the purpose of the meeting of attorneys general to be held shortly to see how the particular sections could be adapted to the amending formula which we have agreed upon in principle.

Mr. Diefenbaker: May I ask the Prime Minister whether there has been any change in the attitude of the governments of Saskatchewan and Quebec since Mr. Fulton, as minister of justice, advanced the views of the dominion government in December of 1961?

Then I also want to ask him this regarding these questions of legislation in respect of which representation will be made by the provinces. Was there any suggestion that any of the provinces should have the authority to legislate in certain recognized federal fields, such as immigration and the like, or should have any veto power over monetary or tariff policy?

Mr. Pearson: The answer to the last part of the question is no. In so far as the first part of the question is concerned, the premier of Saskatchewan indicated that the amending formula put forward in 1961, and which at that time was not acceptable to the government of Saskatchewan, is now acceptable to that government. The prime minister of Quebec indicated that the position of his government in respect of section 91(1) was the same as the position taken in 1961, in other words that the application of the formula to that particular section of the British North America Act should be examined before the formula comes into effect.

Mr. Diefenbaker: So that the position today is that the change since December 1961 is that with a change in government in Saskatchewan the present government has agreed with the formula of 1961, and that so far as the premier of Quebec is concerned he wishes to examine the formula to which objection was taken in 1961?

Mr. Pearson: That is correct, Mr. Speaker, with this addition; that the head of the government of Quebec, along with the heads of the governments of all the other provinces, now accept in principle the draft formula of 1961, which they had not accepted at that earlier conference.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a supplementary question to the Prime Minister.

Has he any comment to make about the statements allegedly made by Messrs. Roblin and Thatcher that an agreement on a formula to repatriate the constitution was still far away.

[*Text*]

Mr. Pearson: Well, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Roblin, as I understand from the reports, indicated some impatience that we were not able to reach final agreement on all details yesterday in Charlottetown, and I have no comment to make on that. I am not quite certain what Mr. Thatcher said, but I think he also indicated the same kind of impatience and hope that there could have been final agreement yesterday. We all shared that hope, but the position taken at the conference by all heads of government was a very helpful one, and we hope that in a very few weeks the remaining difficulties will be cleared up.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I think it is a great pity the Prime Minister did not make a statement on motions so we could have had a full statement on the conference in Charlottetown. However, we all welcome him back, and he has our full support in any steps that may be taken to repatriate the constitution.

I want to ask him whether the government is placing its wholehearted support behind the so-called Fulton formula of 1961. Does this mean the government is now committing itself as well as the provinces to entrenching subsection 92(13), the property and civil rights subsection, which would mean that legislative matters having to do with pensions, a labour code and a great many other matters of that sort, under recent decisions by the courts could not be amended without the unanimous consent of the parliament of Canada and all ten provinces? Is this the position the federal government is taking?

Mr. Pearson: Not necessarily, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry if my hon. friend thought a statement should have been made on motions, but the communiqué was very short and I thought it would probably be more appropriate if I were asked questions so that other hon. members in addition to the party leaders might ask questions also. I would be glad to make a statement next week, if that is desirable, but so far as the federal details in this matter are concerned I cannot go beyond what I have already said. I do not accept the hon. gentleman's interpretation of our position with regard to entrenchment generally.

Mr. Douglas: Could I ask the Prime Minister if in view of the wide powers which the courts have injected into the property and civil rights clause he does not consider that entrenching this clause would put Canada in a constitutional strait-jacket for many years to come?

Mr. Pearson: I can only say that in recent years, in respect to the amendment of the constitution, Canada has been in a kind of

strait-jacket, a strait-jacket imposed from outside.

Mr. Douglas: Is it not true that at present the Canadian constitution can be amended at any time by an address of both houses of parliament?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Prime Minister a supplementary question.

In the course of his discussions with the provincial premiers about the eventual and desirable repatriation of our constitution, was there any mention made of the title our Canadian constitution should bear in the future, if it is repatriated?

[*Text*]

Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker. While I am on my feet perhaps I could explain that when I said we had been subject to a strait-jacket imposed on us from outside, I should have added that the imposition was of our own doing.

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): I realize this meeting was very short, but I should like to ask a question dealing with an aspect of this matter apart from the repatriation of the constitution itself. Would the Prime Minister tell us whether any suggestion was made to hold a federal-provincial conference to modernize and bring up to date the constitution to suit the needs of modern times?

Mr. Pearson: No. We restricted our discussion to methods of amending the constitution. But I should add that in the discussions just completed we agreed to have another meeting to consider, if possible, a report from the attorneys general on the amendment of the constitution and any other questions which the premiers might wish to bring up. This meeting will be held immediately following the visit of the Queen to Ottawa on October 11. There will be a two day meeting after that between the premiers of the provinces and the Prime Minister.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Will that be during the presence of Her Majesty the Queen in Ottawa?

Mr. Pearson: No, it will be the day after she leaves.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I should like to ask the Prime Minister this. In view of the major importance of the step to be taken, would he consider setting a day aside very shortly, and before we adjourn this portion of the session, for the purpose of securing the views of the house on this matter? In 1961 there had been discussions from time to time in the house on this question which divides itself into two parts; first, the repatriation of the constitution, which latter I cannot agree is anything in the nature of a strait-jacket; and second, reconsideration of the whole question of the entranchment of powers. Is it the right hon. gentleman's intention to allow the house an opportunity to discuss these matters before anything is finally determined and, in particular, before legislation is brought before parliament?

Mr. Pearson: Parliament will undoubtedly be required to consider any action before that action can be taken if it deals with a new procedure for amending our constitution, and there would be an opportunity for parliament to do so at the time a decision has finally been reached between the governments of the provinces and the federal government. However, it seems to me it would be quite proper that there should be a general and earlier discussion of this very important matter. Perhaps the estimates of the Department of Justice would be a suitable occasion and, if so, we shall try to expedite them. We could bring them forward next week, perhaps. I am informed—I do not want to mislead the house—that the estimates of the Department of Justice are not in supply yet. Perhaps we could make some special arrangement.

Mr. Raymond Langlois (Mégantic): I should like to ask a supplementary question relating to that asked by the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi a few minutes ago. Does the Prime Minister intend to call another conference later this year between himself and the ten premiers for the purpose of modernizing the constitution after it has been repatriated?

Mr. Pearson: I think we had better restrict our consideration at the moment to the subject of amending our constitution here in Canada. In addition to the meeting in October, there will be a further meeting with the provincial premiers, the annual meeting held late in November or in December. It is a little early to say what will be on the agenda.

Mr. Georges Valade (St. Mary): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the Prime Minister would consider setting up a special committee of the house to study this whole question, so that when the measure is before the house hon. members will have something of a preliminary study on this question.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Pearson: I will be glad to give consideration to that suggestion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Prime Minister. Was there any discussion at Charlottetown, as the Prime Minister said earlier this session, in response to questions, there would be, with respect to how the repatriating of the constitution will be brought about? Will it be by an act of another parliament, or will it be by an act that we take in this our own sovereign parliament?

Mr. Pearson: That matter was mentioned, but it was not discussed in any detail. It will certainly be considered by the attorneys general and the Minister of Justice. On this particular point, Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to add to the answer I gave to a question put by my hon. friend, I think it was last week, in the house.

CANADIAN CONFEDERATION

PROPOSED UNION OF ATLANTIC PROVINCES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. H. J. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Prime Minister. Is the Prime Minister in a position to inform the house in regard to the proposal made by the premier of New Brunswick relative to the union of the Atlantic provinces? Would he care to tell the house about this?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker, I do not think I would care to express any opinion on that matter at this time. Surely that is a matter for the four Atlantic provinces. At the meeting at which the proposal was put forward they had some comments to make on it, but I believe they have not given it very serious consideration.

PRIVILEGE

MR. WINCH—REMARKS IN DEBATE BY MEMBER FOR WINNIPEG SOUTH CENTRE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. It is something I very, very rarely do; therefore Your Honour will understand that it is a matter which I feel is of importance concerning myself. I refer Your Honour and hon. members to yesterday's *Hansard*, page 7581, the first column, starting at line 26, wherein the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre had this to say in reference to myself:

[Mr. Valade.]

—I recall him saying that all he would have to do to be re-elected in the next election would be to march up and down carrying the red ensign in his hand.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Winch: Mr. Speaker, I have at no time been interviewed by the press on my position. I have not as yet spoken in the House of Commons on this flag issue. When I do, that will be my business and my opportunity. However, Mr. Speaker, never having made any such statement in my life, I think I have the right to rise at this time, in view of that statement made yesterday by the hon. member, and say that it is only because of my respect for the House of Commons, its decency and decorum that I say his statement yesterday was a most vicious, despicable inexactitude of terminology.

[*Later:*]

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I am rising on a question of privilege based on the rather sharp attack made on me by the hon. member for Vancouver East. I want to state that I had no intention of offending the hon. member yesterday, and I was rather surprised that he did not raise some objection when I used the words which he now considers to be offensive, as he was in the house at the time.

May I draw to your attention, sir, that when I rose to speak yesterday he interrupted and left the imputation that I was speaking without authority, that I had participated earlier in the debate and should not be allowed to speak again. This occasioned what I thought was a friendly exchange; but if the hon. member has been offended by any words I used I am quite prepared willingly and publicly to apologize to him, and I wish him all the best in the next election.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

CONGO—SAFETY OF CANADIAN CITIZENS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the acting minister of external affairs and relates to the safety and well being of a number of Canadian citizens who are at the present time in the fighting areas of the Congo. Does the minister have any information for the house with respect to the safety of these individuals?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, as I think all members know, a register is maintained by

our embassy in the Congo of all Canadians resident there. These people have been advised by the embassy from time to time to evacuate danger, or possible danger, areas. Some departures have taken place. In other cases Canadian missionaries have preferred to stay en place. In respect of those who have remained, arrangements have been made, with the generous co-operation of the United States embassy, and with the help of the UN authorities for the rapid evacuation to places of safety of those who may so wish to be evacuated.

INDIA—RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR FOOD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the right hon. Prime Minister. On Tuesday and again yesterday the government of India sent an urgent appeal to both the United States and Australia to divert shipments of wheat to India because of the severe flood damage that has been occasioned during the past few days. I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether Canada has received an appeal from the government of India for wheat and other foodstuffs and, if so, what is the response to the request.

An hon. Member: That question was asked yesterday.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker, this question was asked yesterday by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle. I can only say that no special request has been received from the government of India for special help in this emergency. As the house is no doubt aware, we are supplying to India at the present time about $7 million worth of Canadian wheat, which is an increase of $5,500,000 over the amount supplied in each of the last two fiscal years, and credits for the purchase of additional supplies if required. Part of the $7 million worth of wheat to which I referred was shipped from Canadian ports in August, and the balance is going forward in September. I do not think therefore, Mr. Speaker, that there would be any possibility of diverting wheat at this time in a way which would assist India. We are examining the matter and making inquiries as to whether there is anything in addition to what I have mentioned that we can do to help India in this emergency.

INDONESIA—SUGGESTED TEMINATION OF CANADIAN AID

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister in the absence of the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the fact, as reported in the *Globe and Mail* this morning, that the government of Indonesia has dropped armed paratroopers in Malaysia and that the government of Malaysia is sending a complaint to the security council of the United Nations, would the government now give consideration to cutting off aid to Dr. Sukarno?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, as the Secretary of State for External Affairs has said, this matter is now under consideration; but, as it has also been pointed out, the only aid going to Indonesia this year is I believe a few hundred thousand dollars worth of wheat and flour.

Mr. Nesbitt: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the Prime Minister not agree that even though the aid is only in the form of wheat to the value of several hundred thousand dollars, this enables the Indonesian government to save foreign exchange and thus buy arms abroad?

CYPRUS—FURTHER CONTRIBUTIONS TO COST OF PEACE KEEPING OPERATIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Prime Minister in the absence of the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Yesterday the government of the United Kingdom agreed to underwrite $400,000 of the $2 million requested by the secretary general of the United Nations to keep the peace force operating in Cyprus. I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether any other nations have agreed to underwrite some of this $2 million and, in the event that these other pledges do not come through, will the force have to be withdrawn by the end of September?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I shall try to answer my hon. friend's question tomorrow morning. I have not got the information at the moment.

Inquiries of the Ministry

AGRICULTURE

CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION GRANTS TO A AND B CLASS FAIRS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. O. W. Weichel (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. I understand that annual grants to class A and class B fairs in respect of capital construction were suspended some time ago, and may remain suspended for some time. I wonder if the minister could say that such capital grants for construction would be extended until perhaps the 1967 centennial, giving these fairs a greater opportunity for adjustment?

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is correct in that capital grants for construction were suspended, I believe in July of 1962. We are running a pilot project this year, and we are keeping those grants in suspension until such time as we know whether there is merit to that project, at which time we will re-examine the situation.

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): I should like to ask a supplementary question. In the Brome-Missisquoi area this week end we are having a fair. Would the minister come to that fair and tell the dairy farmers what he told us in the house in respect of the dairy industry?

Mr. Hays: Mr. Speaker, if I have the time and I receive an invitation I should be very glad to go with the hon. member.

PAYMENT OF SUBSIDY ON GRAIN TRANSPORTED BY FARMERS

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): On September 1, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Bagot (Mr. Ricard) asked me whether a farmer doing his own transporting by truck would benefit from the transportation subsidies.

The answer is yes. According to the regulations coming into force next September 14, a farmer will be able, from now on, to use his own truck to get his supply of feed grain, and that assistance will be granted to him at any mill in the area where his farm is located.

Under the present policy, he could not obtain any additional help when using his own truck for that kind of transportation.

[Mr. Pearson.]

Hon. Théogène Ricard (St. Hyacinthe-Bagot): Mr. Speaker, could the minister tell the house whether the miller who provides his own means of transportation is also entitled to those subsidies?

Mr. Sauvé: Mr. Speaker, I shall inquire about this, but I believe the answer will be yes.

Mr. Clément Vincent (Nicolet-Yamaska): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a supplementary question. Must the farmer apply to the federal government in order to get this subsidy? Will the federal government pay this subsidy to the transportation company, which will then remit it to the farmer?

Mr. Sauvé: Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any difference in the cases just mentioned by the hon. member. The subsidy is always paid to the mill. Therefore, the miller will have to see to it that the farmer gets the amount to which he is entitled.

Mr. Vincent: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In the event the miller would not give the farmer the money owing to him, will the federal government be able to step in so that the miller will hand over to the farmer the money to which he is entitled?

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order. This question should be placed on the order paper.

[*Later:*]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Raymond Langlois (Mégantic): Mr. Speaker, with reference to the question asked by the hon. member for Nicolet-Yamaska a moment ago concerning the remedy which would be available to the federal government should a miller refuse to pay back an amount of money to a farmer, I wish to draw the attention of the house to the fact that, for nearly a year now, I have been raising questions which are somewhat related to that matter. In my opinion, too many privileges are granted agents selling feed grain and I think the minister should tell us what would happen if the federal government had no remedy at law to force them to reimburse such amounts to farmers.

Mr. Sauvé: Mr. Speaker, as this is a legal question, I would like to inquire about it before giving an answer.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Forestry.

Does the minister intend to issue a pamphlet on the procedure to be followed by a farmer to obtain a subsidy for the feed grain he moves himself?

Hon. Maurice Sauvé (Minister of Forestry): Yes, we intend to do that, Mr. Speaker. We will send a pamphlet to all farmers who benefit or might benefit from that new policy.

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the minister. Will such action be taken immediately or within a few months?

Mr. Sauvé: The new regulation comes into force on September 14. The publicity we intend to carry out in this connection will start immediately and the pamphlet to make farmers aware of the benefits of the new policy will be distributed as soon as possible.

[*Text*]

ROYAL VISIT

REPORTED DANGER TO QUEEN IN QUEBEC

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the question I am about to put I ask with great diffidence, but it is one that I think has to be asked and requires an answer from the Prime Minister. My question is related to the visit of Her Majesty the Queen to Canada. In view of the threats of violence that have been made, the advertisements appearing in newspapers with particulars regarding opposition to the forthcoming visit in respect of which demonstrations are planned, and so on, is the Prime Minister in a position to advise, not particularly what means are being taken to provide necessary precautions, but whether he agrees with the suggestion by the special committee for the royal visit that special precautions are not necessary; or is that not representative of the viewpoint of the government?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I can only say in respect of that visit that adequate security precautions are being taken, and every effort will be made to provide necessary precautions for the security and comfort of Her Majesty.

Perhaps I might also be permitted to express my own feeling that it does not help very much in this respect when exaggeration and extreme publicity are given to the violent statements made by those who are speaking only for themselves and, in one case at least, by a person who has spent the previous 12 months in jail. I cannot think, Mr. Speaker, that it adds anything to the effectiveness of security to have that kind of statement given such exaggerated publicity.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has expressed himself in a way that I think will receive general support, though always subject to the one qualification that we must be very careful not to restrict freedom within appropriate limits. However, I do point out to him the fact that, according to the *Gazette* of Wednesday, petitions are being secured by an organization known as rassemblement pour l'indépendance nationale, and advertisements are appearing in one Montreal daily newspaper in respect of plans for meetings to protest against the visit, and for demonstrations, which were freely admitted in detail on the telephone yesterday by a feminine voice answering the number which appeared in the newspaper advertisement. Would the Prime Minister have this situation looked into?

Mr. Pearson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will do that.

CANADIAN FLAG

NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN GOVERNMENT AND OPPOSITION TO RESOLVE DIFFICULTY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. M. Fisher (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister, but perhaps his gracious substitute for the last two days is in a better position to answer. I should like to ask whether there have been negotiations, official or unofficial, completely aside from the house leaders' meetings, between members of the government and any members of the official opposition in order to find a way out of the flag dilemma.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the leader of the official opposition as an officer of the house, supplementary to the question asked by the hon. member for Port Arthur. Has the Leader of the Opposition any knowledge that members of his party have met unofficially with members of the Liberal

party in an effort to resolve and conclude the flag debate?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I regret to inform the hon. member that under our rules such a question cannot be asked the Leader of the Opposition.

[*Later:*]

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister. In view of the fact that the flag debate has now gone on for five weeks and there seems no immediate prospect of the house being allowed to reach a decision, I want to ask the Prime Minister would he consider again the proposal that was made, that we set aside the flag debate for a period of time and deal with legislation; or the proposal made by my colleague the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, that the government allow one day a week for legislation and one day for estimates, and the balance of the week for debate on the flag? It seems to me there is a great deal of merit in trying to proceed with government legislation at an early date.

Mr. Pearson: Well, Mr. Speaker, the reaction of the government to the proposal to which my hon. friend refers was given immediately in the house that evening by the house leader on this side, and I have nothing to add to what was said then. That remains our position in regard to that proposal.

NATIONAL REVENUE

SASKATCHEWAN—STATEMENT RESPECTING SERVICE AT REGWAY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. K. H. More (Regina City): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a follow-up question to that to which I received an answer yesterday from the Minister of National Revenue. My purpose in asking this question is not to embarrass or chide him, but he did give an answer, which is recorded in *Hansard*, to the effect that the average use of this port involved only four cars during the extra hours in the summer season. The information I have been given is that this is not the case. I would ask the minister whether he has any correction to make.

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I have already indicated in a note to the hon. member that I intended to correct *Hansard*. As found on page 7577, the 15th line from the bottom, I am reported as having said:

[Mr. Herridge.]

I might point out that the average has only been four cars for that shift during this summer, 1964.

What I said was:

I might point out that the average has been only four cars per hour for that shift during this summer.

PAYMENT OF INCOME TAX ON ALLEGED PROFIT BY MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. H. Horner (Acadia): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Prime Minister. Has he investigated the report of the Quebec royal commission under Chief Justice Smith, which states quite clearly that a personal profit amounting to $62,000 was made by a member of parliament in a certain transaction? Is he investigating this matter now or has he done so already? If not, will he do so in the future?

Mr. Speaker: Order. In my opinion this question is illegal. I refer the hon. member to Beauchesne, fourth edition, citation 108, subsection 3, which perhaps I had better read at this time:

Libels on members have also been constantly punished; but to constitute a breach of privilege they must concern the character or conduct of members in that capacity, and the libel must be based on matters arising in the actual transaction of the business of the house.

I think it is a matter of common knowledge that this matter took place outside the house and within the personal capacity of the person concerned, and does not affect any of the business of the house. Unless it affects the honour of the house or of any member therein, and unless a member is prepared to bring a charge in virtue of—I give the reference in Beauchesne—citation 127, subsection 2, which necessitates a member laying a charge and attempting to substantiate it, in my opinion the question is completely out of order. This is particularly so inasmuch as the attorney general of Quebec has said that the matter is a civil matter.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): If I may speak to the point, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned no particular member of the house. My question was to the Minister of National Revenue, whose duty it is to see that people pay income tax. I asked him a simple question; has he investigated or will he investigate this report by Mr. Justice Smith which was recently made public to the effect that personal profits of $62,000 were earned by a certain person, and will he ascertain whether proper income taxes were paid?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member is trying to do indirectly what he is prevented by the rules from doing directly.

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister prompted by news reports carried on the front pages of yesterday's papers. Is the reported leading candidate for the Liberal leadership in Ontario the same Charles Templeton who a few years ago wished a depression on the people of Canada in the interests of a Liberal victory?

AIRPORTS

HAMILTON, ONT.—AVAILABILITY OF FEDERAL FUNDS FOR DEVELOPMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. William Dean Howe (Hamilton South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question I should like to ask the Minister of Transport, of which I have sent notice. Can the minister confirm reports that federal funds will be made available for the development of Mount Hope airport at Hamilton and, if so, how much money will be spent?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, treasury board has authorized certain work to be done at the Mount Hope airport near Hamilton if the Hamilton city council is prepared to take over and operate the airport. We are hoping to have discussions on this matter next week. I think it would be difficult to say how much would be spent at least until tenders are called and we see what can be done for how much money.

PROTECTION AGAINST DAMAGE FROM MIGRATORY BIRDS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources. It relates to a news release by his department last Friday in relation to the migratory bird regulations. One of the orders states that special permits may now be obtained by managers of civilian airports or the commanding officers of military airports to take migratory birds which are endangering the safe operation of aircraft. Can the minister assure the house there is evidence that such action is necessary?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): Mr. Speaker, there is evidence available in the fact that damage of over a million dollars was done to planes by birds last year in Canada. We are taking a variety of preventive measures, and this is one of them.

Mr. Simpson: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. If I may be allowed to say so, I am not too concerned about a few birds that may have to be done away with in the interests of safety in areas where there is relatively little nesting. I am interested to know what precautions, if any, are being taken to assure that this order will not result in unwarranted hunting privileges in some of the northern nesting areas in the vicinity of military airports.

Mr. Laing: Mr. Speaker, we are concerned over this aspect, and we will make every effort possible to avoid abuse.

AIR TRANSPORT

INQUIRY AS TO NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN AIR CANADA AND C.P.A.

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Gene Rhéaume (Northwest Territories): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. Can he report to the house on the negotiations between Air Canada and Canadian Pacific Air Lines in relation to international and domestic operations, which report he expected to be able to make on the first of September?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. gentleman is perhaps rather in a hurry. I said "during September". I can report that very active discussions have been going on between the two air lines since discussions commenced some months ago. I get progress reports from time to time, but I doubt that a statement at this stage would add very much to the prospects of success in these negotiations.

Mr. Rhéaume: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister assure the house he has not been pressuring Canadian Pacific Air Lines to change its name to Air Pacific Canada?

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I have not even heard of that suggestion before, but if the hon. gentleman wants them to do that no doubt he can carry on his own propaganda.

Inquiries of the Ministry

TELEVISION

PROVISION OF SETS CAPABLE OF RECEIVING 86 CHANNELS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A D. Hales (Wellington South): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport. Now that it has become practicable to transmit television programs from one continent to another, is the minister or his officials giving consideration to following the steps taken in the United States so that all television sets that may be produced in Canada will have a minimum of 86 channels?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): I am not quite sure whether under our jurisdiction—I am not expressing an opinion one way or the other—we would have the power to compel manufacturers to do that or whether it would be advisable. I am going to direct the hon. gentleman's question, and the information he gave me on which he based his question, to the Minister of Industry, who I think may very properly discuss this matter with the manufacturers in Canada, although they are rather alert and are likely to have noticed it themselves.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

INQUIRY AS TO HOLIDAYS FOR STAFF

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Royal): I should like to direct a question to the President of the Privy Council. What arrangements are being made so that the House of Commons permanent staff, including members' secretaries, may have holidays?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (President of the Privy Council): I am afraid this problem, although one in which I am very much interested, does not come directly under my responsibility.

HARBOURS

NORTH SYDNEY, N.S.—INQUIRY AS TO IMPROVEMENTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): I should like to ask the Minister of Transport if it is correct that tenders have been called for major harbour developments at North Sydney to convenience the ferries operating between North Sydney and Newfoundland.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): This would not come within my responsibility as minister, because these harbour developments would be undertaken by the Minister of Public Works. I am not actually sure if the tenders have been called as yet. I rather doubt it, but I hope they will be called soon.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): May I ask a supplementary question. I noticed that, according to the press, the Minister of Labour announced that tenders had been called. I am very glad to see the government has finally decided to go ahead with this project which was initiated by the previous government. May I ask also if the minister is aware that I have question No. 1,811 relating to this subject on the order paper, and it has been there for a few days now. Is he aware also that the minister made this announcement in yesterday's press?

Mr. Pickersgill: This just indicates that the Minister of Labour is much more alert than I am. However, I am well aware of the hon. gentleman's question, and I am doing my utmost to compose an answer that will satisfy him, the people of North Sydney and also the people of Port aux Basques.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

HAL BANKS—INQUIRY AS TO WHEREABOUTS

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): I am glad to learn about the alertness of the Minister of Labour. I want to find out the degree to which that alertness has resulted in securing some word regarding the itinerant and elusive Banks. Is the minister alert enough at the moment to advise whether there has been any communication by the Department of Labour with the United States secretary of labor for the purpose of ascertaining if Mr. Banks is at the moment on the payroll of the international S.I.U.? Has he made any investigation in that regard? Is he able to tell us whether the government of Canada, after three weeks, has been able to ascertain from the immigration authorities of the United States whether Mr. Banks shook the dust of Canada off his feet and went to the United States? After all, as one newspaper, the *Whig-Standard* said:

> Of course we're suspicious. The whole affair smells to high heaven.

Let us hear about that alertness now.

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the seeking out of individuals like Mr. Banks is not the proper function of

the Department of Labour. We have attended effectively to all those aspects of Mr. Banks' career that relate to this department.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I realize that the alertness of the hon. gentleman does not extend to other departments, but I ask him, did he ever think of getting in touch with the secretary of labor of the United States, with whom he had such frequent communications only a few months ago, to ascertain whether that gentleman may make inquiry of the international S.I.U. to find out where Mr. Banks is?

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): I want to address a supplementary question to the Minister of Labour. I should like to ask the minister whether in view of the apparent mobility of Mr. Banks he has given consideration to the idea of asking his colleague the Minister of Transport to take over looking into this situation?

HEALTH AND WELFARE

REPRESENTATIONS BY ONTARIO SENIOR CITIZENS RESPECTING MEDICAL CARE AND PENSIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Has the minister's attention been drawn to the request of the united senior citizens of Ontario, made at their meeting in London two days ago, that the federal government provide comprehensive medical care for citizens over 65 and raise the old age pension to $100 per month? What is the government's response to these requests?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): I have just noticed the clipping, and I am grateful to my hon. friend for sending me a copy of the Canadian Press story. As all hon. members know, there was an increase in the old age pension less than a year ago, and there has been no increase contemplated for this year. Perhaps of all things in the press release the most disturbing to all hon. members was the quotation allegedly laid to Mr. Rose in which it was indicated most members of parliament were just not interested in any such increase. I should like to say that all representatives in the House of Commons notwithstanding party affiliations, and particularly the hon. member are most interested in this problem.

Mr. Knowles: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister not realize that it would be a good way to show that interest and to celebrate our being a nation of 100 years existence by raising the pension to $100 a month?

Miss LaMarsh: Mr. Speaker, it may be that my hon. friend will have the responsibility of this particular portfolio by that time, and I would like to leave such a matter to the government of that day.

Mr. Heward Grafftey (Brome-Missisquoi): As a supplementary question, and in a more serious vein, is it not the opinion of the minister that rather than a non-serious ad hoc suggestion, such as was made by the hon. member a few moments ago, in future old age pensions should simply be raised in order to keep abreast of the rising cost of living?

Miss LaMarsh: This was substantially done up until 1957, but for a few years there it jumped very much ahead of the rise in cost of living.

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare concerning her answer to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, when she indicated that possibly he would have the responsibility for that portfolio in 1967. Is this a forecast of an amalgamation between the N.D.P. and the Liberal party, or is it a forecast of a coming Liberal defeat?

Miss LaMarsh: Mr. Speaker, I indicated that the hon. member to whom I was then replying was at least responsible and interested in this portfolio and might indeed aspire to hold it, something I cannot hold out as a hope to the hon. member who asked me this question.

ROYAL COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS RESPECTING MEDICAL SCHOOLS AND SCHOLARSHIPS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. William Dean Howe (Hamilton South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In view of the statement made by the president of the Canadian Medical Association that only immediate expansion of medical training facilities will prevent a serious shortage of doctors in Canada, has the government considered the early implementa-

tion of the Hall commission recommendations for new medical schools and medical scholarships?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): As is well known, Mr. Speaker, the government is considering all the implications and recommendations of the Hall report.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

STAMP COMMEMORATING ANNIVERSARY OF DISCOVERY OF SALT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. H. A. Thomas (Middlesex West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Postmaster General. Has the minister received representations promoting the issue in 1966 of a stamp to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the discovery of salt in Canada? Would the minister investigate the desirability of issuing such a stamp, as outlined by the stamp editor on page 21 of the London *Free Press* for August 8?

Mr. Speaker: Would the hon. member put that question on the order paper.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

TORONTO, ONT.—DENIAL OF BENEFITS TO STRIKING NEWSPAPER EMPLOYEES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Minister of Labour a question related to an answer he gave the day before yesterday about the I.T.U. strike in Toronto. Has the minister completed his investigation in order to ascertain whether a sufficient resumption of work is taking place so that the strikers would now be eligible for unemployment insurance?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I had information yesterday from the commission to the effect that the situation is being closely followed by the insurance officer, and that the jurisprudence in these cases is usually to the effect that 85 per cent activity must be resumed before normal work is considered to have taken place in the operation.

Mr. Scott: Can the minister tell us how they ascertain the 85 per cent? What action is taken by his department to arrive at a conclusion, one way or another, on the figure of 85 per cent?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, this matter is one for the unemployment insurance commission. As I understand it, the insurance officer has authority under the act to make a decision with respect to this matter.

Mr. Scott: Would the minister take into consideration the *Telegram* of yesterday, which produced a 72 page paper and is well within the 85 per cent margin?

CANADIAN FLAG

OFFICIAL ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW DESIGN

The house resumed, from Wednesday, September 2, consideration of the motion of Mr. Pearson:

> 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 the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Diefenbaker, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Churchill.

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe East): Mr. Speaker, when the house adjourned last night I was speaking about the great contributions that had been made by various countries, particularly the Scandinavian countries, to both England and France. The Normans brought with them to England their culture, which was a Latin culture, and the Roman influence. William the Conqueror in some cases pursued a scorched earth policy but he brought order and set up a country that was never again invaded successfully by any other nation.

I also went on to point out that the Norman language enriched the language of the English. It became the language of the court, it became the language of the gentry, it became the language of the politicians, and Latin became the language of the church; while the poorer classes, the agricultural classes and serfs, used English. It was the melding of these two languages that made the English language as we know it today; a language whose origins are part French and part English, a language which is world wide, a language which is used by our neighbour to the south, the most powerful nation in the world. The melding of these strains gave rise to the tongue in which the plays of Shakespeare were written, in which Milton's "Paradise Lost" was written and in which Bunyan's "Pilgrim's Progress" was penned. It produced not only a great language, but unity; unity in a nation which controlled

the seven seas, which held sway over all the oceans of the world and which for years was the greatest peacemaker of all, as well as the greatest colonial organizer in the world.

It is also interesting to note, as I mentioned earlier, that the language of this nation became the language of the great country to the south. There was doubt whether it would be German rather than English, at one point, but George Washington gave the deciding vote in favour of English.

Thus it was that this great British nation came into conflict with the French in New France. Let me remind hon. members that the population in New France at the time of the battle of Quebec was just around 50,000 people. They were people who were heavily taxed and badly looked after, grumbled at by King Louis of France whenever they asked for help. Historians say he would like to have written off the colony and forgotten it. The officials were rapacious. They taxed the colonists whenever they could, stayed long enough to make fortunes, then returned to France to live on their illgotten gains. Certainly there were good officials, but the bad ones overshadowed them.

Is it any wonder, then, that these colonists, given the benefit of free trade under the British constitution and freedom from taxation on their goods as well as freedom of religion and the opportunity to retain the French language and the French code of civil law, were glad to accept these things? To an oppressed, heavily taxed people, robbed by some of their intendents, this represented a freedom they had never enjoyed.

What was the attitude of the English themselves? They were on most cordial terms with the French. We are told they laboured in the fields side by side with these sons of France and worked together with them on other jobs as well. We read that during their second winter in Quebec the English collected five hundred pounds sterling to help the French. This is a sum which would be worth well over $30,000 in terms of today's money. The garrison of Quebec gave one day's ration per month.

This was a friendship the colonists had not known from France. This was a freedom they had not known before. As a matter of fact, we learn that 3,000 Scottish soldiers who settled in New France liked the French girls so much that they married them. Here we see the introduction of some 3,000 young Scotsmen into the mainstream of the life of this colony. It meant, too, that 3,000 girls of French origin were taken out of the marriage market. Talk about unity, what unity is there to beat that? Today, some people talk about disunity. What is wrong with history teaching in Canada if there is disunity? What is wrong with the politicians if there is disunity?

I want to say that the French appreciated the Quebec Act. They appreciated the treatment I have described here so well that when the American revolution came they stood side by side with their English compatriots and with the Indians and, with the help of the British navy and British soldiers, they defended this country successfully during the American revolution and during the war of 1812. This is unity. Who today tries to cause disunity?

The French and the English together made progress over the years. First there was Upper and Lower Canada. Then there was the province of Canada. Then we had confederation. Not 50 years after that the French and the English were found joining together to go to war when over 600,000 boys—yes and for the first time some women, too,—went abroad to defend freedom in the great struggle of 1914-1918. Some of them, both English and French, went to the help of their mother countries, and over 100,000 suffered casualties. But out of the ashes of that war came the treaty of Westminster. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this was a move made by Sir Robert Borden when he insisted on signing the treaty of Versailles, confirmed in 1932 by a Conservative government under R. B. Bennett.

I come now to the second world war of 1939-45. Here again the English and French fought side by side to defend their mother countries, England and to an even greater extent France, against the invasion of Hitler. A great many of these boys and girls of Canada, principally the young men, lie buried in the fields of France, and on one of these graves— I have not seen it—is an inscription of particular significance. A gentleman from Vancouver wrote to me that there is a monument to an unknown soldier on the Normandy beachhead with the following inscription on the stone: "The sons of William the Conquerer come back to claim his land". I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what greater unity could we have? Who is dividing this country today?

We have before us one of the most divisive issues which could be presented to parliament. Here in Canada we have a people whose stock is 44 per cent British, 30 per cent French and 23 per cent of other European

origin. The Prime Minister has made use of two issues which, in my opinion, are most divisive. The commission on biculturalism and bilingualism was appointed to go across this country and, as far as I can see, it has only stirred up trouble. Now the right hon. gentleman has brought in a flag of his own choice.

I do not want to be critical of the Prime Minister, because we all make mistakes. Where is the man who has not make a mistake? I sympathize with him, Mr. Speaker, but I say this was simply a tragedy; this was the thing to disunite the people, not to unite them. Nothing the Prime Minister could have done could have caused more trouble; no way he could have gone about it could have caused more trouble. Then we ask ourselves, why did he do it? It has been said that it was an election promise. If it was an election promise three Toronto daily newspapers did not know anything about it, because they did not carry a single line about it in their advertisements. Not one newspaper mentioned it.

On Friday, May 15 the Prime Minister said "Well, we have 37 important measures to come before the house". But the flag was not included in them. On June 3, though, he announced that he had cut this to 18 items, and the flag made its appearance. Why? Did he have a mandate from the people? This is a Prime Minister with a minority government. I ask hon. members on the other side of the chamber, did he have a mandate? How could he have a mandate, when he had a minority government and only 42 per cent of the vote? It has now been shown, according to the newspaper reports, that nine provinces are against the Prime Minister's personal flag and only one province is for it. But, Mr. Speaker, I have had letters from the province of Quebec as well as designs.

Here is where I think the Prime Minister is making a fatal mistake in coming to the conclusion that the people of the province of Quebec want the flag he is personally proposing. I do not believe this is so, because not one of the designs I received nor one of the letters—and I received a goodly number—called for this flag. After speaking in this house previously I received several letters, most of them congratulatory. Even though they differed, and these people said they wanted a new flag, in my opinion the great majority of people in Canada are not in favour of the design proposed by the Prime Minister. This is my personal opinion, Mr. Speaker.

I say let us have a proper flag; let us have a flag that will be respected and accepted from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The dominion-provincial conference has been held in Charlottetown during the past few days. The other evening in the quietness of my office I thought what a wonderful thing it would have been if the Prime Minister of this country had presented the flag question to that meeting and had said, "You are going to change things. You are going to change the constitution. Let us get together now and work out the flag over the next two or three years", before 1967. Mr. Speaker, let us have a flag that every premier and the people in the provinces from the Atlantic to the Pacific will accept. Would it not have been a great thing if this had been done?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Rynard: I do not think any members on the government side can disagree with that in their hearts and souls. I do not believe there is one hon. member opposite who would say this was not the proper course.

Now we are faced with this problem. The Prime Minister has introduced his personal flag. I say again that I have nothing against the Prime Minister in any way. I know it is a heavy load that any prime minister carries. However, contrary to all the rules of diplomacy he introduced his own flag. Did he consult the Leader of the Opposition or any of the other groups before he brought in this design? Not at all; he brought in his own flag.

In doing so, Mr. Speaker, there was no reference to the people at all, and no plebiscite. At the beginning the Prime Minister said there would not be a free vote; in other words, "If you do not vote for it you can go to the people". I say to you, Mr. Speaker, how in the world could the Prime Minister have gone about it in a more arrogant fashion than this?

Things have changed now, because nine out of ten provinces do not want a change or they want some other design. *Le Devoir* was very sympathetic last spring to the Prime Minister's flag; they were prepared to go along with him. Now the conclusion they have reached, as I gather from reading the articles that have appeared in this newspaper, is that they are fed up with the bumbling in connection with this issue; they do not want to go along with it any more. That is a very influential newspaper in the province of Quebec. They say "In May your ideas might not have been too bad, but in August your bumbling is too much".

I have stated that the correspondence and designs I have received in connection with the flag have led me to believe that the people of the province of Quebec have far better flags, far more acceptable flags which have been designed by the people of that province. Their designs are far more acceptable than that introduced by the Prime Minister. I feel rather sorry for the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker, because his charted course has floundered. Now he offers summit meetings and a free vote, but this is all too late. Perhaps this is his only way out. I want to place on the record an article which appeared in the Cape Breton *Post*. This is very apropos:

> Conservative M.P.'s are taking the right course on the flag issue, in stepping up their campaign in the House of Commons to persuade the government to refer the issue to a special parliamentary committee.
>
> The issue should have gone to a parliamentary committee in the first place, but it's not too late for this to be done as a means of breaking the deadlock on the flag debate.
>
> The Conservative tactics became evident Tuesday as the house plodded through the 14th sitting day of debate on the maple leaf flag resolution. Conservative after Conservative rose to press the point that a small all-party committee would cool off the steaming debate.
>
> The Conservative proposition is that a committee should be empowered to recommend a flag and have it approved by the house. If the committee failed to agree unanimously on a flag, the issue should be taken to the people in a national plebiscite.
>
> The prospect of a committee representing all groups in the Commons, arriving at an unanimous agreement on the flag does seem dim, but obviously such a committee should be the next step toward settling the issue.
>
> The next step thereafter quite conceivably would be or should be a national plebiscite, which previously was recommended by this newspaper as the sure way of the country reaching a firm decision on the design of Canada's new flag.
>
> All parties, including the Conservative party, appear to be agreed that a new flag is essential. It would be misleading to suppose that the Conservatives oppose the adoption of a new flag. The controversy on the issue revolves around a question of design.

I have said previously that the Prime Minister has my sympathy, because he is in about the worst mess possible. He said we cannot have a plebiscite on this issue. Why in the world can we not have a plebiscite? He has only to consider the action taken by previous Liberal leaders, who held plebiscites on issues that were just as emotional as this one; that were just as heart searching. I say to the Prime Minister that it is not too late for him to change his course. I suggest, in the interests of very important legislation that is waiting to be dealt with, that he get on with the job and get this work done. I had a newspaper clipping from the *Daily Packet and Times* which said "The reason he is not getting on with it is that he has not the legislation prepared".

Mr. Speaker, if that is true we should adjourn this house and allow the members to go home, and the ministers should get together and prepare legislation. Why should the Prime Minister keep everyone here when he has nothing for us to do? I suggest the problem is one for the government to solve, not for the opposition to solve. I say with all seriousness as a Canadian that it is my desire to have the flag issue settled in such a way that our national unity will continue in the spirit which existed following the capture of Quebec, as evidenced by the intermarriage and the intermingling of the two races on a firm footing. These two peoples lived in complete unity of purpose and have defended this country over the years. They were faced with a war within a short period of our historic union, and won.

Mr. Speaker, in the interests of preserving that great unity I suggest to the Prime Minister that he allow a committee to commence its deliberations in respect of the flag issue. Let us adjourn this house until that committee has found a solution, or until the government has prepared other legislation. Over and over again it has been proved that the government does not now have legislation ready. Mr. Speaker, I think we can resolve the present difficulties with which we are faced. Whenever people get into trouble I always remember that poem which states:

> One ship drives east and another drives west
> By the self-same winds that blow,
> 'Tis the set of the sails and not the gales
> Which determines the way we go.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, I am one of those members who have been somewhat reluctant to participate in this debate. I consider this to be one of the greatest debates this house has had for many years, and perhaps we will not have another as great for some years. I am not apologetic in any way for rising to contribute in my small way those words I feel are essential at this time. Despite the fact that government members, and perhaps some members of the opposition, have not contributed to it, I think in years to come students will regard this debate as part of the history of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I have been reluctant to speak because I felt, as perhaps the Prime Minister

did, that a new flag might be essential to the unity of this country. I still feel that there is a possible solution to our problem, and I am not prepared to accept the idea advanced by those individuals who are ready to separate from the rest of Canada. I am not ready to accept the idea that a part of Canada, which I believe is part of my nation, should become a separate entity. I think those individuals who feel that part of Quebec, or Quebec itself, should separate from the rest of Canada are wrong, and I will do everything in my power to protect and defend my country, of which I believe Quebec is a part.

Mr. Speaker, I am not happy about what is happening in the province of Quebec, but I do not believe that those people in Quebec, who are deeply disturbed by the present situation, wish to be embroiled in this question. I have hesitated to take part in this debate because I am neither of Anglo-Saxon nor French Canadian origin. My father came from Poland and, although my mother was born in Canada, her parents were of Ukrainian origin. I often refer to myself in a jocular way as a half-breed, but at the same time I feel very strongly that I am a Canadian.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Korchinski: Mr. Speaker, I heard someone on the opposite side say "Hear, hear." I am very puzzled, and have been puzzled over the years, because of a question asked during the taking of the census. Most people in this country wish to be labelled and considered as Canadians.

An hon. Member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Korchinski: Mr. Speaker, again I hear a member say "Hear, hear". We all want to be remembered as Canadians. I should like to remind those members on the opposite side that there is another problem inherent in that problem we are now discussing. We must decide whether we wish to be Canadians, or to be Polish Canadians, Ukrainian Canadians, Yugoslav Canadians, or Canadians of many other ethnic origins.

An hon. Member: Or French Canadians.

Mr. Korchinski: Mr. Speaker, behind the main problem there is another problem which is difficult to isolate. I want to co-operate with all Canadians, but I expect in turn that they will co-operate with me. I should like to know why, during a census taking, some Canadians were labelled as French Canadians, for example. If an individual wishes to be identified as something other than just a Canadian I would agree to that designation, but I should like to know why those of us who wish to be Canadians must disclose our racial background.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure my leader is aware of my position. I felt perhaps the establishment of a distinctive Canadian flag would lend itself to national unity.

Mr. Benidickson: Would not this distinctive flag help?

Mr. Korchinski: I do not know what distinctive flag would help create national unity, but I am sure that the flag your government has proposed is not accomplishing that which you intended.

Mr. Speaker, I have been very reluctant until this stage of the debate to say anything, because I honestly felt that perhaps at some time during this great debate something would be suggested that would be accepted by all parties. Unfortunately no suggestion has been put forward which is acceptable to all parties. There have been many suggestions put forward by the official opposition, and only by the official opposition, but none has been mutually acceptable. If this proposed flag is not mutually acceptable in this House of Commons, how could it possibly be mutually acceptable throughout Canada? I suggest to those members who have been pressing this flag issue that they should take stock of the situation at this stage.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out that we in the opposition are not debating this flag issue because we love to stay here all summer. Do not think for one moment that we are not jeopardizing our own position if we are taking the wrong course, but think what you are going to do to Canada. As I said, I have been very reluctant to participate in this debate because I was perhaps not convinced as readily as some. I too felt that there might have been some in between measure we could take. I still believe that today. But there is only one group that can do something about the matter, and that is the government. We are not the ones who are responsible for taking action in the House of Commons; it is the government.

The leaders of all parties are meeting. The debate going on in the House of Commons is the frontispiece, if you like. Behind it are the discussions that are being held between the Prime Minister, the Leader of the Opposition, the past leader of the Social Credit party, the leader of the New Democratic party and the leader of the Creditistes. I have referred to the past leader of the Social Credit party for

the simple reason that he is stumbling over himself in his hurry to get over to the other side of the house and have them accept him. Let us not fool around about that.

We have been told that this debate is a filibuster, but so many strange statements have been made by the past leader of that party that it is disgusting. In fact he has reached the point that he does not even know whether he wants the Social Credit nomination in his own riding. He wants the Liberal nomination. We might as well accept that fact, and the people of Canada might as well know it.

I am one of those who believe that a two party system is the most effective parliamentary system that can be devised. I do not believe for one moment that a third party is necessary, nor do I believe that you add to the effectiveness of the system by adopting another name. You simply have a special label and that is all. However, I am sure the Liberal party of today can accept many of the ideas and ideologies expressed by the Creditiste group, the Social Credit group or the New Democratic group, and I am sure that many of us in the Conservative group are also quite prepared to accept many of their ideas. We have done this in the past. This has nothing to do with the issue today.

Mr. Deschatelets: Is your leader ready to do so?

An hon. Member: Your leader is not ready.

Mr. Korchinski: The two members who sit behind me will substantiate that he was ready to accept them because some of their ideas represent ideas in which he believes.

Mr. Thompson: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, there is a subamendment before the house. Should we not be speaking to the subamendment?

Mr. Korchinski: I am sure what I am suggesting is unity. I am suggesting that the past Social Credit leader should unite with the Liberal party. That is exactly where he is headed.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Perhaps the hon. member could direct himself to the subamendment.

Mr. Korchinski: Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will agree with me that what we want in this country is unity, and there cannot be unity if we are going to divide ourselves in the House of Commons in such a way that the people of the country do not know where they are being led. How can the country be led by minority groups, large or small; and if the leader of one of those groups is going to deviate where is the country headed?

I want to turn again to the subamendment.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Korchinski: Again I say that if at this moment the leader of the Social Credit group were to suggest that he was going to walk across to the government side, they would accept him and members on that side would not even interrupt me. The point is that we in Canada are going through a quiet struggle, a struggle that it is difficult for people to understand. It is difficult for me as a private member to understand. I should like to see the man who can show us the answer to this dilemma. I should like to see that man, because I do not believe the past leader of the Social Credit party is the man who will show us how it is to be done. There are those who want to call themselves French Canadians. We have no problem with them, but they have a problem within themselves.

An hon. Member: You have a problem over there.

Mr. Korchinski: That is true. We have a problem.

Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne): Like the Ukrainians in Europe.

Mr. Korchinski: I say that I do not want to be labelled as a Ukrainian, nor do I want to be labelled as a Pole. I want to be labelled as a Canadian. I do not know the constituency of the hon. member who interjected, but if somebody will remind me of it I will put it on record.

Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne): It is a good French name.

Mr. Korchinski: The point is that I want to be a Canadian, and the sooner all of us want to be Canadians the sooner we will get to the root of the problem. Why do you want to be called French Canadians when it comes to the census but want to be labelled as Canadians when it comes to a flag? I ask that question. On the one hand you want to be labelled as a separate French Canadian group, and on the other hand you want to be labelled as Canadians.

May I say I have some very good friends among the French speaking members. I am looking at the Minister without Portfolio. I am sure he will agree that I have discussed with him the question of how we could get at the root of the problem.

Mr. Benidickson: By a Canadian flag.

Mr. Korchinski: Why do they want special consideration on the one hand, and on the other hand do not want to be recognized as a separate group? Why do we want two flags? What are we supposed to ask for in this debate? I am asking today, what do we want? What does the government want? After we finish this debate what will we be in the midst of then? We will be in the midst of another debate which will be a contradiction of what the government are trying to do today. They are going to say to us that the union jack is all right in certain cases. What hypocrisy. You do not believe it. Why do you try to shove it down the throats of Canadians? I do not know what is behind the whole thing, and personally I do not think the Liberal party is behind this flag proposal. I do not think the cabinet is behind it. The only one who is behind it is the Prime Minister. This is the problem. I have a quotation here from Shakespeare.

An hon. Member: Read it.

Mr. Korchinski: Sure I will read it. It might be a lot easier to take than my words: I refer to Julius Caesar, act one, scene two:

> Caesar. Let me have men about me that are fat; Sleek-headed men and such as sleep o'nights. Yon Cassius has a lean and hungry look; He thinks too much: such men are dangerous.
> Antony. Fear him not, Caesar, he's not dangerous; He is a noble Roman, and well given.
> Caesar. Would he were fatter! But I fear him not;
> Yet if my name were liable to fear,
> I do not know the man I should avoid
> So soon as that spare Cassius. He reads much;
> He is a great observer, and he looks
> Quite through the deeds of men; he loves no plays,
> As thou dost, Antony; he hears no music;
> Seldom he smiles, and smiles in such a sort
> As if he mock'd himself, and scorn'd his spirit
> That could be moved to smile at any thing.
> Such men as he be never at heart's ease
> Whiles they behold a greater than themselves—

I am suggesting at the moment, Mr. Speaker, that this is what the Prime Minister and the Prime Minister alone has done. He has thought to himself, for what am I going to be remembered. He said to himself well, the Leader of the Opposition was prime minister and he is going to be remembered for the bill of rights. For what am I to be remembered? He said, I am going to be remembered for the flag. He talked to a few of his colleagues in the cabinet. I stand to be corrected on this, but I understand it was suggested at one time that there were only a few, select members of his cabinet who were going to choose a design for the flag.

An hon. Member: Well, be corrected, then.

[Mr. Benidickson.]

Mr. Korchinski: I suggested that I wanted to be fair about this.

An hon. Member: Who told you that?

Mr. Korchinski: I read it in the Liberal press. I am suggesting that this country is being divided, and it is being divided not by the Liberal party, not by the Liberal cabinet, not by anybody except one man. This one man wants to immortalize the name of Pearson. He wants—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. May I recall to the hon. member that we are discussing how to conduct a plebiscite and what we should do with the results, whether they should be published in one way or the other. This is really the subamendment.

Mr. Korchinski: I should like to bow to your wishes, Mr. Speaker. I certainly do not want to divide—

Mr. Speaker: I think all the members in the house must realize that a great deal of leniency has been given to the hon. member. I do not see where it is in order for an hon. member to indulge in a personal vendetta against any particular member, no matter what his official position may be. We are discussing the subamendment and under the heading "national unity" there is wide scope.

Mr. Korchinski: I am suggesting that a division is being created in this country, and it is being created by only one individual. I do not know how to skirt around this problem without referring to the particular individual. If I may refer to him as an hon. member, then I will do that. I do believe I am discussing unity at this particular moment. I do not want to deviate from your ruling, Mr. Speaker, or anything of the sort. However, I do want to be able to discuss unity. I have already suggested it is not the Liberal party that is dividing this country. I have suggested it is not the cabinet that is dividing this country. I am suggesting that—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Korchinski: I am suggesting that we can find unity only by avoiding one man's ambitions. This man is ambitious. I am suggesting to the members of the government and to government supporters that this man is dangerous to you. You are going to lose your seats because of this man's attitude.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Korchinski: Well, if it is all right for the Minister of Trade and Commerce to suggest it is dangerous for the Conservative party

to have a certain leader, I am sure it must be all right for me to make the same suggestion to the Liberals.

Where are we heading? I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, where we are heading. I have a letter here, and I do not mind telling hon. members that I did not receive very many letters concerning this problem. This is one of the reasons I have not participated in this debate heretofore. I have a letter here from which I am going to quote very briefly. This letter is from one of my constituents, a French Canadian if you want to use that hyphenated name. She is Mrs. Roland Bosse from Perigord, Saskatchewan, which is a French community. I receive a great reception when I go there. Let me tell the members of the government what they are doing.

Mr. Rouleau: Is the letter in French or English?

Mr. Korchinski: Let me tell the hon. member what she says about the flag:

> I'm sending you three letters that I cut out from "The Western Producers, The Young Co-Ops' Page", and they express my feelings better than I can express them myself.

I am just going to quote this letter. I am sure she did not want to hurt my feelings, and I do not want to offend her in any way:

> Canada, O Canada
>
> "United we stand; divided we fall." This is an old saying that historians often use in reference to the fall of a country. Does this hold true today? We are faced with the division of our country today, and most of us realize this. All over this large country of ours a team to study bilingualism and biculturalism has been set up, headed by André Laurendeau and Davidson Dunton. Exchange students are being sent to Quebec and vice-versa.
>
> The new flag has raised the question of further split. I am sure all of us would be content with the old flag if the new one had to be brought in at the expense of a division in our country. If we all work for the interest of the country I am sure a division can be prevented.

Now, this expresses her sentiments, and I underline the fact that it expresses my sentiments. I do not want a division in this country. I believe that Quebec is part of Saskatchewan, if you want to look at it that way. I believe I have an interest in that province. I have tried my utmost to understand the situation. I believe that today the Prime Minister is going headlong into something, and he does not know where it is going to end. If he wants to immortalize his name he will do so in one way, and that will be as the man who divided this country.

This is not going to be a laughing matter when it happens. I do not regard this as something funny. My parents came to this country because it had a future, and they would not want to see a division in this country. If you think it is a silly matter, then you do not respect the historical background of our flag. Let us not forget that right today Britain does not want to allow Southern Rhodesia its independence until such time as freedom and free speech for all its people are guaranteed within its confines. This is what that country stands for. This is what my people came to; this is what we want, and this is what I want. Do you not want it?

I heard overtures from the Social Credit party suggesting we should propose closure, and the hon. member who sits behind a former leader of the Social Credit group suggested he would be willing to impose closure. Is this what this new flag is going to represent—lack of freedom of speech? This is not what my people want; this is not what I want. I am sure this is not what government members want.

Mr. Deschatelets: Speak for yourself.

Mr. Korchinski: I am speaking for myself and I hope I speak for a lot more people when I speak for freedom of speech. Is the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Deschatelets) suggesting for one moment that freedom of speech is not important?

Mr. Deschatelets: I said speak for yourself.

Mr. Korchinski: In uttering those words at this moment he is expressing a freedom of speech that is unknown in many countries. In fact if he spoke them in some countries he would be taken behind the curtain, and it would be an iron curtain.

I am suggesting that there is nothing to prevent the government from taking action which will provide a solution for this problem. Obviously the opposition is not being foolhardy. We are doing this because of the type of letters we get, and because of the type of reaction across the country. Obviously we are speaking for a minority, if it is such; but it could be a majority, and I am suggesting the longer this debate is prolonged it will become a majority. I am sure most of the government supporters will agree with that—that it will be a majority, if it is not one already.

I know what the reaction was in the press gallery when this debate started. Members of the press gallery said public opinion would solidify itself behind the flag issue and that the Prime Minister would be all right. This is what they thought; but let me point out to the government members and the members of the press gallery, if it is not obvious to

them already, that public support has not solidified behind the government, has not backed up the Prime Minister in his bold, foolhardy venture. The man who is Prime Minister today had a bold and imaginative idea. It is all right to be bold and imaginative, but he is going to learn it is over his head and that it is about time he quit.

Why must he pursue this course? It is for the simple reason, as I said before, that he wants to immortalize himself through the flag. Why must the rest of his party be subjected to that type of treatment? I suggest to his party that the mixed caucus it holds stinks. This idea stinks and the Prime Minister should not go through with it. I suggest that his party should not pursue this course because it is foolhardy, because they are going over a cliff. Like lemmings they are heading for the sea. There are a lot of good members on the government side; perhaps some of the finest members are found on the other side, and I would like to see their faces again, but not in shame. If they divide this country it will not be for a day or a year or two; it will be for a long time.

I do not like to see my fellowmen fighting me. I do not like to fight my fellowmen. I see no reason. Because of what—a flag? I am sure a country can exist without a flag.

An hon. Member: We are the only one.

Mr. Korchinski: If we want to preserve our unity, if we have any respect for each other we can exist without a flag. If this is what you say, then we have done it for over 100 years.

Speaking of history, at one stage when Lord Durham was preparing his report he had a sheaf of notes and he jotted down what came to his mind. The thought that entered his mind on one particular occasion was that this was a country without a history. This he jotted down, and later that day the maid entered his study to clean up and she saw these notes. I understand she was a French maid, and when she saw what he had written she thought it was wrong, and she wrote that on his notes.

Mr. Dupuis: May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Korchinski: Just hold on a minute. When Lord Durham saw his notes in the morning he realized he had been wrong and that this woman knew what she was talking about. He asked her to explain why she had written on his notes, and she told him that Canada was rich in its history, even at that date.

[Mr. Korchinski.]

We are not an emerging nation. We are not a nation that all of a sudden has got its independence. We are going to celebrate our 100th anniversary. We have a history. Are you to deny what has happened in the past? Am I to deny it? Stalin told his people, "Things happen this way." After him Khrushchev came along and said what happened under Stalin did not exist. Are those in Germany today, much as they dislike what happened in Germany, and much as a lot of us dislike it, to deny it happened? They cannot deny that they had a history. They had a history, much as we may dislike it.

Somebody said Wolfe fought Montcalm. Wolfe defeated Montcalm, somebody said; but the other point of view is that Montcalm surrendered to him. It does not matter how you look at it. The point is that this happened, and much as we may like or dislike certain events, they did happen; and much as the government supporters may dislike what is happening here today the fact is that there are those who want to preserve history as we know it, and I want to be associated with those people who want to be proud of our history.

I am amazed that the Prime Minister, a past history professor, should discard our history. What reason is there in this?

An hon. Member: You know something about the Poles and the Ukrainians, don't you?

Mr. Korchinski: I know something about Canada, and that is what I am interested in. The point I am making is this—that the Prime Minister, a former history professor, says that history is to be forgotten and that we are going to start from scratch. And scratch it is. Somebody has suggested to me that if you draw three twigs on one base—a chicken's foot—that is the flag in winter. The Prime Minister is dividing this country today in such a way that I am ashamed. I have a letter here, but before I read it I should like to put on record a comment by Lubor J. Zink which I think sets out the situation very clearly.

> All this sowing of nationalistic mistrust, which cannot but produce a harvest of hatred and strife is done by allegedly rational men motivated by visions of a strong united Canada.

I am sure that at one point the Prime Minister must have thought he was unifying Canada. I am equally sure that at this stage he is bound to realize he has not done so. He has divided us. I do not mind telling the supporters of the government that if there had been a free vote at an early stage

of this debate I might have felt as they do. But I have since changed my mind, as I think a great many Canadians have also changed their minds. I do not know whether I speak here for an ethnic group. I know I can speak as one member of an ethnic group. And I say the Prime Minister is wrong and that he had better consider the situation again.

We have offered alternatives. We have suggested a plebiscite. It is true that in a sense this was a negative proposition—

An hon. Member: Your own member voted against it.

Mr. Korchinski: I do not care how he voted. That is the freedom he enjoys. There was no effort in this party to prevent a free vote. But there was no free vote on the government side.

We offered another alternative. It must be remembered that it was the Conservative opposition, and the Conservative opposition alone, which offered this other suggestion and I am proud to stand with it. No one on the government side put forward the suggestion we now offer that this question should now be placed before a committee. If hon. members opposite want to save the face of the Prime Minister they should plead with him to accept this proposal. I do not know how they will go about it. I have tried in a quiet way to suggest to private members that they should make such an approach but, apparently, they were unable to get through to him. For anyone to suggest, as did the leader of the Social Credit party, that this party is not consulted by its leader—I think the blame should be laid on the government side of the house—is absolutely disgusting.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired.

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Up to this point I have not taken part formally in this flag debate, but at the present time I feel we have reached a stage where there must be some alternative course to the one we are following now. Therefore, I wish to speak briefly in order to put forward a few suggestions which I think are vitally urgent as far as an alternative line of approach is concerned.

Many charges have been made by various members who have taken part in this debate, including the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Korchinski) who has just spoken. In my opinion, this is not an occasion for further remarks which might arouse emotions or feelings. It is a time when we must realize it is imperative for us to reach some kind of agreement which can bring this spectacle, of which we are all a part, to an end.

I do not care for the way in which the flag issue was introduced into this house. I think the timing was poor. I think the method which was used to bring these resolutions before us can hardly be considered the best. Neither does the three maple leaf design appeal to me as far as its beauty is concerned, or in terms of the type of flag I should like to see this nation have. I must admit however that since the debate began I have learned much more about the history of the three maple leaf emblem and the extent to which it has been tied in with Canada's story from the beginning. But somehow it seems to lack the aesthetic appeal which a flag should have.

On the other hand, I have taken the stand for a number of years that Canada should have a distinctive Canadian flag. I have spent most of my adult years overseas living in foreign countries and it has been my privilege to share part of the general regard which, for the most part, nationals of foreign countries have for Canadians. I do not think this regard arises so much out of what has been done by our successive governments. Rather I think it has risen because of what Canadians have done. It seems that whether they are of English stock, or French stock, or whether they have another ethnic origin, Canadians are able to make friends with and influence effectively the people with whom they come into contact. This is one of the reasons I have for thinking that Canada has a definite role to play in a world whose affairs come closer to us each year.

One of the questions which has been asked of me over and over again in the course of years is: Why don't we have a flag which is distinctively Canadian? People in other countries often ask whether we still belong, as a colony, to Great Britain. They wonder whether or not we are an autonomous nation. They find our position difficult to understand. In June I was part of a delegation which visited Europe, and while there I talked to many of our people, who are doing a wonderful job—in fact, it seems to me they are better liked than they were ten years ago when they first went to Europe. But I did not find a single officer serving in Europe with our Canadian forces who did not voice the wish that we might have some distinctive flag expressive of the distinctive and unique role which Canada is playing at the present time. As to my own convictions with

regard to this, I have tried to respect the opinions of others. I do not think this is a matter we should use in order to develop animosity among ourselves. Goodness knows, we have little enough of a national purpose today without trying to break down further what there might be.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion that we ought to try to come together in some non-partisan way in order to work out together a design that would be acceptable to all of us, in a way that the majority of Canadian people would agree with, and which would make them proud of the flag decided upon. I do not think it has been helpful to any of us in this house or to the nation to have this debate carry on as it has now for 20 days. I believe it is the responsibility of every one of us in this house to endeavour to make it possible to come to some mutually acceptable agreement, an agreement that is not forced upon one or the other and is not legislated upon one or the other.

I am confident that such an agreement is possible. I am sure that if we were to lay out the vehicle by which this coming together could be made possible, we would even surprise ourselves how quickly we could come to some agreement. I do not think there is anything to be gained by charging the Liberals at this time that they did not do this the right way, or because they did not consult on a non-partisan basis or did not adhere to their original position that there would be a free vote, as was said at the beginning. These things belong to the past. I do not agree with the tactics and the policy the Conservative opposition have used. I do not think this is the time to try to arouse feelings or to condemn them for that. I believe the time has come when we should try to come together in order to reach some agreement.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the hon. member would permit a question?

Mr. Thompson: If the hon. member does not mind, Mr. Speaker, I would be very pleased to answer his questions afterwards. I find that this flag debate has become odorous in the nostrils of our own countrymen, and a spectacle to other countries which must cause them to smile in a tolerant way, as though they were watching children quarrelling at play. We have become akin to high school cheering sections, tearing each other to pieces on the sidelines while the people who paid the price want us to get on with the game for which they paid.

[Mr. Thompson.]

It is time we got down to the serious business of running our country's affairs, which we have been sent here by the people to accomplish. We are in danger of not holding the country together at all so that any flag of any description can have anything to fly over. If we do not behave like responsible, mature people, we will not be doing anything more than reserving a picture of the map of Canada in a page of world history of something that once was—a faded camelot. You can colour it "shattered".

Unless there are ulterior motives on the part of some individuals—and I do not believe this is so in this house—reasonable men should be able to arrive at a reasonable and fair solution to our unnecessary dilemma. At the heart of our democratic process is the basic philosophy of majority rule with flexibility of action to make required concessions to a minority opinion. It has been said that politics is the art of the possible. There is nothing wrong with that. But I believe it is impossible for us to continue as we are going on at the present time. The only result that can come to pass by having the government resort to closure directed at those who are opposing the three maple leaf design, and to have them fail in their objective, would be to have it replaced by a more acceptable design.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is possible for us to come together. That is why I am speaking in this manner at this time. We can come together on this issue so that the House of Commons may proceed with the legislation that is vital to our country. I would suggest, first of all, that the Prime Minister call, immediately after Labour day, another meeting of the leaders. I would urge the Prime Minister to consider this request. Second, I suggest that a committee be set up to which both flag resolutions could be referred. It has been proposed that this committee comprise 15 members; I have no objection to that. But I do not think we should demand of this committee a degree of unanimity that it is impossible to expect if it is there as a requirement. I believe we should accept such a committee being set up; we should accept those who are suggested to represent the different parties on that committee in good faith, in that they will consider the resolutions and be able to come to some mutually acceptable agreement.

I am sure that if this committee were to be set up on that basis there could be achieved just as great a degree of unanimity as there was in the former committee in 1946.

Third, this committee should be given one month to deliberate to seek a mutually acceptable alternative. This would bring us past the date of the Queen's visit. If the committee could come to an agreement in less than 30 days, all to the good; then their report should come back to the house. The fourth point is that when the report comes back to the house, if it received mutual acceptance in the committee the following debate should be limited to the party leaders in connection with the recommendations of the committee. In the event that it was impossible to come to a mutually acceptable agreement in a month, then the matter should be referred again to a meeting of the leaders.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): How long did the previous committee sit? I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether the hon. member would consider that, in the light of his suggestion that the committee sit for one month.

Mr. Thompson: The hon. member has asked how long the previous committee sat.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Yes, Mr. Speaker, in the light of the hon. member's suggestion of one month.

Mr. Thompson: In answer to that question I would say that I do not think that length of time would be required at this point. We have had 20 days of debate up to this time. If we would be honest with each other and would admit our own feelings in regard to this debate, I believe it would be practically unanimous that most of us are fed up with the way this debate has been going on, and would like to see some alternative. As I talk to different members I seem to sense that there is a determination or desire to come together, rather than to let this matter continue as it has been.

If agreement could not be had in a matter of a month's deliberations, then the question could be referred back to the leaders again and if necessary some alternative action could be taken. As a further alternative, this question could again come back to the house. I believe these suggestions are reasonable, Mr. Speaker. I believe these suggestions are necessary because it troubles me to think how we can expect to continue this debate through the next weeks of September and be in any frame of mind ourselves or to have developed within our own country an attitude favourable to the visit of Her Majesty the Queen. Certainly what we are doing now is encouraging those elements within our society that resent her coming and would do violence to her. This is something that is intolerable, and certainly not in keeping with the reputation, dignity and loyalty that Canadians and Canada have portrayed as far as the crown is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, if this suggestion in respect of setting a time for a leaders meeting can be acted upon by the Prime Minister before we go home for the Labour day week end, it would give us all time to reflect seriously on the situation that now exists and to probably sense in a more realistic way the attitude of the people in this country. Then perhaps we can go along with the spirit that should have developed as a result of the first centennial celebrations which have just concluded in Prince Edward Island. If we find it is not possible to do that, then we are left open to the kind of criticism that is mounting from every side, criticism from those Canadians who are loyal to what Canada is and who have ambitions and desires for the continuation and projection of what Canada should be in the future.

Typical of this criticism is that editorial which appeared in the Montreal *Gazette* of yesterday entitled "If the Fathers Came Back". At this recent celebration in Prince Edward Island certain men portrayed the fathers of confederation and acted out the events that took place 100 years ago. If those men, who re-enacted those scenes, had actually been the Fathers of Confederation back in our midst, what would they have thought about what they found here in Canada?

The part of this editorial that impressed me very much reads as follows:

> But saddest of all for the fathers would be their look at what takes place today in the capital city on the shore of the Ottawa river. Here was to be the parliament of the nation—a parliament with wisdom and skill and eloquence, capable of seeing and shaping a broadening destiny. Instead they would find a faded hope, a tawdry spirit, a pitiful wrangle, an exhibition of how little littleness can become.
>
> The vision they had has departed. The parliament that heard the voice of Thomas D'Arcy McGee, and the good humoured good sense of Macdonald, and the blunt integrity of George Brown, and the fiery statesmanship of Cartier has become a gathering that has lost all faith in itself, that knows not what to do, that lets the sun come down on day after day of drab uselessness.

I do not believe that anyone who is trying to follow the thoughts I am projecting has any purpose or useful intent in interjecting things that would be contrary to how the general public is coming to regard us and this institution. Summarizing my remarks as briefly as possible, I would urge the Prime Minister to reconvene the leaders meetings again on Tuesday after Labour day, and

suggest that the leaders, including the leader of the official opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker), should seriously consider and display a willingness to let a committee have one month to attempt to work out a solution to this problem. Again I say I am convinced that if 15 men, even if some were those who have expressed themselves very strongly on both sides of this matter, could come together on this basis, before 30 days had passed—and perhaps even before one week—they could come to a decision which would be mutually agreeable to at least the vast majority of the party representatives, if not a unanimous decision. Who knows but what this thing could be resolved even before the Queen came here, by our own free will and by our serious intent to resolve a problem today that has degenerated into a hopeless situation.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would repeat this suggestion with the thought and, yes, may I say with the prayer, that we will all seriously consider this or some similar avenue of approach that would end this damaging and futile debate in which we are engaged at this present time. I think it is the responsibility of every one of us, who claim to be loyal Canadian citizens, to use our every effort and influence, on the basis of loyalty to the nation and with a sense of national purpose, to see that this thing does come to some such conclusion, which I am confident can come to pass.

Thank you.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I should like to draw attention to the fact that nothing the hon. member has said during the last 25 minutes has had any relevancy whatsoever to the subamendment or amendment. I hope the same freedom will be allowed other members who speak during this debate.

Some hon. Members: Closure.

Mr. Roxburgh: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question? He suggested that it was now open to the Prime Minister to again ask for a conference of the leaders of the different parties. Is he asking the Prime Minister to do this? The Prime Minister has left the door open, as a result of which it has been stated that he has backed up. However he has left the door open in respect of suggestions from members of the opposition. It was suggested by the leader of the official opposition—

Mr. Smallwood: Order. Are you making a speech?

[Mr. Thompson.]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Roxburgh: I should like to ask a question.

Mr. Smallwood: You have not got the guts to make a speech about the red ensign.

Mr. Roxburgh: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the hon. member—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Will the hon. member resume his seat.

Mr. Roxburgh: I just want to ask a question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Would the hon. member put his question.

Mr. Smallwood: Get up and make a speech on the red ensign if you are going to make a speech at all.

Mr. Roxburgh: Is the hon. member inviting the Prime Minister to call a meeting?

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I would say in answer to the hon. member's question that I am inviting the Prime Minister to again convene the meetings of the leaders of the different parties. We cannot demand that he do so but I would urge that he take such action.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question? If when such a meeting is held there is difficulty in agreeing to establish a formal committee, which might require a vote in the house, and might even result in a debate, would the hon. member also consider suggesting to the meeting of leaders that consideration be given to establishing an informal committee, perhaps with the same number of members, which might after several meetings be able to come to a conclusion that would be helpful to us all?

Mr. Thompson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am very willing to agree to such a suggestion and would propose it if necessary. In fact, I think that every member in this house should bring to his individual leader, and discuss it with others, the suggestion that we make this a non-partisan discussion so that we as members of this House of Commons can come to some agreement. I think it is the duty of every member of this house to put forward suggestions, perhaps better than the ones which have been proposed. The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre has suggested there is nothing new in this proposal. I do not make any claim that it is a new proposal, but actually if the hon. member looks back far enough he will find there is nothing new under the sun in this old world of ours. It does seem to me

that what I have suggested is a logical approach. I think we should get together in respect of every possible or plausible suggestion, to accomplish this purpose.

I say this as a Canadian, not as a westerner. I have lived away from Canada too long to take a provincial view. I believe that Quebec is my Canada, as much as Alberta is, and I should like to think that members from Quebec feel that way about other parts of Canada. In that spirit let us see if we can get together on this matter.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. With regard to the point of order raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre, perhaps I should have tried to give a ruling earlier. However, as the hon. member knows, the Chair has tried to interpret the rules of relevancy as leniently as possible in this debate. While the hon. member for Red Deer was speaking it was my opinion that his remarks related to the aspect of unity stressed in the subamendment before the house, and that is why I did not think he should be called to order.

Mr. Thompson: May I make one remark, Mr. Speaker. I forgot even to mention the subamendment. I did not consider that the previous speaker was referring to it at all. What I had in mind saying was this. I have been in favour of a plebiscite but I am not sure whether or not it could serve a useful purpose now. I do not think it should be connected with an election. I am even in favour of the subamendment because I think that is the way a plebiscite could be most effective. On the other hand, at this point I think we should be talking about the situation in which we find ourselves, because I believe that because of that situation we are going to have to find some other solution, even though earlier we would have liked to see a plebiscite held.

Mr. Moreau: Will the hon. member permit another question? I was interested in his remarks that we should not expect unanimous agreement in this committee. In view of the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) that there should be a virtually unanimous view, would he not agree that such a committee would likely be very fruitless, having in mind the veto power granted in that way?

Mr. Thompson: I was very careful to state and I reiterate now that I do not think you can legislate unanimity. It is like trying to bring a boy and girl together and telling them they must love each other. It does not work out that way. But if we could come together with a sense of co-operation and good will, forget about the demand for unanimity, and set up an ordinary committee I believe we could achieve unanimity far more easily than if we attempted to legislate it. Let us forget the veto. Let us forget all of that. Let us not use such words. If we could not reach general agreement the matter could come back to the leaders, but I am confident that we could come to an agreement and even surprise ourselves.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Before the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Nugent) speaks, may I ask the hon. member for Red Deer another question?

Mr. Thompson: Yes.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): If I heard him correctly, he said he was in favour of a plebiscite. Yet the other day he voted against it. How does he explain that?

Mr. Thompson: I did not vote against a plebiscite at all. I voted against a subamendment with a set of questions with which I did not agree. That is why I voted the way I did. I have advocated a plebiscite right from the beginning. In fact, I believe it was an hon. member of this party who suggested for the first time that the counting of the vote should not be done on a regional or provincial basis, but on a national basis. I think this would have been an excellent way of arriving at a solution to the problem, but I think that at the present time we have gone beyond that point. I believe the Liberal government would have been far better advised if they had adopted some such proposal at the beginning.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Then I can take it from the hon. member's remarks that he is in favour of the subamendment and the amendment before the house?

Mr. Thompson: I said I was in favour of the subamendment proposed yesterday as it relates to a plebiscite.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): And you are prepared to vote for it?

Mr. Thompson: Don't put words in my mouth.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): That is why we want you to explain yourself fully.

Mr. Thompson: From the very beginning, long before the flag issue was brought before the house in the form of a resolution, I have talked plebiscite. However, I qualify my statement at the present time because I think that

as a result of the way in which the government introduced the matter and the way in which the debate has developed a plebiscite is not the answer to the problem now, although it is an approach that should have been taken before.

Mr. Churchill: Retreat.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): You will never vote against the Liberals.

Mr. Terry Nugent (Edmonton-Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, I am sure most members of the house were much impressed by the sincerity of the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Korchinski) in what I considered a great speech that he made this afternoon. I am glad there has been a little comedy relief since then, prior to my rising, because I thought his was a pretty tough act to follow.

With regard to the suggestions of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson), the leader of the Social Credit party, I can agree with him on one point, that the matter should go to a committee. However, it did seem to me most significant and very peculiar that he should propose a time limit of one month for the committee and a limiting of the debate to the leaders afterward, if the committee should not be unanimous in its recommendation. Neither the hon. member for Red Deer nor anyone on the government side has ever bothered to explain the necessity for the rush. Why does this matter have to be concluded within a specified time or in such a hurry or at a non-stop pace? Surely those members who are so exercised about a new flag regard the matter as serious enough that the problem should be dealt with by the house in its own good time, so that everybody can be heard and every voice from across the country can be heard and considered.

If the hon. member for Red Deer was serious in the platitudinous speech he just made he should have at least explained the necessity for the rush. If he wants the matter to go to a committee, why does there have to be a time limit? Why is there any hurry at all to finish the flag debate? I cannot understand why the committee should be limited to 15 members. I am certain the house is aware that a previous parliamentary committee was able to deal with this matter and bring about a good deal of agreement. On that occasion there was no time limit and the committee finished its work within a reasonable length of time, and made a very reasonable suggestion which I think had general support in the house.

[Mr. Thompson.]

There is only one reason why we are having any trouble with the flag debate. It is the manner in which the government is handling the matter. I would think that anyone who had the temerity to make the suggestion that the hon. member made should deal with the aspect of time and tell us why there is a rush. What is wrong with the government's putting aside a very contentious issue and bringing forward more urgent legislation? What is wrong with putting this matter aside for a while and letting tempers cool and negotiations be conducted? What is the reason we have to have a change in our national flag right now?

I was very concerned this afternoon, when the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas) asked the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) a question, to see the reaction of some of the government supporters. They wanted no compromise line followed with regard to this affair. Surely the government should be aware by now that a majority of the people of Canada are not in favour of the three maple leaf design. I am willing to concede it may be possible that a majority of the people want a change in our present national flag, but since the government is insisting that only one flag be considered and since the opposition is aware that a majority of the people of Canada do not want that flag, we have one simple duty to perform, to make sure that the flag resolution does not pass.

There has been only one difficulty throughout the debate, one factor leading to dissension within the country. I refer to the method of handling the flag issue. After all the speeches that have been made and the numbers of letters and newspaper articles that have been quoted, surely the Prime Minister must be aware it is his method of handling the matter that is dividing the country. Once the error has been pointed out and has become so apparent, what is wrong with a man who will not change what is obviously a very bad plan? This, I think, must puzzle the minds of even the most loyal Liberal backbenchers. I would feel a little better about it if the Prime Minister had explained, or even any of the government supporters had explained, the urgency connected with the matter of the flag.

We have asked the question again and again, why the rush? No one has explained why the government is handling the matter in such a hurry. I am willing to listen to any member, and I hope some member over there will get up and explain why it has to be run through non-stop. There is only one explanation that comes to my mind. It is the Prime Minister's

reputation for retreat and somersault, and he is afraid to do anything now. Surely, with the kind of insistence there has been, with the kind of trouble there is in this country today, with the heavy demands that are being made on such a logical basis, this is the one time when the Prime Minister should reverse his stand and receive general credit across the country.

The last time I spoke in this debate, Mr. Speaker, I quoted only small portions from two letters because it distressed me to find this feeling of division in our country. It was distressing to find feelings of resentment against Quebec and therefore I quoted only briefly from these letters. After listening to the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Korchinski) I think perhaps I would have been wiser to have gone into that aspect in more detail. We certainly do not achieve unity in the country by closing our eyes to the feelings that people express. It may well be that a certain amount of the correspondence members receive comes from crackpots, intemperate or violent people, and this would have little or no effect upon a responsible member.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, that is not the case here. The volume of mail is too large and the tone of many of the letters indicates such a high degree of intelligence and responsibility that we must take very seriously these symptoms of the illness that affects this country today, since the Prime Minister started this method of trying to change our national flag. The Edmonton *Journal* is the only daily newspaper in northern Alberta and it covers the entire northern half of the province. I think it is a fairly responsible newspaper. The only time I do not feel it is responsible is when it is against me during election campaigns. Other than that, I am sure the publishers and editors try to do their job. On August 25, page 4, the entire top half of that page of the Edmonton *Journal* was taken up by an article and included a three-column cut of the Prime Minister. The heading is "The Brink of Disaster?".

Perhaps I will have to put the whole of this article on the record, not because I agree with it but because that feeling is so current that the only daily newspaper in northern Alberta gives it prominence. I feel, therefore, it is my duty to bring it to the attention of this house. This feeling of resentment, of puzzlement, was not evident in my area before this flag debate started. I will say that over the last year there has been an expression of puzzlement as to what exactly the members from Quebec want. What is this new feeling of nationalism in that French Canadian province? This article is headed "Partition for Canada; it may be the only way says Edmonton's H. B. Turner." I do not know who Mr. Turner is. I may have met him some time, but I cannot place him at the moment. I quote:

> I suggest that the blackmail Liberal government of Mr. L. B. Pearson has done more to dissolve confederation than any group could have done had it deliberately set out to accomplish this fact.

Now, that is just the first paragraph. There is the word "blackmail" there. I suggest that if there is this feeling, then part of the reason for it is that there has been no explanation in this house by this government for rushing this flag through. There has been no explanation of the method they are using and why they are using it. There has been silence from the government supporters. There has been a stubborn, steadfast refusal to handle this matter of the flag in the manner in which it was handled before, and there has been apparently a complete blindness and deafness to the situation in Canada today. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) had the effrontery to suggest we are always responsible for this house becoming disreputable; that this flag debate is bringing down the standard of the house. I suggest that when the government starts determinedly on a course to try to foist a flag on the country in this manner, when we know the majority of the people do not want that flag, when there is no alternative action, when they refuse to handle it in any manner other than by force, then we have no alternative but to do what we can to make sure that that course is not successful.

May I call it five o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: 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, private bills and public bills.

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

CORRESPONDENCE WITH POSTMASTER, THETFORD MINES, QUE.

On the order:

That an order of the house do issue for a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, and letters exchanged between the Postmaster General, his executive assistant, his parliamentary secretary, or the deputy minister of his department and the postmaster at Thetford Mines, from January 1, 1960 to June 30, 1964.

Private Bills

Mr. Raymond Langlois (Mégantic): With regard to this notice of motion, may I say that I have had a talk with the Postmaster General and ascertained that the information I was seeking was available from the Department of Public Works. I have received this information from the Department of Public Works, so there is no necessity for proceeding with this motion. I should like, with the consent of this house, to withdraw the motion.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Has the hon. member leave to withdraw the motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

SECURITY PROCEDURES AND INVESTIGATIONS

On the order:

Resuming debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Orlikow—That an order of the house do issue for a copy of all government statements and directives to government departments during the past year regarding security procedures and investigations.

Mr. Knowles: Would the house give consent to letting this resumed debate stand?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Do we have unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Order stands.

PRIVATE BILLS

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING

Bill No. S-39, respecting Meota Pipe Lines Ltd.—Mr. Nugent.

BANK OF WESTERN CANADA

The house resumed from Thursday, August 20, consideration of the motion of Mrs. Konantz for the second reading of Bill No. S-6, to incorporate the Bank of Western Canada, and the motion proposed thereto by Mr. Perron.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre-André Boutin (Dorchester): Mr. Speaker, I fully support the amendment moved the other day by the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Perron) to the effect that Bill No. S-6 should not be read a second time but deferred for six months. This would give the mover and all those who support the bill an opportunity to consider carefully the remarks made by the hon. member for Beauce. It would also permit them to study the merits of his statement, as well as the suggestions he made to the house in this connection.

[Mr. Langlois.]

I wish to point out at the outset that if I participate in the killing of this bill, it is not that I want to prevent anyone from earning a living but there is a principle involved.

No matter who had presented this bill in the house, I would still be opposed to its passing, because my constituents elected me to the house precisely to help change the monetary system which we have to put up with since the Bank of Canada relinquished its powers to chartered banks.

I would therefore feel remiss if I let this bill pass today without giving my views on the present banks and monetary system.

I must tell you that I am very surprised to note that those who urge the nationalization of almost everything that belongs to private industry hardly think of nationalizing the most important business, that on which all the others depend as well as the public: the chartered banks.

Nobody talks about nationalizing credit institutions, though individual economic activities in this nation depend on them in a proportion of over 90 per cent.

Everything should be nationalized, according to some, except the gear-wheels, or machinery, so to say, of all the trusts which are to be nationalized. The existing trusts are to be destroyed, except the parent organization.

This reasoning is quite as ridiculous as if, wanting to get rid of all bees, we wasted our time killing them, while continuing to feed the queen bee which is responsible for what we want to eradicate.

And worse still, Mr. Speaker, instead of destroying this plague at its very source, permission is sought to add others and quite as pernicious ones.

This comparison, which some may think silly, is the exact replica of what is happening in our economy.

At this time we have eight chartered banks which distribute and control the economic blood stream of this nation, that is the money. Is there any reason for pride in the achievements of those institutions so far? When looking at the results, can we really say that those banks have played their part?

The country is constantly getting into debt day after day, year after year; every organization or individual must face this problem.

Is the country in need of money? It loses no time in borrowing from chartered banks. When the provinces need money, they hurry to borrow money from chartered banks. The same applies to our municipalities and our school boards.

Is it normal, Mr. Speaker, for a government that could order the Bank of Canada to create the money required, that could borrow directly for that bank, to have to go to chartered banks owned by private individuals? It just does not make sense and yet, it is exactly what the government is doing at the present time.

At this point, I should like to ask the hon. member for St. Jean-Iberville-Napierville (Mr. Dupuis) what he would think of the suggestion I am about to make. I address myself to him because he is the last one who is willing to understand what we want to rectify, for the simple reason that he does not understand the present system.

What would he think if, at the end of the month, he gets close to $3,000, I were to ask him to hand me that money and then to come and borrow it from me. That is what the Bank of Canada is doing now. It gives its money to the chartered banks and the government borrows it from them with interest.

With all the power those chartered banks now have, is it any wonder that the Canadian government, no matter which party is in office, should be at the mercy of a few hundred people who do as they please with it because they are empowered to restrict or extend credit.

How is it that, in a time of peace, we should be forced to tighten our belts due to a lack of money, when, to produce weapons of destruction, we can immediately find the funds required? Are those people for whom we provide jobs in wartime not there in peacetime? Are the materials we use to build destruction machines not there in peacetime? Are all those natural resources we develop in wartime not there in peacetime also? How is it that we are unable to use all those energies and resources in peacetime to build, improve, enlarge? How is it that we are unable to employ those people to build, etc. in peacetime?

It is because in peacetime the actual credit based on production and consumption capacity is not related to bank credit. That is why it is abnormal that the credit of the country should be controlled by private institutions instead of by a social credit agency which would seek to facilitate credit in the areas where the need for it is the greatest.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that there are now enough parasites living at the expense of the Canadian people.

When one considers that the Canadian government or parliament is ready to allow a new agency to do like the other chartered banks, namely to live at the expense of the people who pay to support them, one realizes that this government merely works for those parasites, as we call the finance people; one is glad to help killing this bill, because there are enough chartered banks now; we do not need more.

Mr. Raymond Langlois (Mégantic): Mr. Speaker, as my colleague from Dorchester (Mr. Boutin) said, the question is not whether the bill should be talked out or whether it should be delayed or passed. In my opinion, there is no need at present for another bank which would be known under the "French Canadian" name western bank of Canada. I see on page 5 of the bill that the bank would also be allowed to use the name *Banque de l'Ouest canadien.* It still remains, however, that it is designated as the bank of western Canada on the first page of the bill. But that is only a minor detail.

Mr. Speaker, the sponsor of the bill claimed that the setting up of another chartered bank would provide more credit in Canada. That is untrue.

Over the past 60 years, there has been a centralization of more than 30 banks; their number has even been reduced to eight under the Bank of Canada Act. That being so, would the addition of two more banks be justified now?

Mr. Speaker, the number of banks is unimportant; it is what banks can do which counts. At present, I think the chartered banks are being called upon to restrict credit. If the government itself controlled its own credit and credit issues, we would not have to put up with the effects such restrictions have on the financial system which is itself inadequate.

I note among the shareholders or those asking that the company be incorporated, the names of the hon. member for Winnipeg South (Mrs. Konantz) and that of the former governor of the Bank of Canada, Mr. Coyne, who, as we all know, experienced certain difficulties in 1954 about his ideas on the Canadian economy and especially on credit restrictions, because he had been pointing out for a few years that Canadians were living beyond their means and that they should tighten their belts.

It is not a question of increasing or not the number of banks. We, Social Crediters, fear that these banks and not the government control the issuance of credit to the nation. We want a change in that regard.

Therefore, if we are restricted to a particular amount when the government claims to control credit, how can we believe that more banks will create more credit. If you

have eight pounds to divide between eight persons, everyone will get one pound, but if there are ten persons, each one will not get one pound. According to the government, nine or ten chartered banks will make more credit available, but this is precisely the proof that its monetary policy is unsound. "The more banks, the more credit". That is false. Normally, credit should be proportionate to the total production, to the potential output of the country, of its manpower, of its natural resources.

Private enterprise is not short of credit nowadays.

Mr. Speaker, the chartered banks are private financial institutions which should finance only the private sector in the Canadian economy. As a matter of fact, if I get credit from a bank, it is normal that it should charge interest. By lending me money, the bank does me a service and I must pay it interest, just as the worker is entitled to his salary. That applies in the private sector of the Canadian economy. However, there is no reason to increase the number of chartered banks which already exist because they can do the same thing, that is be of service to the population.

Besides, when you borrow money from a chartered bank, you must pay interest; that interest is included in the final price of the article sold. In that case, the bank's interest is covered. But here is where the present system fails. We lack the public financial institutions which could supply public credit, which is something entirely different. That is another sector of the economy which seems to be forgotten. It seems that no difference is made between private and public credit.

When I talk about a manufacturer, I talk about private credit. The same thing goes when I talk about credit granted to a farmer who harvests potatoes; that is private credit. As a matter of fact, the money he invests in his farm or machinery to grow potatoes is private credit.

But when I talk about bridges, highways, waterworks, viaducts, in short any public utility which serves everyone in general and no one in particular, everything should be financed in the same way the private sector is financed by private credit. Consequently, public utilities should be financed by public credit.

It does not make any more sense to finance public business from private funds than it would to finance private business from public funds. Today, we are taking advantage of the revenue of the private sector to finance sidewalks, waterworks, schools, streets, roads and bridges. The money needed for such public works comes from the private sector, nowhere else. In this connection, I think we could obtain the necessary credit, without interest and without having to go through chartered banks.

Instead of suggesting the establishment of a new chartered bank, which would be adding another one to the eight already existing, why not use the Bank of Canada in the various provinces of the country, with branches to finance public utilities? Then, chartered banks would only have to finance the private sector, which they would do very well.

My opinion as a mathematics professor is that the suggestion of establishing a new bank does not make any sense and is anti-mathematical. We will never swallow that kind of theory.

If it is nonsensical to use public credit to make investments in the private sector, it is even more nonsensical to inject private credit into the public sector to finance public business.

Bridges do not belong to me, roads do not belong to me as a member of parliament or as a private individual; they do not belong to me, even if they belong to everybody. If the Bank of Canada were to finance public business through its branches, we would pay much less interest for the construction of highways or bridges. Construction costs could be refunded at the depreciation rate of the public utility built or the natural resource developed.

If it is a bridge of $3 million, you would have a certain depreciation each year—engineers know what this depreciation would be. The amount is recovered each year. If the construction cost of the bridge were $3 million and the depreciation rate established at 5 per cent per annum, you would only have to recover the construction cost at a rate of 5 per cent per annum. That bridge would then be financed through public credit, without any interest. Thus we would not have to pay the cost of that bridge three times.

We know that as soon as the construction of a bridge is completed, it starts to depreciate. The bridge does not produce anything nor does it increase in value. Why should it be paid for three times? By using public credit, credit would be created and after completion the bridge would be paid for.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Dupuis) to pay attention to what I am saying. I ask him to listen care-

fully. He will soon see the ridiculous situation we are in now. He just has to establish the total value of our production to realize that we owe more than we actually have in value. I am referring here to the total debt of the country and to its total assets. We have more debts than accounts receivable. The same thing should be done for the United States, the richest country in the world. The United States, after having collected everything which was due to them, plus everything they owe, are still in debt.

In making these computations we unavoidably find that every country has a debt. How is it that every country has a debt when it has collected all its receivable accounts? To whom is it indebted? I would like the Minister without Portfolio to take the time to figure out where the shortcoming lies. He will then undoubtedly understand that there is something which is wrong in our financial system.

That is the reason why I believe we should make the changes. There is unavoidably hardship when our human laws come in conflict with the logical and natural needs of our citizens. Well then, it is illogical to create another chartered bank when there are already eight which are operating quite well and which can create all the private credit that the private sector needs. What is wrong is that the public sector must be financed by money from the private sector, and that results in a lack of credit in the private sector.

Why must the public sector repay sometimes four times the cost of construction? It is a little like the wheels of an automobile; the wheels of the private sector and those of the public sector are not turning at the same speed.

In fact, with a small wheel and a big wheel, we are apt to turn round in a circle. That is exactly what is being done today. One wheel is turning faster than the other. What we want is to balance the two wheels. At that time we shall go where we want and not where the wheels take us.

Mr. Speaker, as long as I am a member of this house, I shall oppose the setting up of another chartered bank. Perhaps I shall not object to a provincial bank. But, there again, we should know whether this bank would finance the private and the public sectors, because if its only object was to finance the private sector, I would oppose its creation.

Today, it is public financing which is lacking. It should be possible to finance public projects without having to pay the cost four or five times over; in other words, we shall always have credit restrictions, and be unable to balance things, an inacceptable condition in a country like Canada, which should be the richest in the world, but where some people are still literally dying of malnutrition; all that can be attributed to our financial system as it is today.

Mr. Speaker, I object to this bill and I shall continue to do so.

Mr. C. A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, while reading the bill to incorporate the bank of western Canada and realizing that it comes from the Senate, I cannot but think that the Senate members refused to pass another bill that was requested by all the citizens from a certain province. They bluntly refused, without giving any explanation.

And they expect to bring before the House of Commons an entirely private bill, a bill coming from individuals who request that a bank be added to the eight chartered banks that we already have in Canada.

I do not know whether it is due to the age of the senators, whom I respect, but things have turned topsy-turvy when you begin by refusing what close to two million people ask for and then grant a special favour—because a chartered bank is a special favour—to people like Mr. Coyne and all those whose names are listed here.

Perhaps we will be accused of being against chartered banks. But we are in favour of doing justice to the majority of the people. Now, if the House of Commons were to grant a charter to another bank, I say and I maintain that it should first favour the majority of the population, by complying with a request made by a whole province, before complying with the request of two or three individuals.

We will no doubt be told that several names appear on the list, but we know too well now what a chartered bank is to be fooled by this list of names.

Mr. Speaker, I am not against chartered banks, inasmuch as they remain in their sector. But when they start encroaching on the public sector and especially when this government gives them, by a legal act, the right to accomplish what only a national bank should accomplish, we object.

We are not opposed to the banks themselves, but to the special powers and privileges given to them by former governments. I do not wish to pass judgment on those governments, but they were supposed to administer the business of the country in the interest of the people. Now, I can assure you that

serious questions come to our mind concerning chartered banks.

Mr. Speaker, if we were to increase the present number of chartered banks, what would that change, as long as we maintain that monetary principle, that funny credit? Social Crediters are being accused of wanting to print funny money, but nobody realizes that as it is, we have the funniest monetary credit that ever existed.

Whether we have one, two, three, ten, 20 or 50 agencies issuing credit—I say issuing credit because everybody knows exactly now that the real specialty of chartered banks is to issue new credit—if we always maintain the same monetary system we have today, nothing much will be changed. We might get more competition between those who gamble on the taxpayer because I look at what banks are doing today and I consider them much more as economy gambling houses than as serious accounting institutions whose purpose would be to work in the interests of every citizen.

Besides we cannot blame them for it, because they are private institutions acting for private interests.

But the error of the government is to try to have them play a public part. Precisely, that part should be played by the Bank of Canada. Principles were distorted at that stage by not teaching people what is a real monetary system, because after all a real monetary system, sensibly established, is simply a bookkeeping system.

Today, we of the Social Credit say that this bookkeeping system must be kept by the Bank of Canada and must be nationalized.

If there is one thing that should be national, it is the economic life blood of a nation: its monetary system.

Today they talk about nationalizing everything in the province of Quebec as in other provinces; they nationalize power, they want to nationalize paper mills. It is ridiculous. It is like trying to catch a bear by the tail.

Ministers know it; they cannot speak because undoubtedly their hands are tied, but if they were really sincere and if they worked really for the people and the taxpayer, they would come here to parliament, Mr. Speaker, and they would take steps to free our national economy from all those private financiers who have been fully empowered to empty the taxpayer's pockets.

And if there is one thing that ought to be nationalized by the government, it is surely the monetary system. What do they do today? They say: we have monetary control—because they read in bulky papers from famous economists that when a country loses 65 per cent of its monetary control, it is bankrupt.

[Mr. Gauthier.]

Well, do you know that we, in Canada, only control 10 per cent of our monetary system? I am wondering if we are not bankrupt three times over because we have lost control of our monetary system at the hands of financiers to whom full powers have been given to control our chartered banks.

We have lost control of over 90 per cent of our credit. In fact, what do we control today? Only the issue of paper money. We control only legal tender, and this control is relatively new, since it dates back to 1934 or thereabouts. Before that—the young people might not remember, but the older people will—each one of the 12 chartered banks in Canada printed its own money. That is why on each bank note appeared the name of the issuing bank—for instance, the provincial bank, the Bank of Montreal, or the names of one of the different banks existing at the time.

On what was the issue of such money based at the time? Each bank had to have in its vaults a gold value equal to the value of the paper money it printed.

You may ask me: What happened that the whole system had to be changed? Well, it happened that they realized that paper money poured from one bank to the other in such quantity that there were monetary surpluses. They realized that there was no more gold in some banks to guarantee the paper money they were issuing.

So the King government, I believe, withdrew from the chartered banks the authorization to print paper money, and ordered that in future only the Bank of Canada would be entitled to issue paper money. And chartered banks were told: if you want paper money, you only have to buy some from the Bank of Canada. And it is still the way it is being done today.

The Bank of Canada has a 100 per cent control over paper money. Should a chartered bank need additional paper money, all it has to do is go to the Bank of Canada and buy the paper money it needs. I am saying this because as far as legal tender is concerned, the chartered bank is playing what is really its part.

The chartered bank is an institution dealing with money; it does not create money. Chartered banks are essential to the over-all economy of this country, but only as far as they play their part, which consists in money dealings. When they use their customers'

deposits to make loans, everything is right. If they do not have enough, they buy some from the central bank in order to lend it at low interest rates. Such is the part chartered banks must play.

As long as chartered banks will not resume playing their proper part, Canada will get more and more into debt, because as long as Canada will only control part of its money supply, which is the legal currency, and will allow the monetary credit, that is, the balance of the money supply, to be controlled, as long as chartered banks will be allowed to issue or create this new monetary credit out of nothing, as long as this government will allow private enterprise to create the assets of the country and to lend it again to the country, I say that a tremendous theft is being committed and parliament is responsible for it before the country. In my opinion, this is a wrong that must be righted.

If in order to correct the legal monetary system the government of that time had to resort to drastic measures to gain a 100 per cent control over its legal currency, if it had to temporarily prohibit all banks and impose new conditions on them, I say that the remedy which was good at that time for the legal currency is good today for monetary credit.

Before 1934 we had lost control of legal currency; today we have lost control of monetary credit. Control of our credit must be regained. Such is the remedy; the means used to regain control of legal currency should be used again.

Then any new credit created in Canada will really be for Canada. For instance, if next year Canada has a capital gain, a net revenue, a surplus, or is richer by more than $10 billion, the amount should be credited to the Bank of Canada, which is the people's bank, the bank of each and every citizen. If instead of giving those $10 billion back to chartered banks so that they may circulate it, they were credited to the Bank of Canada to be used for the welfare of Canadian citizens, I can tell you that in four or five years from now, we would no longer hear about the debt system that we have today.

Suppose that next year we have a capital gain of $10 billion. With that amount, I think we could start by "paying our way", cover our budget expenditures and still have a balance of $3 billion.

But what is being done today to help the average citizen who had the heart to work day and night for the further development of the country, even with the help of machines and science?

What do we do in point of fact? We say to international financial organizations: Get hold of this production, get hold of the country's net assets and lend it back to the citizens, school boards, municipalities, provinces and even the federal government, while the next day we are being taxed to fully cover budget expenditures, deductions being made from our cheques, while all the revenues of the country are going directly into the hands of international financiers.

Such is our economic situation; such are the results of those special privileges granted to the chartered banks. Those banks are private establishments which have been given the extensive powers of public enterprise. They have been given all the powers the government has for extending new credit. And today there is but one solution: to get into debt.

As my friend was saying a while ago, there was once a fellow who had won $3,000. Overjoyed, he ran to this neighbour and told him: "Here, take this money. I can't look after it, it's too complicated. Tomorrow, I'll come and borrow it from you, with interest." That is exactly what is happening with the chartered banks. We can get out of this impasse if we stop saying we have to get into debt.

If we have to get into debt, it is because we live under a crazy system. That is the only reason why people get into debt. Do not think for a second that Canada is not rich enough to feed a mere 19 million inhabitants.

I am convinced that if our economy were truly strong, our fellow citizens could get what is rightly theirs. For that to happen, however, Canada would need to have its own bookkeeping system.

In short, the only way to achieve that end would be for the Bank of Canada to have full control over such bookkeeping.

As long as chartered banks are not forced to operate on a 100 per cent liquid basis, all other reforms will be useless. That is what we want and that is what the government must require—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

[*Text*]

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland): Mr. Speaker, I do not think there could be a better example of putting the cart before the horse than the introduction of this bill into the house at this time. The house is charged

with the responsibility of taking action on the report of the royal commission on banking, as well as revising the Bank Act next year. Yet at the same time we find the government bringing forward measures which would allow the establishment of, not one, not two but possibly three new banking institutions in this country. Before any action is taken by the house with regard to the establishment of new banking institutions, surely we should have some appreciation of what the government intends to do about the report of the royal commission on banking, and what it intends to do in respect of the revision of the Bank Act next year.

I do not believe it is fair at this time to ask members to approve or disapprove of the establishment of one, two or three new banking institutions when we are not fully cognizant of what the government intends to do with regard to the Bank Act. At the same time, it is my personal opinion that we have no great need for the establishment of new banking institutions in this country. Indeed in recent years we have witnessed the merging of various substantial banking institutions with other banking institutions. I am not referring to banking institutions that have been in existence for one or two years, but those that have been in existence for a great number of years and have a broadly based business in this country. Yet these institutions felt it was necessary to amalgamate with other institutions in order to get a still broader base so that they could compete in a satisfactory manner for the banking business of this country. With this point of view in mind, I feel we should take a very long look at these bills before we allow further institutions of this nature to be established in this country.

Now, it seems to me that the government did not want to face this issue, that it did not want to make any specific decision as to whether or not there was a need for more banking institutions. The government has allowed a large number of people to spend a great deal of money in endeavouring to establish new institutions of this nature in Canada. The government is now in the unfortunate and unfavourable position of having to make a decision which they would rather not make. It would appear to me that we will meet with no success during this session in attempting to pass any of these bills. For this reason, and for the very obvious reason that the Bank Act has to be revised, I feel it would be much wiser if these bills were withdrawn until such time as we, as members of this house, know exactly what the government's intentions are with regard to the Bank Act.

There is a further problem here and it is a very important one; it is one that will weigh heavily upon the mind of each member as he considers this matter. As I pointed out, we have seen banking institutions amalgamating in this country on numerous occasions in the past few years. It would be a most unfortunate thing if we were to approve the establishment of these banks, then find out within a year or two that their boards of directors decided they should amalgamate with some other bank that is presently in existence and has available a broad base of branches across this nation which are providing a service the people need and like. As a result of this we would find a few people reaping huge benefits in the way of profits because we, as members of parliament, had approved the establishment of these institutions before we were fully cognizant of all the facts related to them.

This is the type of decision that I am sure members would just as soon not be saddled with. Certainly I am in that position. I have not learned that there is any lack of availability of credit through the existing banking institutions. As a matter of fact it has always been my opinion that we probably have the best banking system in the world. We have a system which provides service through branches to communities which, under any other type of system, could not look forward to having a branch bank in their community. This has resulted, in the main, from the fact that we have had a small number of banks with a large number of branches which have been in a position to build up this type of support right across the nation, and the type of financial backing that allowed them to suffer losses in some areas because of the benefits they were able to derive from other areas.

We have a sound system. I would not like to think we would do anything to damage this banking system in any way. At the same time if it is proven to me that we have no fear from the establishment of a new banking institution in this country, that it will provide benefits that are not available now to the Canadian people, that the competition would be of benefit to everyone concerned, then certainly I would be quite willing to give my approval to the establishment of a new bank. However, I feel there are a lot of questions to be answered and that we should not be establishing new banking institutions on an ad hoc basis. I feel this question should be part of the government's revision of the

Bank Act, in association with the royal commission report on banking. Until this is presented to us by the government of the day I do not believe we, as a parliament, should be charged with making a decision on the bill before us, or on the other two bills which I believe are ready to come before us.

Before another private members' hour comes up, Mr. Speaker, I hope the government will give some thought to this problem so that we will not spend another hour on this bill. We should know the long range plans of the government in relation to the Bank Act in general before this bill is considered further.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order; the hour appointed 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

OFFICIAL ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW DESIGN

The house resumed consideration of the motion by Mr. Pearson:

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 the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Diefenbaker, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Churchill.

Mr. Terry Nugent (Edmonton-Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, I had a few minutes start before private members' hour, but I think it would do no harm to remind the house that the gist of my remarks is simply that the government is going about this flag resolution in the wrong way, that there now seems to be stiffening of attitude, that there does not seem to be any desire to meet half way, and this in face of the fact that there is no explanation why the government should give the matter such haste and urgency, and that no one has been able to explain to the house or to the people of Canada why a flag design must be rammed through.

I do not want to be just negative. It is my contention, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution, or these resolutions, really, should be turned over to a committee of the house. I do not agree with the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) that 15 members would do; I think it should be a good sized committee. Most of our committees consist of 60 members. Many of them have difficulty getting a quorum, and I can only imagine the difficulty of the task imposed on just 15 trying to be there all the time, especially when some seem to be so desirous of speed, as we have seen evidence to that effect.

It is my purpose this evening to point out to the house, in perhaps a more emphatic manner than I did before, the results already observable in the country because of the Prime Minister's determination to force a choice of a flag down the throats of the people of Canada. I say the situation is getting worse because the government persists, even though there is plenty of evidence to show that aside from having a majority of the people of Canada in favour of the flag there is much evidence to indicate that a majority are against it.

The hon. member for Red Deer mentioned the low repute into which parliament is falling. I can only repeat the words of the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Korchinski), who said it so well, that this is the government's doing. It is the government which has the responsibility of bringing on business. It is the government that wanted to introduce this flag. It is the government which has so many pieces of legislation on the order paper, and it is entirely in the government's hands whether it wants to proceed with those measures which will cure some of the ills of the country or proceed with this one measure which it thinks will be such a political gimmick and palliative to many who are in economic difficulty. The effect on the country is simply that, and I suspect partly it is because the government is so slow in doing anything for the province of Quebec.

The previous government was berated by some of our members from eastern Canada, Ontario and Quebec, because they had felt that the western farmer had been given too much attention, that too much had been done for him and not enough for the other farmers. There is much evidence to show that the small Quebec farmer is in almost desperate straits. He needs the type of action which the former government gave. He is looking to the present government for that type of action. I would think part of the difficulty here is that everybody across Canada, especially in the west of Canada, knows so well that what this government is doing is substituting politics for government—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nugent: —asking the people to accept a banner instead of the concrete action that they have waited for so long.

As I think I mentioned previously, a parallel situation would have been the awful plight the western farmers would have met in the last three years by asking them to put a sheaf of wheat on the red ensign, and wave that to show how much the government thought of the farmers. That is what this government is doing to the Quebec farmer.

I suggest that trying to convince the people of Quebec that, because we are holding up this flag debate we are stopping all necessary legislation, is a lie so big it can only be credited to that party which has the greatest success in selling lies to the country, the Liberal party. I want to assure the house that I have had no part in trying to lend any fuel to divisive thought in the country. In my last speech I only mentioned part of a couple of letters, but I do feel my duty to the house is to represent as fully and completely as I can the type of feelings which, as I say, are the result of the way in which the government is now proceeding, and to ask the government again to reconsider.

I had mentioned the first paragraph of an article on page 4 of the Edmonton *Journal*. Now I am going to read a considerable part of it because I am sure many members of the house will be shocked at its tone, will be surprised at its vehemence. I know through private conversation with some of my Canadian friends of French origin that they found it almost incredible, but they finally had to accept that such is the result of the way in which the government is trying to foist this flag on Canada.

I feel the house should be subjected to the reading of this, in order to give it a little second thought on how we are proceeding. With the permission of the house I shall reread the first paragraph:

> I suggest that the "blackmailed" Liberal government of Mr. L. B. Pearson has done more to dissolve confederation than any group could have done had it deliberately set out to accomplish this fact.
>
> In their bid to buy the 75 Quebec seats, the Liberals dropped Canadian politics to a new low by appealing to the nationalistic spirit of the French.
>
> Irresponsible and unconstitutional promises bought them a Quebec majority at the expense of Canada. Cowering to pressure from Quebec has won the Liberals the support of French speaking M.P.'s regardless of political affiliation.
>
> Liberal strategists who formulate policy might well have provided their minions with calling cards with the legend "Have tails, will grovel."

[Mr. Nugent.]

I think the hon. member for Jasper-Edson (Mr. Horner) mentioned that paragraph the other night. While I believe I should put this on the record because I think it is so scandalous, I hasten to assure the house that these are not my feelings, but the only way in which I am sure the Edmonton *Journal* could be persuaded to print this kind of article at all is because that newspaper is aware that this sort of feeling is being expressed more and more in the country.

I would remind the house of the Prime Minister's words when he said that what a flag should do is unify the country, and that it should be a unifying banner. I wish the Prime Minister had explained to the house how his unifying banner is going to patch up all this. To continue this article:

> The Liberal government has opened a Canadian Pandora's box which it cannot close. We have the spectacle of a federal government that is controlled by Quebec.

Certainly, that reflects a feeling in this country as a result of the actions of a government which, without explanation and contrary to all common sense, contrary to the feeling of parliament and in place of other methods such as trying to get co-operation from other parties, has attempted to ram this decision through. This is bound to give rise to some suspicion, when one considers the predominant number of Quebec ministers in the cabinet, that the Prime Minister has his hands tied—that this resolution must go through, no matter what happens.

French Canadians to a great extent feel strongly that we should have a new flag. This feeling is common knowledge. In the absence of any explanation from the government these circumstances are bound to lead to a feeling that the Prime Minister has had his nose twisted by the Quebec ministers. I suggest that whether this be true or false, and no matter how anxious these people are to have their flag design go through, no responsible prime minister could see such a feeling grow, or observe the divisive effects of this feeling across the country and not realize that its actions are doing more to divide Canada than any flag could unify it.

I am paying particular attention to this article in the Edmonton *Journal* because it appeared in a paper which has usually supported the Liberals at election time and which has not been too kind to Conservatives in connection with the flag debate. I suggest, again, that it must have some meaning or

this newspaper would not have given it such prominence. It continues:

> We have a federal government that intends to force the rest of Canada to accept changes in the B.N.A. Act that will make Canada a bilingual country and accordingly perpetuate the life of the Liberal government.
>
> There are those who would have us believe that Canada is a bilingual nation.
>
> We are not, nor was it the intention of the authors of the B.N.A. Act to make French a second language for Canadians.

The use of French in Canada has caused us all concern from time to time. We have seen its use greatly expanding. No parliament can compare with this one for the manner in which French speaking Canadians have insisted at every opportunity that French be given an equal place in this house. I would say, too, that there has been no resistance to this trend, except on occasions such as when a committee has been unable to provide a simultaneous translation system, when we felt that the French Canadians could all understand English, though the reverse was not true, and that in the interest of co-operation they might have shown a little less insistence. I can understand the feeling of our French Canadian members that any slackening of their demands would be taken as an indication of bad faith by their constituents. However, I feel they have a responsibility in this house now and then to lead public opinion and not be driven by it to unreasonable lengths. I suggest that more friends are won by reasonableness and compromise, by pointing out an unfairness, than by taking up the club and saying: We will have this, or else.

I know that despite what is said in this article and despite the expressions of opinion in some of the letters I get from my constituents, the ordinary Canadian in Alberta, in my area, would feel nothing but a sense of outrage if he felt that French speaking Canadians were being discriminated against. I would remind the house of something which took place not too long ago. When the railway committee made a fuss about the manner in which promotions were handled by the Canadian National Railways, the president of the railway said he would have an investigation conducted and the situation would be corrected. And he did. He brought in some new rules, and in the following year there was no trouble with the committee whatsoever. The lesson, therefore, is that there are certain areas in which there may be legitimate grievances, and when these grievances are brought forward reasonable men will listen to them and give effect to changes which will correct the position and do away with any feeling that people are not being treated fairly. People in western Canada can understand the desire of French Canadians for justice where they think it is being denied. This is in accordance with a theme I have often pursued in this house—the people must be heard; their voice must be listened to. It is in this light that I ask the house to consider the feelings of those who live in my area respecting the manner in which this flag question is being handled and the attempt which is made to ram it through without sufficient consideration for their point of view.

I have referred before in this house to the tendency in western Canada in depression days to blame the "Bay street boys". The flag is only a symbol of our country, after all. It is the health of the nation, the position of each citizen, no matter what his ethnic origin, that really matters. It is the duty of the government to pay heed to the economic well-being of the nation rather than to political propaganda associated with this issue.

Now I should like to continue reading a little further from this article. The heading is "Bilingual?"

> Section 133 of the B.N.A. Act clearly states that French is an official language in Canada only for the purpose of debates in parliament, the provincial legislature of Quebec, the official records of these governments, proceedings in the Supreme Court of Canada, Quebec provincial courts and the Exchequer Court of Canada.
>
> I say that the French language has no official or legal status in any other area of Canada.

May I say that my constituency contains only a small percentage of French speaking Canadians. Despite the fact that I get very few votes from these particular electors, I have some close friends among them. I have been here in parliament for six and a half years and I have never heard any voice raised by these people telling me they were afraid they would lose their language or their religion. I never heard any expression of opinion from any of them that they were being treated as inferior Canadians. I know they use the French language in their homes, and that their children speak it. I know they are brought up to be Catholics and I know they get along very well with their English speaking neighbours across the road. My fear is that it will be very much more difficult for them to do so, should the government persist in the kind of action it is now taking.

Why does the government try to divide Canada at this time? What is wrong with doing the normal business of parliament in

this house? Why cannot we treat the flag resolution as any other resolution and debate it in this house in the same manner, with all members having the guts to stand up and speak their piece?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nugent: Then send it to a committee, which can do its work in a worth-while and efficient manner and report back to the house in due course? Where are all those of so little faith in this house? I suggest that if the parliament of Canada is falling into disrepute with the people of this country, it is because of the calculated campaign in that regard by the Liberal government, which always feels that the way to perpetuate a Liberal government in power is to downgrade parliament so that legitimate criticism will receive little attention from the nation.

Where are those voices in the Liberal back benches that go home and make such a great pretence to their constituents that they are looking after their affairs? They have not the nerve to stand up in this house and refute those arguments which we say are legitimate criticisms of the manner in which this issue is being handled by the government. Why cannot members who feel strongly about the flag get up and tell us why? Why is there no voice from the province of Quebec that will interpret the feeling in that province to the rest of Canada, so there might be understanding? Where are these pseudo spokesmen from Quebec? Why are they afraid to get up and explain their stand?

The hon. member for St. Denis (Mr. Prud'homme) had the effrontery the last time I was speaking to ask whether I have explained to my constituents what Quebeckers want. I pointed out to him that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau) and other Quebec members in this house have not yet told us or explained what the people in that province want. Is it not time, Mr. Speaker, for those who want a symbol that is not wanted by most of Canada to explain to us the meaning of that symbol; to explain to us exactly what new type of Canadianism they think a new type of flag will signify? My constituents are reasonable people. If you have a reasonable argument, they have the right to hear it; and I want them to hear it. You show us some reason, and they will buy it. I say to the government they are not going to shove this flag down the throats of the people of Canada when the majority of the people do not want it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[Mr. Nugent.]

Mr. Nugent: We are not going to abandon our duty to fight that kind of tactic and that particular flag. I would suggest that instead of just standing here talking, from now on there should be no estimates passed, no supply passed, no money granted this government until it decides that the voice of the people of this country shall be heard.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nugent: I am challenging my friends opposite to bring forward the reason; to get up in this house and debate this issue. I ask them to point out the fault in my reasoning, to explain to us and to the people of Canada the Prime Minister's method of handling this matter. Let those members from the province of Quebec who are most vehement and most concerned about it explain to the rest of Canada the injustice that must be corrected and how this new symbol will do it. The people of Canada are entitled to at least that much. I say again, Mr. Speaker, that I for one am getting just a little fed up with just delaying this matter. If the government does not want to get on with essential business, I for one want to grant that government no more money. It is not fit to carry on as a government of this country.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nugent: You may all think I am on the wrong side in this matter and that if this were to result in an election I might be defeated. But I will tell you something. I will have been defeated as an honest man; and I wonder how many of those silent members over there could go home with the same feeling of honesty and patriotism.

I am not going to read the rest of this article, Mr. Speaker, but I want to remind the house that it is something I have read. This appears in the only daily newspaper in the northern part of Alberta. I say it was printed because a great deal more of that feeling has appeared—and that feeling has only come about in the last little while. I ask the government backbenchers over there, is that what you want to do to Canada? I am reporting to my constituents that this is a deliberate plot on the part of the Liberals to do just that to Canada. I hope there is an election soon and that I will get a Liberal opponent like one of those hon. gentlemen opposite to run against me, because on every public platform I would love to tell this story to my constituents.

Mr. D. M. Fisher (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, like previous speakers in this rather prolonged

debate, I plan to place before the house a proposal with regard to which I hope all members will take an opportunity to express themselves. Before I do so I would like to express some views, a few of them personal and some of them partisan in the sense that I speak for my colleagues in the debate. The personal remarks really deal with my regrets over some of the overtones that have been brought in by some of my Conservative colleagues relating, for example, to French Canada.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): You are one to talk.

Mr. Fisher: The hon. member from Alberta says, "You are one to talk". He is quite aware that I am not the most popular political figure in the province of Quebec.

Mr. Ormiston: Or anywhere else.

Mr. Monteith: Trying to make it up, eh?

Mr. Fisher: But the point is that I happen to be one of those who were prepared to vote for the new flag, and I am not one of those who consider it is any concession to Quebec or French Canada. I am sure I have the right as much as anyone else to say that. The second point I wanted to make is also a reaction to what I think has been an unnecessary wrapping of patriotism and chauvinism around the support of the red ensign. I have nothing against the flag, but I have heard so much about the red ensign waving in shot and shell and our soldiers dying and fighting for it. Maybe symbolically there is something in this; but I had a fair measure of experience in one war and I was certainly around the front a great deal, and I only remember seeing the red ensign in view in two places—one was on General Simonds' Staghound that he used to trundle his way around in, and the other was on a Canadian corps headquarters tent. I never saw it any other place.

I wanted to make this point because there seems to be an attempt to generate the opinion that our soldiers were in action with the red ensign fluttering, in a sense, as their national symbol. It seems that people who try to accentuate that point of view make a mistake about what was the character of recent wars. I would also like them to consider what the character of future wars may be, if they are thinking of a flag solely in terms of a military symbol around which to rally.

The other personal point I wanted to make has to do with the tendency of our Conservative colleagues who have dominated the debate in the sense of the number of contributions. This is very much a personal reaction and has nothing to do with the issue before us. I could have forgiven them a lot easier if in their speeches they had been less ready to pat themselves on the back for the quality of those speeches. It is a minor point but I wanted to put it to you.

Mr. Speaker, I should like now to turn to the more general points. We are now going to have a free vote.

Mr. Monteith: Oh, yes.

Mr. Fisher: I should like to point out to my hon. friends that the Prime Minister made that clear in the form of a statement, which I think was a concession in this house, which we certainly took in our group as meaning there would be a free vote which would depend on our individual consciences. I think everyone here is aware that the sum of the consciences of our particular parliamentary group does not add up to the total of promised support. There are a number of our members who are prepared to support the red ensign while a number are prepared to support the new flag.

Mr. MacInnis: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Fisher: No, I will not permit a question, Mr. Speaker. This willingness to compromise is not something in which we have any special righteousness. I do not believe, however, that the proposals which were put forward by the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Scott), in connection with the design, and by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), in connection with parliamentary procedure, or by my leader in connection with arrangements for a house leaders' meeting, have been mere ploys in a partisan game, or represent anything underhanded or opportunistic from our own point of view in this particular issue.

Throughout the development of this issue from the fateful evening reception of the press—specially selected—by the Prime Minister, through his Winnipeg appearance, which I much regret, before the Legion; through the introduction of the resolutions; the early debate; its temporary hoisting; through the long summer; through the long and continuing interim supply debate, which prefaced this present debate, until we got into the four days a week continuity of debate, and throughout this whole business, until we are now debating very broadly a rather narrow

subamendment moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill)—through all this we have been somewhat unwilling watchers of the confrontation between the government's determination to have a flag and the official opposition's determination to block it. I think a substantial majority of the official opposition is obdurate and wants or intends to block it.

We have heard the stories about 14 more amendments to follow. I do not know whether there is any substance in them or not, but I assume that my hon. friends in the opposition are determined, as evidenced by the remarks of the last speaker. Just today during the question period we were told that there was no change in the government's position. Just today the Prime Minister told us he knew nothing about any private negotiations between the major parties' representatives for a way out of this dilemma.

I am chary of saying I speak for the Canadian people or any portion of them in this debate, after hearing from my hon. friends, with a repetition which makes me despair, that they speak for thousands, and even millions. I am hesitant to talk about history, even though I have been a history teacher, after listening to some of the historical interpretations of my hon. friends, some of which have given me a different and unusual light on events back to and including the Norman conquest.

I am not anxious to dwell on the issues of parliamentary efficiency or filibuster, or whether this is just a noble sense of duty that is being displayed. I do not feel that I should go into that in any great detail; but I believe that one substantial body of opinion in this country has not been well represented by spokesmen in this debate. This opinion, at its most radical, is that we in parliament in this debate are making fools of the electors. This opinion, at its mildest, is querulous and confused over what is going on. Or, putting it simply, it demands: When are you going to get down to business; when are you going to tackle laws and spending items which mean something to me?

Get down to business; get on with it. Let me put a plea to the government and the official opposition. Your confrontation is not helping parliament. Your stubbornness is not helping the cause of the federal government at this particular time when we have burgeoning provincialism. This may not be so dramatic as saying, a plague on both your houses; but I certainly feel in respect of this particular issue, each side of this confrontation has egg on its face.

While we sit and listen and listen, and some talk, ostensibly to this subamendment on the voting procedure of a plebiscite, a lot of things are not being considered which we believe should be considered. Look at the order paper. Even the measure we most want, the Canada pension legislation outline, is not on it. There is only an expression of the intention of the government.

Mr. Skoreyko: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the hon. gentleman will permit a question?

Mr. Fisher: No, Mr. Speaker, I will not permit a question.

Mr. Skoreyko: Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak on a point of order. What has the hon. member's remarks at this moment to do with the subamendment, or is he playing the Liberal game?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. MacEwan: He is one of the kissing cousins and has finally come around.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member has asked a very pertinent question on the point of order, but I point out to him that all hon. members have been allowed a great deal of leeway in their opening remarks. We are discussing the subamendment which refers to the conducting of a plebiscite, and whether or not certain methods should be used in announcing the result. However, in the subamendment you will notice the words "*inter alia,* in the interests of national unity". Aside from that, hon. members were invited as of last night to express their personal opinion. It does seem to me that during this type of debate an hon. member is entitled to honestly give his own opinions in this house, which is a forum and not a courtroom.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to press the point of order at all. I understand Your Honour has made a ruling, but I wonder whether the hon. gentleman can tell us when this fine act of co-operation was developed, because I have noticed the Liberal members opposite seem ready for what the hon. member is about to announce.

Mr. Fisher: Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that the hon. gentleman is in for one big surprise.

Mr. Diefenbaker: We know what is coming.

Mr. MacEwan: We know what is going on.

Mr. Fisher: Mr. Speaker, I should just like to say to you that we have a subamendment before us which in effect would put the suggested plebiscite on a national scale in such a way that there would be no local counting of votes. This may be very important, but I would prefer to see a consideration of legislation in respect of redistribution, a consideration of railway legislation, about which we have been talking for days, and consideration of crop insurance. I think we should be considering the Department of Forestry rather than this item.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that people who want to search for principles under which to stand should look at redistribution legislation, which in itself is a principle that we are denying by our inattention. When the prospect is before us that we will possibly be fighting an election on the basis of 1951, what greater sacrilege could be committed? What greater sacrilegious move could one make in the parliamentary process than by putting off or postponing legislation of the type I mentioned?

With all the talk we have heard, the time of parliament is fleeting and this session is moving toward an end. I suppose this parliament is moving toward an end. We are at an impasse. We are in a state of legislative paralysis. I do not want to overwork this word "sincerity", which people have been throwing around, but with some sincerity we have debated this whole question in respect of that which this country wishes us to do. We believe the country wants us to get about our business. If the opposition will not let us move the flag issue along to a vote; if it will not accept a compromise in the form of a committee and then a limited debate; if the government insists, as it does, that it cannot go any further in the way of concessions, then there is nothing much we can do to register our opinion that we should be looking after the business of this country that is before us on the order paper, or has been promised for the order paper, than to make the move I now make.

If we did this, at the very least it would put the spotlight on who among us want to tackle more substantial and I think less deflated matters. I want to make the point to you, Mr. Speaker, that the flag design put forward by the Prime Minister has generated no tremendous enthusiasm. I suppose that is a responsibility he bears, but in essence we have a force supporting something that goes back to hereditary emotions, and against it we have something that seems to be supported in a quite lukewarm fashion both by the government and to a degree by many people in this country.

I want to make it clear that we are prepared to vote and we would like to vote—

Mr. Horner (Acadia): For something lukewarm?

Mr. Fisher: —but obviously we are not going to get the opportunity to vote for some time. It seems that we have almost a negation of the parliamentary process. In this particular situation we have mulled over the problem and we have decided that there is at least one thing that we can do, and we are not doing it frivolously. If it does not work or have effect now we intend to repeat it and perhaps add further substance to it. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I should like to move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow), that this debate be now adjourned.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I knew it. Nice co-operation. Heads were together over there.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the said motion 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 motion (Mr. Fisher) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Alkenbrack	Fisher
Barnett	Flemming (Victoria-Carleton)
Bigg	Forbes
Churchill	Gundlock
Clancy	Hamilton
Coates	Herridge
Cowan	Horner (Acadia)
Crouse	Horner (The Battlefords)
Diefenbaker	Howe (Hamilton South)
Dinsdale	Howe (Wellington-Huron)
Doucett	Irvine
Douglas	
Fane	

Division

Jones, Mrs.	Ormiston
Jorgenson	Ouellet
Kennedy	Pascoe
Knowles	Peters
Loney	Pugh
MacEwan	Rapp
MacLean (Queens)	Rhéaume
MacRae	Rynard
McCutcheon	Scott
Madill	Simpson
Mather	Skoreyko
Millar	Smallwood
Monteith	Southam
Moore	Starr
Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria)	Stenson
	Thomas
Nasserden	Thompson
Nesbitt	Watson (Assiniboia)
Nielsen	Webb
Nowlan	Webster
Nugent	Weichel
Olson	Willoughby
Orlikow	Winch—69.

NAYS

Messrs:

Armstrong	Kelly
Asselin (Notre Dame de Grâce)	Lachance
	Laing
Badanai	LaMarsh, Miss
Béchard	Lamontagne
Bélanger	Lamoureux
Benidickson	Langlois
Berger	Laniel
Boulanger	Latulippe
Boutin	Laverdière
Brown	Leblanc
Cadieux (Terrebonne)	Legault
Cameron (High Park)	Lessard (St. Henry)
Cantin	Macdonald
Cardin	MacEachen
Caron	MacNaught
Carter	McIlraith
Cashin	McLean (Charlotte)
Choquette	McWilliam
Côté (Chicoutimi)	Moreau
Crossman	Mullally
Davis	Nicholson
Deachman	O'Keefe
Deschatelets	Otto
Dionne	Pearson
Drury	Perron
Dubé	Pickersgill
Dupuis	Pilon
Ethier	Rinfret
Foy	Rochon
Gauthier	Rouleau
Gelber	Roxburgh
Gendron	Sauvé
Granger	Stewart
Gray	Tardif
Groos	Teillet
Guay	Temple
Habel	Tremblay
Hahn	Tucker
Haidasz	Turner
Harley	Walker
Hays	Whelan—84.
Hellyer	

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Mr. E. Nasserden (Rosthern): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate on the subamendment I think my first remarks should be directed through you to the hon. members across the way who tonight have shown that they have discernment and good taste, and that they really appreciate the remarks that have been made by members of the official opposition and others on this side of the house who have taken part in this debate so far. One of the remarkable things about what has happened tonight relates to the entrance of the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) to take part in the vote, accompanied by many members of the cabinet who, as soon as the vote had taken place—a vote in which they indicated they wanted a continuation of this debate—immediately left the house.

Some hon. Members: Hear hear.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I am rising on a question of privilege. I am sure the hon. member for Rosthern would not have wanted to make that remark had he realized that the Prime Minister was presiding as host at a dinner for the delegates to the commonwealth educational conference and that the ministers who came back for the division interrupted their dinner to come here to vote.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pickersgill: Well, Mr. Speaker, if hon. gentlemen feel that is the kind of exhibition they want to put on for our guests from other countries, I cannot share that view.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nasserden: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Minister of Transport for the remarks he has made. Of course I agree that the Prime Minister has a responsibility to be where he is tonight, if the minister's remarks are according to the facts.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Nasserden: Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not want to cast any reflection on the Minister of Transport—

An hon. Member: Oh, no?

Mr. Nasserden: —and I sincerely want to make that perfectly plain. If what he has said is so, I wonder why the members of the Prime Minister's party voted the way they did tonight. To me it indicates they have no legislation to bring before the House of Commons.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I do hope the hon. member will not continue along that line, because his last few remarks were really out of order.

An hon. Member: They are true but they are out of order.

Mr. Nasserden: We have had a vote tonight that will be remembered in the history of this parliament.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Nasserden: Those who cry filibuster, those who cry obstruction, what was their cry tonight? They wanted more of the same. Speaking in the debate tonight the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Fisher) referred to those pieces of legislation for which the country is crying. What was the answer from members across the way? They want a continuation of a debate they have called futile, a debate they have called damaging to the image of parliament and to the welfare of the country. I do not want to say anything more along that line, except to note that they had some notable allies in the vote that took place tonight.

An hon. Member: Where were your Quebec members?

Mr. Nasserden: This debate has been one of the most dynamic in the six years that I have been a member of the House of Commons. I was never prouder to be a member of this party and to be associated with those on this side of the house than I was yesterday when the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) placed upon the record some of the history of this country. He spoke as one who appreciates those things that are built into the traditions of a people, those things that went into the building not only of the part of the country with which he has been associated but also every part of this nation, as he put forward the case for the flag that throughout the world today is known as the Canadian flag.

Every morning when I have come to the parliament buildings while the commonwealth educational conference has been in session and have passed the front of the west block I have seen the flags of the commonwealth there, and I know in my heart as every Canadian knows that the Canadian red ensign is a distinctive flag not to be—

An hon. Member: Not to be.

Mr. Nasserden: —not to be mistaken for any other flag. Mr. Speaker, there are some across the way whom I would like to see on their feet giving the reasons why they believe Canadians should accept the three maple leaf flag. After all, we have not heard any arguments from the other side of the house indicating why the three maple leaf flag should be the flag of this country.

The other day the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) placed upon the record some proposals that he thought might be a solution to the impasse that now faces parliament, and to an even greater extent the Canadian people. I believe he spoke as one who had made a reasonable and forthright appraisal of the situation that exists in this nation today. I think he also showed he had an appreciation of the history involved in the building of this nation from the very earliest times. All of these things have contributed and are contributing to a developing situation in Canada from which I believe those who support the Prime Minister and his personal flag can take very little comfort.

I remember the words of the Prime Minister when he put the resolution before the House of Commons. If I understood his remarks correctly, he thought that this measure was necessary if we were to have an increased degree of unity in the country. I also recall the early days of the debate on the measure and remember those who said that perhaps it was already too late to bring forward such a measure. We have seen the transformation that has taken place across the nation. Many were prepared to support the new flag, many thought that perhaps there was some good in this measure, but every day we see the opposition to it increasing from one end of the nation to the other. That is one of the reasons we have the subamendment before the house at the present time.

Hon. members will recall that prior to the last general election campaign there were those who said they had the answers to the problems that confronted the nation. There were those who said that the prime minister of that day, now Leader of the Opposition, was unable to meet the challenge of the problems that faced the nation. An election was held and a minority government was elected. I want to place on the record at this point what they said when they were elected, as found in the Ottawa *Citizen* for April 18, 1963:

> Lester Pearson and his ministers will come to power equipped with sheaves of policy papers, priority lists and agendas which they expect will enable the quickest take-off of any new government in Canadian history. One Liberal backroom boy, flipping through a neatly bound and confidential Pearson program guide, commented, "No party ever came into office as well prepared to draft

legislation and take executive action". The business of fining down broad party policy into programs which should be put into effect has been going on for years.

This was the situation when this government came into office. You will recall the legislation that was brought forward after 60 days of decision. You will recall the time that was wasted. Again tonight we have had an example of a government that is not prepared to meet parliament with legislation. I maintain, sir, that this is no longer a matter of simple determination when you take into consideration the question that this parliament is being asked to consider at the moment. It is no longer a matter of those things of which the Prime Minister spoke when he introduced this legislation. It is a matter of trying to salvage something out of national unity. This is the challenge that faces the Prime Minister and the government. I say this to the Prime Minister and to those around him: He never faced a greater challenge. He will never face a greater challenge in his career. The people of this country are watching and waiting to see if he is equal to that challenge. None of us is so faultless that he has never made a mistake. None of us is so faultless that he has not something in the past of which he is not altogether proud. On this occasion, although there may be an element of that kind facing the Prime Minister, surely in the name of national unity, for the welfare of this nation and the generations that will follow, this Prime Minister has the courage, the decisiveness necessary to make a decision that will bring this parliament back to active consideration of a legislative program that will give the people of this country the instruments of unity through the economic use of the resources this nation has.

There are those who say that a plebiscite is not the answer. I remember the plebiscite of those other days. I remember the way it was brought about. I remember too what followed that plebiscite. I remember the animosities and those other intangible questions that were left in the mind of one Canadian as he faced another Canadian. This is one of the reasons we have the subamendment before this house moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill). We are trying to prevent that kind of thing from happening in Canada again. There is no one on the other side of the house who, in his heart, does not know that this is the course which should be followed in connection with a matter as important as the one before us now.

There are other aspects of this problem with which I should like to deal as well. In thinking of the whole problem of national unity, thinking of the problem of trying to decide what shall be the flag of this nation, I find myself confused by the action that has been taken by the government in proposing a two pronged resolution which promises the people of this nation two flags. Every one of us in this house knows that the union jack is the flag of Great Britain. There is no need to pass a resolution in this parliament to recognize Great Britain as the head of the commonwealth. I am a little shocked, and I am a little sad too, to think that he who is the Prime Minister of this country would try to introduce a measure of such shallow consequences before this parliament and before the Canadian people in an effort to try to justify one section of the proposal he has made.

The other day the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton (Mr. Flemming) brought up the matter of the amenities that should exist as between one province and another in deciding on a distinctive Canadian flag. I think he brought forcibly to our attention the fact that confederation means more than the simple terms embodied in that act. After all, there will always be an argumentative situation in this connection, but there are some things that belong to the provinces, while other fields belong to the federal government. In a matter of such importance as the flag, surely there should have been consultations with the provinces to secure their views before any design was placed before parliament.

I see the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Deschatelets) smiling. I do not believe that a minister representing the province of Quebec—

Mr. Deschatelets: No, no, on a point of order—

Mr. Nasserden: —should be smiling at this reference.

Mr. Deschatelets: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I was not smiling; I was laughing.

Mr. Nasserden: Then, the greater is the shame that a minister representing a province containing a third of the population of this country, a province that has fought for provincial rights down through the years, a province that has held out for those things distinctive in its own life, should smile at a reference such as I made in regard to the

amenities that should exist as between the provinces and the federal government.

Of course, when I think of the resolution now before us, the amendment and the sub-amendment, I think of my own riding which is one of the historic ridings of this country. It is a riding composed of people of many origins. I should like to congratulate the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Korchinski) upon the speech he made this afternoon. I must confess that it would be a poor Canadian, it would be a poor member of parliament indeed, who did not approach this subject with some measure of hesitation. After all, we all know that in a matter such as this there is a variety of opinion. There is a widespread division in this country. There is a widespread division between some of the ethnic groups. As I look at my one constituency, as I think of the correspondence I have received and as I recall the visit I made to my riding, I am moved to reinforce some of those things that have been said in this debate.

Five years ago, four years ago, three years ago, perhaps even two years ago, you did not find in western Canada what you find there today. You did not find any animosity toward the province of Quebec. I want to remind hon. members that during the period when the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) was prime minister some actions were taken that were not altogether of a non-controversial nature. I remember one of those—the adoption of bilingual cheques. There was not a murmur from any place in Canada when that action was taken, but what would have been the situation had there been the manoeuvring at that particular time of a government like the one we have opposite? They would have fed the fires of isolation, as they have always fed the fires of isolation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Moreau: Explain.

Mr. Nasserden: Somebody says "explain". I could talk here all night and explain, and you would not know any more than you know now. Some people have a closed mind when it comes to taking a look at the aspirations of Canadians in all parts of the nation.

I recall that when I first came to the House of Commons I was very conscious of the fact that the people from whom I descended had not been in Canada very long. My father came to Canada from Lebanon. My mother was born in Canada of Swedish parents, and I remember the community in which we lived and in which we were a minority—I would say a very minor minority. I can recall first going to school, and I think many other hon. members who were in the same situation can remember some of those experiences too. I believe I know something about what minorities in this country have faced over the years.

Later on, as the years rolled by, I became interested in politics. One could not help but become interested in politics in western Canada when we had a government here in Ottawa that for so many years neglected the problems of western Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nasserden: You know, Mr. Speaker, they were so negligent that a socialist government was elected in our province for the first time and in the first place anywhere on the North American continent.

An hon. Member: In what year?

Mr. Nasserden: 1944. As I recall, the first campaign in which I took part, in 1953, was the first time I had a chance to become acquainted with some of the French speaking people in my riding, and I have 1,500 of them. I want to say they are among the best farmers and businessmen to be found in that riding.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nasserden: When I go back to my riding, as I did a week ago, and find people of other origins pointing their fingers at them because of the actions taken by this government, I know someone has not been working for national unity.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nasserden: That situation did not exist five, four, three, even two years ago.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Six months ago.

Mr. Nasserden: Well, I think that we could go a little further back than that because, after all, there have been other actions that have been the most divisive in the entire history of this country.

I recall the remarks made in this debate by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp), and it was he who referred to a troublesome minority. It was he who referred to appeasement—and these are not words for a minister of the crown. But what do concern me at the moment are the actions of some of those on the treasury benches opposite. I wish they were here tonight so that they might hear what I have to say, although I know that they know all about

these things, having been responsible for the clippings I want to refer to very briefly.

I do so, sir, not to try to stray away from this subject but to try to keep to the theme of national unity, the influence that a flag can have, the necessity today of taking the action proposed by this party of having a plebiscite because the actions taken by the Prime Minister have ruled out any other possibility, unless he still has in the back of his mind the sending of this measure to a committee of the house for consideration.

Here in Canada we expect leadership from those who are given responsibility. There are no officers of the house who are given more responsibility than those who sit behind the Prime Minister on the cabinet benches. Now I want to refer to a quotation from the Winnipeg *Tribune* of April 4. This is what one cabinet minister has been going around the country saying:

If Quebec leaves confederation western Canada will be forced to its knees, begging for help and aid from Washington—

This is a quotation from a cabinet minister, the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Teillet).

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Nasserden: Then he went on to say this:

He warned his audience if the present situation between Quebec and the rest of Canada is allowed to continue, confederation will be dissolved.

Where did this talk of separation start? It started right in the cabinet opposite. Then he went on to say this:

If Quebec secedes, confederation as we know it will be gone. Western Canada will be on its knees, begging at Washington's doors.

He went on to say this:

We may wake up and find ourselves too late.

I want to direct these remarks to the attention of hon. members opposite, through you, sir, and particularly to those from the province of Quebec:

Mr. Teillet said the crisis Canada now finds itself in has been caused by a complete lack of understanding and communication between French and English speaking Canadians.

Sir, what party in Canadian history has always said that it was the only party that could communicate the hopes and aspirations of French Canada to the rest of the nation? There they sit, and they have their members from the province of Quebec, but in the words of one of their own ministers they have failed to communicate the hopes and aspirations of their people to this parliament and to Canadians from other parts of this nation. I ask you, sir, is this the kind of representation that the people of any area have to expect from those they send to parliament? For more than half a century, with the exception of a few years, la belle province has sent to the parliament of this nation those majorities that should have been compelling in persuasion, in understanding, in the translation of those problems dear to the hearts of their people, and yet only a few short weeks ago 16,000 farmers from the province of Quebec had to register their disgust with the agricultural policies of this country. Due to lack of action from hon. members opposite, they marched on the capital of their own province. Somebody said they do not get $10 an acre. We never got $10 an acre in western Canada. I remember a prime minister who told the people of Quebec: Elect us, and we will do for you what John Diefenbaker did for western Canada.

An hon. Member: Out of order.

Mr. Nasserden: If I am out of order it is because of the interruptions from across the way.

I recall that a delegation came down from western Canada. We did not give them all they asked but we tried to place legislation on the statute books the benefits of which they could share together with the rest of the farmers of this nation, and I am proud to see sitting in this place one who was responsible for this achievement to a greater degree than any other Canadian in recent history—the minister of agriculture of that day, the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Hamilton).

National unity means not only symbols but the tangible things that touch the every day living of Canadians. There never was a government which came to office with so many answers, or a government which took so little action, as the present administration. Once again tonight hon. members opposite have shown by the way they have voted that they would prefer to listen to this debate than admit they have no legislation ready to bring before parliament.

Earlier, I quoted some observations by members of the cabinet. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau) is not here tonight; I understand he has a reason for not being present. I believe he told us that he did not know what the people of Quebec wanted.

An hon. Member: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nasserden: That is what he said. Behind him he has supporters galore. Apparently they have not been able to reach the cabinet, either. I see the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Turner) in his place.

This is what he had to say on one occasion. He condemned what he termed—

> —the "monopoly of information" and charged that the bureaucracy—"that mandarin class of faceless experts, protected by the cloak of anonymity of a government department, operating beyond the range of the people's control"—is fighting a running battle with members of parliament.
>
> "The M.P.", he said, "is losing that battle with the civil service."

I do not hear him denying he ever said that.

Mr. Turner: I did not realize the hon. member was so well read.

Mr. Nasserden: You do now.

An hon. Member: That was your contribution to this flag debate.

Mr. Nasserden: That quotation tells a tremendous story. It is the story of what is happening in this parliament today. Backbenchers are not doing their job, or else the Prime Minister would never have placed before us the measure which the country does not want and which many of his own supporters do not want. They say that we on this side are engaged in a filibuster. We are said to be obstructing. But you, Mr. Speaker, know that debate is the life of parliament. You know, too—

Mr. Choquette: Not debate—legislation.

An hon. Member: Bring it in then.

Mr. Nasserden: The hon. member had an opportunity tonight but he would not grasp it. His leader would not grasp it either. What I wanted to say was this—those interruptions almost got me off the track.

Mr. Turner: They almost got you on to it.

Mr. Nasserden: The hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George revealed something which has been reiterated by backbenchers across the way on more than one occasion. In debate, when one is faced with a proposition which is not only threatening the unity of this nation but destroying it, what else can an opposition do but take a course such as we are following tonight? No one would say that a plebiscite is the first answer to this question. But no one would say, either, that the Canadian people should not be consulted now, in view of the division which has appeared in almost every part of this country. This is why I feel so strongly that we should give consideration to the subject matter of the subamendment and of the amendment.

Before I pass on to deal with other matters, I have some clippings here.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nasserden: I know I have a few here tonight, but they do not amount to 132,000, the number received by the Secretary of State (Mr. Lamontagne) in regard to this proposition, as he told us in answer to a question. I have a telegram here from a zone rally of the Royal Canadian Legion as follows:

> Recent Legion zone rally respectfully urges continued support red ensign.

Here is another:

> The Royal Canadian Legion at its 20th biennial convention in Winnipeg overwhelmingly endorses the Canadian red ensign and asks your unqualified support of its stand.

I have another here from the Royal Canadian Legion, Saskatoon. This was sent to me during the period when Saskatoon was without a member:

> In view of the fact that at present there is no sitting member for the Saskatoon constituency the members of our branch request that you give your consideration to the following resolution—

Perhaps I should read the resolution. This is the way they put it:

> Resolved that we urge delay in the proposed legislation for the adoption of the new flag and propose retention of the red ensign as Canada's flag until more assurance is obtained that this legislation has the concern of the nation.

Is there a single member on the other side of the house who would argue that they have the consent of the nation when they put forward this resolution? They are a minority in a house of minorities. They received a minority of the votes in the last general election. They have completely reversed the stand taken by the order in council put forward by one of their own former prime ministers. When I read the debates of those days I find tremendous arguments which could be used against the adoption of a resolution such as they are now trying to put through the house.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The time allotted to the hon. member has expired.

Mr. Raymond Langlois (Mégantic): I had not intended to take part in the debate at this point. However, we have passed a great many days on this single issue, and tonight we had a vote. For my part I voted against the motion that the debate be adjourned. Why did I do that?

An hon. Member: Tell us.

Mr. Langlois: I will tell you why. I do not know whether the Conservatives are getting a little fed up. I would just as soon see them with their tongues sticking out, if they expect

to bring into the house a series of amendments. Let them bring in one amendment, with one flag proposition, and let us have the vote. I am willing to have a vote on it and we in this corner of the house have been taking this stand since the beginning.

Mr. Alkenbrack: You have been sitting on your hind end.

Mr. Langlois: I may have been, as one hon. member has said, sitting on my hind end. That may be perfectly true, but I still think that is more useful than what he is trying to do. This country and this house wants a flag; there is no doubt about that. We have now spent 20 days on the flag debate. If we did not want a flag, we would look pretty silly at the moment all across the country in every province. People are wondering what is wrong with this parliament. They ask "What are they trying to do? What are they trying to prove? They look like a bunch of school kids that has lost its teacher". You just cannot go around blaming the people, blaming this guy or that guy.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): We will blame you now.

Mr. Langlois: But you can blame some Liberals and their past administration, and some Conservatives and their past administration. We have had these two parties sitting in this house as the government for practically a century. The mess we are now in has been built up by nobody else but them. We have heard a great deal about this flag debate, Mr. Speaker. People have been waiting a long time for this flag. But they do not want the flag brought in through disunity and misery; they do not want a flag that will tear this country apart. Right now this issue is tearing the country apart. Perhaps the leader of the Liberal party, the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) is as much to blame for this as anybody else because he has been too much of a fancy skater; he has tried too much to save the goat and the cabbage at the same time. But perhaps the greatest separatist we have in this country right now sits on the front bench as Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) in this house. When I hear the Leader of the Opposition—

Mr. Skoreyko: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Langlois: —say in this house—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Edmonton East on a point of order.

[Mr. Langlois.]

Mr. Skoreyko: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the last remark of the hon. member for Mégantic (Mr. Langlois) should be withdrawn. That is a complete falsehood and should not be accepted by this house. I insist that it be withdrawn because it is an irresponsible statement.

Mr. Speaker: I understand perfectly the feelings of the hon. member for Edmonton East, but all hon. members have an opportunity to give an explanation or an answer, in subsequent debate, to a statement like that.

Mr. Smallwood: Nobody will pay any attention when they know where it came from.

Mr. Skoreyko: Mr. Speaker, is the word used by the hon. member for Mégantic in reference to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) parliamentary?

Mr. Davis: Sure.

Mr. Speaker: These questions are, of course, not easy to answer. I would say that the word used was rude; but in my opinion it was not unparliamentary.

Mr. Skoreyko: I agree with you, Mr. Speaker. It was indeed very rude and shows the ignorance of the hon. member.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Langlois: I know perfectly well that the word was rude, but the truth is often difficult to accept.

Mr. Bigg: It is a scurrilous lie.

Mr. Langlois: Just to prove my point, Mr. Speaker, when we hear a man such as the Leader of the Opposition, who is before the eyes of the people of this country just as much as the Prime Minister himself, go out in this country and say that the three maple leaf flag is a major concession to Quebec, I will not accept that statement; Quebec will not accept it, and Canada will not accept it, from the Leader of the Opposition or anybody else.

Mr. Skoreyko: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has made a statement to the effect that the Leader of the Opposition has said that the three maple leaf flag is a massive concession, or a concession, to Quebec. That is also a falsehood. Those words were never used by the Leader of the Opposition.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas: But they were used by his supporters.

Mr. Speaker: Order. A little earlier today I counselled one hon. member to stop referring to another hon. member in the house in his general argument. It is a matter of courtesy and custom that, while you may attack a political party, its politics, its activities and all the rest of it, one does not launch an attack on the leaders of particular parties. We are here to discuss general principles, and not personalities.

Mr. Langlois: I agree with you in that respect, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Churchill: Withdraw the remark.

Mr. Langlois: It is not the personality or his integrity that I want to attack. I attack the man, as leader of a party and representing a philosophy, if they have one—

Mr. Smallwood: It isn't funny money, that's for sure.

Mr. Langlois: I am not attacking the man as a man, as the hon. member for Prince Albert in his personal life, or anything like that; that is certainly not my intention. I am attacking the man as the representative of the party and the spokesman for that party, normally.

Mr. Smallwood: Well, stay with the facts.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It is now 10.30.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, may I ask whether the order of business for tomorrow holds as announced?

Mr. MacEachen: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

At 10.30 p.m. the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to special order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, September 4, 1964

The house met at 10.30 a.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. CHOQUETTE—ACTION AGAINST C.B.C. BY MEMBER FOR YORK-HUMBER

[*Translation*]

Mr. Auguste Choquette (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, the duty I am about to perform is not altogether a pleasant one but, having heard on the air that the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) has actually brought an action against the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation for having authorized the operation of a French speaking station in the city of Toronto, I feel compelled to rise on a question of privilege to say that action is due to narrow-mindedness and fanaticism.

Mr. Speaker, if such an antiquated mentality is allowed to persist in Canada—

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order. What is the point of privilege?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Choquette: My point of privilege is that, as a Liberal, I am humiliated by such an action and that, as a French speaking member, I am shocked and disgusted by such an attitude.

That is why I want to protest.

[*Text*]

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

CONTINUATION OF PROGRAM OF SMALL POST OFFICE CONSTRUCTION

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, hon. members will recall that on June 10, 1963 and again on October 14, 1963, the Minister of Labour informed the house that it was the government's intention to supplement the federal government winter construction program in order to create greater employment opportunities during the winter in designated areas. The supplementary construction program included a number of small post office buildings.

On April 15 of this year, in reply to a question, the Minister of Public Works stated that all the buildings originally scheduled under this special program had not been undertaken because of site problems and cost and staff limitations.

I should now like to inform the house that it is the intention of the government to continue the special program consisting of those locations in certain designated areas and areas of high winter unemployment that, while included in the original listings, it was not possible to complete during the last winter season. Approximately 185 locations will be involved as compared with 103 last year.

It must be appreciated, however, that although yesterday I passed the names on to my colleague the Minister of Public Works for construction, it will be subject to his being able to make satisfactory arrangements with respect to the acquisition of suitable sites and to obtain tenders reasonable in cost. One reason names are being forwarded at this time is to afford ample opportunity to acquire suitable sites well in advance of the winter season.

CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

REPORTED STATEMENT RESPECTING POSITION TAKEN BY QUEBEC

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister and has to do with the discussions that took place at the Charlottetown conference and certain questions which I asked yesterday and he answered. Has his attention been drawn to the fact that Hon. Ross Thatcher, the Liberal premier of the province of Saskatchewan, said in an interview:

> The premier of Quebec was certainly a long way off from the rest of us. If Quebec persists in its present course it will cause real trouble when the attorneys general meet to discuss the formula.

The report added:

> Mr. Thatcher said Premier Lesage apparently wanted to secure for Quebec additional fields which are currently federal responsibilities before the constitution was brought home. The Saskatchewan premier gave jurisdiction over Indians as one example.

Is there any foundation for these words of the premier of Saskatchewan, whose affinity

to the Prime Minister, politically and otherwise, is so well known? I trust that the Prime Minister will be able to state categorically that there is no foundation for Mr. Thatcher's fears.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to comment on a press report of what the premier of a province is alleged to have said. So far as the report itself is concerned, it would not reflect my interpretation of what happened at Charlottetown.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Is there any foundation whatever for the statement that the province of Quebec is asking for the right to take over certain fields of federal jurisdiction as a basis upon which agreement will be made for repatriation of the constitution?

Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker, there is no foundation for that.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is fine.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Prime Minister, in this connection, whether his attention has been called to the statement by Professor Bora Laskin, the well known constitutional expert, on the C.B.C. last night, when he described the Fulton formula as an unmitigated disaster. I wonder if the Prime Minister can assure the house that Professor Laskin and other constitutional experts will be consulted before any constitutional straitjacket is imposed on the people of Canada under the guise of repatriation?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I saw and listened to Professor Laskin on television last evening. I have also in the past had the advantage of reading articles by him on this subject and I know his views, as indeed, I think, many members of the house do. Without necessarily subscribing to those views, I think they are to be respected. If the attorneys general when they are meeting—they will also be familiar with his views—feel it will help them to have discussions with him, I am sure that will be quite in order.

POWER

NEW BRUNSWICK—POSSIBLE DELAY IN GRANT FOR MACTAQUAC DEVELOPMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. Does the Prime Minister plan to request the Atlantic development board to withhold final approval of the $20 million grant to the province of New Brunswick toward the Mactaquac development, in view of the request by the premier of Newfoundland that no final action be taken on power in the Atlantic area until they are made fully aware of the final feasibility report on Hamilton falls, as reported in the September 3 edition of the Halifax *Chronicle-Herald*?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I would have to look into that question, Mr. Speaker.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

INDIA—OFFER OF ASSISTANCE FOLLOWING CROP FAILURE

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, I have a follow-up question to that which the Prime Minister answered yesterday in connection with the request for food for India. I would like to ask the Prime Minister the same question that I put to the Secretary of State for External Affairs about a month ago, namely, has the Canadian government made any direct contact with the Indian high commissioner here in Ottawa to offer help?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we are already offering help to India and, as I mentioned yesterday, ships with Canadian grain will be leaving for India during the current month. The Secretary of State for External Affairs is in contact with the Indian authorities on this and other matters.

Mr. Hamilton: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I do not think the Prime Minister quite understands what I am getting at here. About a month ago, when the monsoons were late, the Americans stepped up their assistance, under public law 480, in shipments of wheat to India. Since that time a strike has occurred. These shipments to which the Prime Minister referred yesterday are the ordinary shipments under the extension of the Colombo plan. My question is, has there been a direct government to government approach to India, as distinct from the routine type of thing we are doing, to help in this particular emergency?

Mr. Pearson: We have discussed the current situation with the Indian authorities, and no request has been made by the Indian government for any special assistance in this situation.

CYPRUS—EXTENSION OF PERIOD OF COMMITMENT OF CANADIAN FORCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the term during which Canadian troops are to serve in Cyprus will soon expire, has there been any request for a further extension? If not, in the event of it being asked for, would the Canadian government be prepared to extend that term and also to finance the Canadian operation there in the event that the United Nations still faces financial difficulties?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, there has been, to my knowledge, no such actual request made. The whole situation with regard to a possible extension of the period of service of the force in Cyprus, and the financing of the force if such an extension takes place, is now under consideration in New York by the secretary general. As soon as there is something to report on this matter I will be glad to make a statement to the house.

RECOGNITION OF CANADIAN SOVEREIGNTY OVER ARCTIC ISLANDS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources. Can the minister assure the house that the government of the United States recognizes Canada's title to all islands north of the mainland up to the north pole?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): Mr. Speaker, I hope the hon. member thinks he is asking a rhetorical question. For some years now the present government and the previous governments have asserted our sovereignty over the islands extending northward from the meridians appropriate to Canada: on the west from the meridian which divides Alaska from the Yukon and on the east from the appropriate eastern meridian, with a sinuosity devised to provide for the existence of Greenland and thence extending to the north pole. Canada has not only asserted its sovereignty there but we are implementing our sovereignty in many places. I have never heard or seen that assertion called in question by any nation, let alone the United States of America.

Mr. Herridge: May I ask a supplementary question. The minister did not quite answer my question. Can he assure the house that the government of the United States has formally recognized these Canadian claims?

NATIONAL DEFENCE

ROLE OF NAVY IN OVER-ALL DEFENCE PLAN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence. Is the minister proceeding with any policy decision on the role of the navy within an over-all Canadian defence plan? If so, will he withhold his decision until a report on the navy's role is received from the House of Commons special committee on defence policy?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, the role of the navy in the over-all Canadian defence plan was set out in the white paper which was tabled in March. What we are considering at the present time is the method by which this role can best be implemented. I am sure the report of the committee will be received before most of the important decisions are reached.

Mr. Winch: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could I ask, what is the position of the House of Commons special committee, if decisions have already been reached?

Mr. Hellyer: Its terms of reference were set out in the resolution which set up the committee, Mr. Speaker.

CANADIAN FLAG

SUGGESTED MEETING OF PARTY LEADERS TO CONSIDER PROCEDURE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the right hon. Prime Minister. Can he inform the house whether he intends to accept yesterday's request to convene a meeting of party leaders immediately following Labour day, in order that further discussions may take place in regard to an alternative way of dealing with the flag issue, which has now become an urgent and critical national problem of concern to all Canadians?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have already stated that if further meetings of this kind can be useful I would be very glad indeed to participate in them, but unless there is some change from the position adopted at the last meeting it is difficult to see what progress can be

made. Nevertheless, I will be very glad to give consideration to the matter.

Mr. Thompson: A supplementary question. Would the Prime Minister not think it might be well to call such a meeting in order to find out whether such positions have reached the point where we could come to some agreement?

Mr. Pearson: I should like to ascertain, Mr. Speaker, whether there has in fact been any change in the attitude of any of those who attended the last meeting to ensure that a further meeting would be positive in character.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

STEPS TO MEET PROPOSED ACTION BY MEMBER FOR YORK-HUMBER

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State.

Could he tell the house what steps are being taken by the C.B.C. to meet the legal action taken against the corporation by the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) and if that legal action will cause the corporation to change its plans for the establishment of the proposed station in Toronto?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I will try to obtain this information from the C.B.C.

[*Text*]

DOMINION-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

STUDY OF ECONOMIC INTERDEPENDENCE OF PROVINCES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Prime Minister a question. Can the Prime Minister tell the house whether the committee which he announced in the early summer was investigating the economic interdependence of the provinces has completed its work and, if so, can he tell us when we might expect its report?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker, it certainly has not completed its work. There is a starred question on the order paper which I will be answering the next time starred questions come up, and that will give some information as to what has been done.

INDUSTRY

QUEBEC—POSSIBLE LOCATION OF NEW AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Raymond Langlois (Mégantic): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Industry. Can he tell the house at this time where Peugeot and Renault industries coming from France will be situated in Canada? In which province?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, in the province of Quebec.

Mr. Langlois: A supplementary question. Have negotiations gone far enough for the minister to give us the approximate locality in which either one will be situated?

Mr. Drury: No, Mr. Speaker. The choice of location will be made by the General Investment Corporation of the province of Quebec in the event that it is practicable to go ahead with the proposal.

Mr. Langlois: A further supplementary question. Did the federal government make any recommendations as to where they would prefer to have such companies situated?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, negotiations are still in progress, so I do not think it would be helpful either to the parties or to the country to discuss the matter any further.

Mr. Langlois: One last supplementary question. Can the minister tell the house approximately when he expects these negotiations to be completed?

Mr. Drury: Soon, I hope, Mr. Speaker.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

FORT WILLIAM, ONT.—PROTEST RESPECTING SURVEILLANCE OF EMPLOYEES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Postmaster General whether he has received a protest from the postal employees in Fort William on the ground that his department has ordered construction of peepholes in washroom facilities in the new building in the city through which postal employees can be spied on?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have received such a communication, and I think it has been replied to.

Mr. Orlikow: I wonder whether the minister can tell the house what was the nature of his reply.

Mr. Nicholson: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will put his question on the order paper I will give the reply.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

LEVELS OF RADIOACTIVITY AMONG CANADIAN ESKIMOS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. William Dean Howe (Hamilton South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In view of the fact that Canada has the highest rate of radioactive fall-out in the world, and in view of the dangerously high levels of radioactive caesium 137 recently found in Alaskan Eskimos, has the government considered testing Canadian Eskimos for similar danger?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the radiation protection division of our department has been making a special study of the problem in Canadian Eskimos in co-operation with the northern health services of the department and with the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources. We published preliminary reports in the October, 1963 and April, 1964 issues of our monthly publication "Data From Radiation Protection Programs". These reports include data on caesium 137 content of samples of caribou and reindeer meat and of urine samples obtained from residents in the north whose diet contains appreciable quantities of caribou meat.

This data indicates that ceasium 137 levels are higher for persons who eat caribou meat than for the general population. However, preliminary estimates of the total amount of caesium 137 in the bodies of these people, based on the amounts measured in the urine specimens, lead to the conclusion that in general the maximum permissible body burden of caesium 137 has not been reached. The highest levels noted are slightly below the amount recognized as permissible for continuous lifetime exposure. Levels are expected, I am very pleased to be able to say, to show a gradual decrease provided, of course, that nuclear testing is not resumed.

BROADCASTING

APPROVAL OF TRANSFER OF WINDSOR RADIO STATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. M. Fisher (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, in view of the interest expressed in the house by the Leader of the Opposition and other members I want to ask the Secretary of State whether he has any information on the application that Mr. Frith has made to unload the radio station for which he was granted a licence last year.

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Fisher: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the reasons given by Mr. Frith I want to ask the Prime Minister whether Mr. Frith approached him to be relieved of his duties as one of the commissioners on the biculturalism and bilingualism probe?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker.

SEARCH AND RESCUE

PORT STANLEY, ONT.—OPERATION OF COASTGUARD VESSEL "SPUME"

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. A. McBain (Elgin): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Transport, but in his absence and the absence of his parliamentary secretary perhaps the acting minister can take it as notice.

My question is based on information just received by letter this morning concerning the operation of the coastguard vessel *Spume,* at present moored at Port Stanley, Ontario, to serve the lake Erie district. Before this coastguard vessel can take part in any search or rescue work orders have to be received from the Trenton headquarters, which slows up rescue operations. Will the minister intercede to ascertain why Captain McLain cannot use his own good judgment as to the necessity of the *Spume* engaging in search and rescue operations, thereby speeding up the service with the possibility of saving lives?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Acting Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to take the question as notice.

Inquiries of the Ministry

HOUSE OF COMMONS

INQUIRY AS TO HOLIDAYS FOR STAFF

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, this question is supplementary to one asked yesterday by the hon. member for Royal addressed to the President of the Privy Council. The question yesterday inquired as to what arrangements were being made for members of the House of Commons staff to have holidays. The President of the Privy Council replied that this did not come directly under his responsibility. In view of the fact that the President of the Privy Council is an important member of the internal economy commission and also is chairman of treasury board, does he not at least share some responsibility for this matter, and does he not feel that something should be done about it at an early date?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (President of the Privy Council): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I hesitated to give any information yesterday because the responsibility does come under Your Honour, and for that reason I did not deal with the matter fully. I have no responsibility in this regard as a member of treasury board, but in my capacity as one of the commissioners of internal economy I do have knowledge of what is happening.

The whole matter of holidays for the house staff has been receiving very thorough consideration and I expect will be receiving more consideration in the immediate future. The matter has been receiving quite active consideration and will be up for decision as soon as a meeting can be arranged.

Mr. Knowles: In view of the fact that this matter is receiving consideration by the body of which the minister is a member, will he take note of the fact that both in Ontario and in Canada there are laws requiring that there be annual holidays; and in view of the fact that many members of our staff have been working for over a year without holidays should not one or the other of these laws be observed?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I think the desire is to have better laws for our staff than are ordinarily applicable in either of the jurisdictions to which the hon. member has referred. However, the problem is not just as simple as the hon. member has stated it. It is a little more complicated. Parts of the staff have been receiving regular holidays in the usual way. There is no question so far as they are concerned. With regard to other parts of the staff, the nature of their duties is such that they are very closely related to the actual sessions of the House of Commons, and a problem arises since these employees were all hired on the basis that they would not have holidays while the house was in session.

The difficulty has arisen because of the fact that due to the situation this year the normal policy or practice no longer was practicable. The problem is to find a method that will fully and adequately provide for the situation bearing in mind the former practice and which will not result, of course, in a cutting off of the services necessary for the functioning of the house while it is in session. It is a rather complicated matter, but it is receiving very close attention.

Mr. Knowles: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the commissioners of internal economy not take note of the fact that sessions have become more or less year round and that in the view of hon. members our staff should not suffer from that fact?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, that is the whole reason why this question has arisen at all. It would never have arisen except for the sharp increase in the continuity and length of sessions. This is the whole point that requires attention.

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister understand that we are referring to holidays with pay, not holidays at the employees' expense?

Mr. McIlraith: Quite. There is no confusion in that regard at all.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

QUEBEC—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON STEPS TO DEAL WITH F.L.Q.

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Justice but in his understandable absence I will do so to the Prime Minister. Has he received a communication from the F.L.Q. regarding the homicide of Mr. Leslie McWilliams committed by that organization, according to this document? In view of the fact that this organization is openly threatening the law officers of our country and boastfully describes itself as an instrument for the attainment of freedom in Canada, as well as its claim that the alleged wrongdoers in the homicide are entitled to

the benefit of the provisions of the Geneva convention, would the Prime Minister consider making a full statement as to what action is being taken by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in association with other police officers to round up and stamp out once and for all a group which is placing in disrepute the administration of justice in our country by a course of violence and terror repugnant to the instincts, traditions and feelings of the people of Quebec, within which province this organization is operating?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not agree that the administration of justice in this country is being placed in disrepute by, to use the right hon. gentleman's phrase, "a course of violence" in the sense that there is any general violence of that kind which has brought the administration of justice into disrepute. So far as the specific question is concerned, I will be glad to take it into consideration and if it seems desirable for the Minister of Justice or myself to make a full statement it will be done.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Has the Prime Minister received a letter containing the communiqué?

Mr. Pearson: I am sorry; I do not recall having received that letter, but I will be glad to look into the matter as soon as I get back to my office.

TRADE

COAL—POSSIBLE REDUCTION IN EXPORTS TO JAPAN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. K. H. More (Regina City): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Industry. I do this because of the statement made last night on television by a representative of the western Canadian coal industry to the effect that the industry was losing markets in Japan because of government red tape. I ask him if the industry has requested the assistance of his department in maintaining and expanding their portion of the coal market in Japan.

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker. I imagine such an inquiry would more properly be directed to the Department of Trade and Commerce, but I shall be glad to inquire into it.

GRAIN

INQUIRY AS TO DELIVERY QUOTAS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. E. Pascoe (Moose Jaw-Lake Centre): I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister. I have had complaints from my constituents regarding slow wheat deliveries to country elevators because of the lack of delivery quotas. When will the Minister of Trade and Commerce return to parliament so that he can be asked to take action on this pressing farm problem?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): The Minister of Trade and Commerce, as my hon. friend no doubt knows, is out of the country on very important government business. He is attending a meeting of the commonwealth finance and economic ministers at Kuala Lumpur and the Japanese-Canadian ministerial meeting in Tokyo. As soon as the latter meeting is over, and I think it finishes today, he will be back in his place in the house.

SUPPLY

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

DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR

1. General administration, including grants as detailed in the estimates; the expenses of the International Labour Conferences; the promotion of labour-management co-operation; the promotion of a program for the employment of the older worker; the promotion of a program for combatting seasonal unemployment; the organization and use of workers for farming and related industries; and the manpower consultative service, $4,243,000.

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): Mr. Chairman, in introducing the estimates of the Department of Labour I do so against the background of the fact that about a month ago the committee of supply spent a full day discussing the activities of the Department of Labour, and in the following week I made a rather lengthy statement on the activities of the department, especially relating to those points that had been brought up by hon. members in the course of the discussion.

However, I should like to highlight in this statement a number of the activities in the Department of Labour which I trust will anticipate some of the questions that might be asked by hon. members of the committee, and contribute to a better understanding of the numerous and indeed increasing activities of the Department of Labour.

I should like to begin, Mr. Chairman, by saying a few things about the current employment situation. During the past year hon. members will be glad to learn that employment has shown a marked increase while unemployment has registered a noticeable deciine. Improvement in the employment situation was particularly marked during the first half of 1964. Manufacturing employment showed great strength, a larger than seasonal increase being recorded during recent months. Construction employment held up better than usual last winter, but more recently it has shown less buoyancy than last year. Government measures to stimulate house building activity during winter months have helped to reduce the incidents of seasonal unemployment.

Between September, 1963 and February, 1964, the seasonal high and low points for the year, the unemployment total increased by some 217,000. The average seasonal swing over this period during the past five years was 322,000, so we conclude that the seasonal impact of our special winter employment program has been in the vicinity of 100,000 jobs. While construction employment is currently at somewhat lower levels than last year, the prospects for the coming months are very good. Housing starts are once again running above last year after registering a decline in May following an unusually strong first quarter. Non-residential construction can be expected to show more buoyancy during the second half of this year.

Total employment in the second quarter of 1964 averaged 261,000 higher than in the corresponding period last year. This represents a gain of 4.1 per cent, which was a substantially greater rate of advance than in any recent year. Unemployment has remained at a relatively high level even though more new jobs were created during the past year than in any previous year, with the labour force increasing by some 217,000 between the second quarter of 1963 and the second quarter of 1964. The net decrease in unemployment over the year was about 45,000.

The rate of labour force growth was well above the long term average. A little over one third of the increase in the labour force over the past year was made up by the addition to the labour force of younger workers under the age of 25 years, while almost all the remainder of the increase in the growth of the labour force was made up of women between the ages of 25 and 44 years. The comparatively large number of young workers added to the labour force was the result in part of the population increase, but there were also changes, and significant changes, in the pattern of labour force participation amongst young people in the community.

Among the more encouraging developments of the past year was the improvement in manufacturing. In the second quarter of 1964 manufacturing employment averaged approximately 90,000 higher than the corresponding period in 1963, and almost all parts of manufacturing contributed to the advance in output and in employment during the past year. Thus far in 1964 the most marked improvement in employment has been in durable goods. The service producing industries have been expanding at an accelerated rate during the past year. During 1962 and the early part of 1963 they experienced a relatively slow rate of growth. Since the beginning of this year service employment has been running well above 100,000 higher than last year. The increase in numbers has been constantly in excess of 40,000.

Despite the impressive decrease in unemployment during the past year, Mr. Chairman, in many parts of the country it is still relatively high. In July the unemployment rates varied from 2.2 per cent on the prairies to 5.1 per cent in Quebec. The disparity was somewhat less marked than a year ago. In July, 1963 unemployment rates varied from 2.4 per cent on the prairies to 5.7 per cent in Quebec. Hon. members will be interested in noting the duration of the unemployment of those currently unemployed. Of the 265,000 unemployed in July, three quarters of the total were unemployed for three months or less. The remaining 60,000 had been seeking work for four months or more. This group accounted for a smaller proportion of the total than a year ago. The shortages of certain skilled and semi-skilled workers were becoming fairly widespread in Ontario and Quebec. During the second quarter tool and diemakers, machinists, welders, electricians and loggers were in very short supply in a number of areas. Engineers, draftsmen and miners were also reported to be in short supply in certain parts of Canada.

Turning now, Mr. Chairman, to our specific activities for the current fiscal year, the committee will be asked to provide $228,079,800 in the main estimates and $263,004 in supplementary estimates (A). Of this total of $228,342,804, and amount of $114,491,504 is required by the Department of Labour proper and $113,851,300 for the unemployment insurance commission. This represents a reduction of $105,786,850 from moneys totalling

$334 million made available in the fiscal year 1963-64.

To account for this substantial decrease I should explain that in the main estimates for 1964-65 no provision has been made for the continuation during the coming winter of incentive programs to reduce seasonal employment, for which over $55 million was provided in the 1963-64 estimates. There is also a substantial reduction, approximately $62 million, in our anticipated need this year in meeting our commitments for training facilities under the Technical and Vocational Training Assistance Act. This is offset somewhat by increased provision for the operating aspects of the training program. There is also an increase of over $8 million for the operations of the unemployment insurance commission.

At this point I should like to assure the committee that although no provision is being made in these main estimates for our winter works incentive program, it is the government's intention, as already announced, to continue it during the coming winter, and money provisions will be made in supplementary estimates at a later date.

As hon. members will have observed, one of the items in the supplementary estimates provides authority for the transfer of payments connected with the operation of the national employment service insurance commission to the Department of Labour, and for the transfer of the duties, powers and functions related to this service. This transfer, which was recommended by the Gill committee, has been widely endorsed by national employer and labour organizations, as well as by others.

Hon. members will note that provision of funds for the economics and research branch of the department is also included under the principal vote in the estimates, and I would like to say a word or two about the activities of this important branch of the Department of Labour. As the central federal agency for economic and social analyses and research in the labour field, this branch conducts on a continuing basis studies of employment and unemployment, skilled and professional manpower resources, wages and working conditions, union organization and collective bargaining. The results of these studies are made available not only to the federal government but also to labour and management, to international agencies and to the general public through the *Labour Gazette* and various regular and special reports issued by the branch.

I would like to mention a few of the branch's specific activities over the past year. Studies on seasonal unemployment were given further attention during the year. An important part of this work was concerned with assessing the effectiveness of the winter house building incentive program as a means of reducing seasonal unemployment.

The development of special manpower information continues to be an important aspect of the work of the economics and research branch. In co-operation with the dominion bureau of statistics, a study of multiple jobholding was completed during the year. The report sheds light on the magnitude of multiple jobholding or moonlighting, as it is frequently referred to, its regional concentration, the characteristics of multiple jobholders and their work patterns.

The continuing work of the branch in reviewing local labour market situations in all parts of Canada was helpful in designating the 35 development areas. The Department of Labour has the responsibility of designating areas that might qualify for special federal assistance under the area development program. The economics and research branch at present is engaged in a study which is aimed at evaluating the appropriateness of the present system of selecting areas.

The branch is continuing its studies of the manpower effects of technological change. Consideration is being given to concentrating research on major new technologies in the early stage of use in industry. Particular emphasis will continue to be given to occupational trends studies. In addition to the report published early this year which deals with occupational trends on a national basis, work is now proceeding on the changing occupational structure of specific industries.

May I now say a word on a subject which has been discussed frequently and at some length by hon. members during the current session of this parliament. I have myself referred at some length, during recent statements in the house, to the work of the board of trustees, and it may be that hon. members will wish to raise points that I can deal with later today. Hon. members will recall that the trustees submitted their first report, as required under the legislation passed last October, on March 9, 1964. Since this report was submitted the trustees have taken action with respect to the president of the S.I.U. Mr. H. C. Banks was removed from office and replaced by one of the members of the staff of the board of trustees.

The trustees have been able to develop a joint approach in bargaining which is now taking place between the employers representing the companies and each of the individual unions coming under the trusteeship.

The principal accomplishment of the trustees, to date, however, has been the removal of the harassment on the great lakes and the St. Lawrence seaway which has plagued this water highway for many years. It is still too soon, of course, to say that all the problems besetting the maritime unions in Canada have been solved or removed, but I do feel the trustees have made a substantial beginning in this important task. The Department of Labour and other government agencies have endeavoured to co-operate with them fully in carrying out the difficult task they have been asked to undertake.

Hon. members know there has not been an opportunity for the full exercise of democratic rights on the part of many Canadian seamen in their union activities for some years. This was one of the main reasons for establishing the trusteeship, and is one of the basic objectives which the trustees have in mind. The trustees have initiated steps to ensure that proper procedures are developed for the election of officers in the S.I.U., which will be taking place over the next few months.

Steps are also being taken to encourage separate union organizations for officer personnel including engineers and other seamen as recommended in the Norris report. These proposed steps I understand have the support of the unions concerned and of the Canadian Labour Congress. Proposals have been made to reduce initiation and assessment fees in the S.I.U.

These are all important steps which the trustees have taken and which should help them to accomplish the over-all task which parliament has assigned to them. Later this session members of the House of Commons will have an opportunity to meet with the chairman of the board of trustees, and I am sure will be able to secure more detailed information which will be helpful to them in assessing the work of the board of trustees and in restoring democratic practices and democratic attitudes in the seafarers union. It is obvious that the development of democracy, after the kind of regime that has existed in this union for a long period of time, will not be an easy task and will not be undertaken overnight.

Later on today I would like to make a statement on the larger question of automation, if this would meet with the approval of the committee, but at this stage I wish to refer briefly to the new manpower consultative service which is also provided for in the first vote of the department. This service was set up this year to assess the implications of industrial change on manpower in industry, and develop measures to alleviate manpower dislocation attributable to technological change. It will administer the program of research incentives for investigations at the plant level into the manpower effects of technological change and will also administer the program of financial assistance for relocation of employees displaced by technological change. The director and three officers have been appointed, after cross-country competition. Two additional officers will be appointed as soon as suitable candidates are found.

The special services branch's main functions relate to the stimulation of winter employment. It is charged at the present time with the administration and the development of the municipal winter works incentive program; the winter house building incentive program; the supplementary federal government winter construction program. This branch also administers the federal-provincial farm labour program.

Some changes were introduced into the municipal winter works incentive program last year which were designed to further increase the program's effectiveness. The maximum federal incentive payment on municipal buildings was increased from $50,000 to $100,000 to encourage the inclusion of larger buildings under the program.

In respect of projects carried out in designated development areas and areas of high winter unemployment, the federal incentive payment was increased from 50 per cent to 60 per cent of direct payroll costs. The period of the program for 1963-64 was reduced from seven and one half months to the six month period November 1 to April 30, so as to concentrate more work in the actual winter months.

During the course of the 1963-64 program 7,320 applications for projects were accepted. These were submitted by 2,755 local authorities, including Indian bands. The total estimated expenditure on projects undertaken in 1963-64 is $282,000,000. The program this year provided an estimated 165,000 men with approximately 6,875,000 man days of work. The figures in 1962-63 were 146,000 men for 6,200,000 man days. The federal government's contribution to direct payroll costs for 1963-64 has been estimated at better than $52 million,

while in the previous year the amount expended was approximately $31 million.

The winter house building incentive program was introduced during the winter of 1963-64 to increase winter employment in the house building industry. It provides, as hon. members know, for the direct payment of a $500 incentive to the first purchaser or owner-builder of a house substantially built during the period December 1, 1963 through March 31, 1964. As evidence of the success of the program, representations were made by the industry for an extension of the inspection date because of shortages which occurred due to the heavy demand on materials and skilled labour. The extension was granted to April 15, 1964.

Under the program 32,647 applications for the incentive payment were received. Of these approximately 3,400 were cancelled and 4,700 were rejected at first or final inspection because they did not meet the conditions of the program. This leaves approximately 24,529 active applications which covered 28,213 dwelling units. The total amount of incentive payments will be approximately $4 million.

This program was successful in creating additional employment for construction workers last winter. The program also created additional employment for workers in the manufacture, transportation and sale of building materials.

As announced in the house on June 23, both the municipal winter works incentive program will be continued next year. It may be possible for me later in the day to tell hon. members of certain changes we are contemplating with a view to increasing the effectiveness of both the municipal winter works program and the winter house building program for next season.

May I report to the committee on the experimental program for the employment of older workers. The older worker employment and training incentive program was initiated by the federal government on an experimental basis last winter. Under its provisions the Department of Labour pays 50 per cent of monthly wages or $75 per month, whichever is less, to employers hiring workers aged 45 and over who met certain conditions for new jobs in insurable employment. Payments are made for a total period not exceeding 12 months. It was recognized that breaking in a new employee, particularly one who had been unemployed for six months or more, could be costly to an employer. Therefore it appeared reasonable to share these costs with an employer until such time as the worker had become fully productive. Twelve months was considered to be an adequate period for this purpose.

The program resulted in some 1,948 older workers obtaining employment, all of whom had been unemployed for at least six of the previous nine months. The program has, in my judgment, been reasonably successful. It has led to the employment of approximately 2,000 older workers, and it will provide the Department of Labour with better insight into the whole problem of the employment of older workers. At the present time the department is continuing an evaluation of this particular program and I hope this evaluation, which we expect to be completed very soon, will allow us to plan future action on behalf of older workers. This obviously was an experimental program, and I hope it will continue to be possible in the department to take the risk of experimenting in providing opportunities for the employment of older Canadians.

May I say a word about federal assistance for technical and vocational training, which is having a substantial impact on the development of a skilled labour force. Since April 1, 1961, when the new technical and vocational training agreements with the provinces came into effect, Federal approval has been given to sharing in provincial expenditures for 572 projects to build and equip new schools and to make additions and alterations and provide equipment for existing schools. The estimated total cost of these projects was $583.4 million; the estimated federal contribution was $352.5 million; the projects will provide 159,417 new student places. Enrolments in all programs have increased. There has been a dramatic increase in the number of vocational high schools; technician training programs have enrolments to capacity, apprenticeship continues to increase, and training classes of unemployed have continued to increase in the face of much improved employment conditions.

Under agreements which provided for sharing at the rate of 75 per cent in capital expenditures incurred by the provinces before April 1, 1963 there was an initial year largely devoted to the planning of new facilities. The following year, 1962-63, was a period of incentive construction. By year's end the accumulated total of federal contributions toward buildings completed and equipment installed had reached $197.5 million. In 1963-64, as previously approved projects reached

completion, the amount of capital assistance claimed by the provinces fell to about $102 million for the year. The December, 1963 amendments to the Technical and Vocation Training Assistance Act extended the period for sharing at the rate of 75 per cent in capital expenditures for most of the provinces, and the planning of additional facilities has been resumed.

In the current planning of training facilities and programs, considerably more attention is being paid to the training of adults. The new legislation provides increased incentives for the development of training programs, in co-operation with industry, for employed workers. These programs will provide the worker with the basic knowledge of mathematics, science and communications necessary for him to enter training for a skilled occupation. It is a fact that one of the obstacles facing certain classes of workers in acquiring needed skills is their lack of a basic knowledge of mathematics and science which would enable them to acquire the skills which would allow them to take on gainful employment. This training program covers industrial apprenticeships and programs for the retraining of employees who without such training would be displaced because of technological or other industrial changes.

Another program for adults which is receiving increased attention is the program for retraining the unemployed. Experience has demonstrated that the most effective way to permanently remove many of these workers from the ranks of the unemployed is to upgrade their basic education to the point where they can proceed to training for occupational skills, either in school classes or in industrial courses while employed. Though the severity of unemployment has lessened, the long run advantages of this type of training warrant the additional expenditures incurred to support it. Certainly the training programs that have been developed, and the capital expenditure program with which the hon. member for Ontario was associated, have had a very marked impact in upgrading the labour force in Canada.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my remarks in introducing the estimates of my department. I do apologize to the committee for taking up some time in outlining the activities of the Department of Labour. Before I conclude I should like to anticipate a question that might be asked by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre especially, having to do with the matter of labour standards.

Mr. Knowles: It had better be good.

[Mr. MacEachen.]

Mr. MacEachen: As I indicated when the estimates of my department were discussed last year, the development of a comprehensive piece of legislation in the field of labour standards was a prime target or objective of the Department of Labour. In the speech from the throne this year we indicated that it is our intention at this session to introduce this legislation for the consideration of the house.

Mr. Orlikow: Where is the resolution?

Mr. MacEachen: The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has been pressing for further information with respect to the precise date when this particular legislation will appear on the order paper. I am looking at the date today, Mr. Chairman, and I feel reasonably confident that this legislation will be on the order paper before the calendar turns to the month of October. Perhaps I will exceed my own expectations by having it on the order paper well before the calendar turns to October.

Mr. Knowles: What year?

Mr. MacEachen: Oh, 1964.

The Chairman: Order. I have to bring to the attention of the committee that the minister's time has expired. Is it agreed that the minister may go beyond his allotted time?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Knowles: If he has any more promises to make, let him go on.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, I wish to conclude my remarks by referring to the fact that this is a very appropriate occasion on which to discuss the estimates of the Department of Labour, because on Monday next all Canada will pause to pay tribute to the great contribution that the labouring people of Canada have made to the development of this country, and to the great role that organized labour has played in the development of ever increasing participation by the working people of Canada in the wealth and welfare of our country.

Mr. Starr: Mr. Chairman, in his opening remarks the Minister of Labour mentioned the fact that we have already devoted one day to the estimates of the Department of Labour, and he is quite right; one day was devoted to this subject when we discussed interim supply. However, one day may not be sufficient, in view of past experience with the estimates of this department and the fact that the Department of Labour has played

such an important part in the economy of our country in recent years. Bearing in mind previous discussions of the estimates of this department, many more days have been taken up in dealing with these estimates than perhaps those of any other department which have been brought before the committee for their approval.

It seems rather strange, Mr. Chairman, that this appears to be a new approach by this government, namely that ministers warn the House of Commons and its members that they are prepared to bring in legislation provided the promise is made that there will be no debate or that there will be debate for only one or two days. This is a condition that always seems to be placed on any needed legislation being put before the house. Then, of course, the Minister of Labour, in a mild way, reminded us of the fact that we had already spent one day on the estimates of his department when we considered interim supply. In view of the fact that we have spent only one day dealing with this matter, I believe some hon. members will wish to express their opinions with respect to the many matters that are involved in these estimates, but I hope we may be able to pass them during today's discussion.

The Minister of Labour has repeated statements he has made on previous occasions, and has pointed out with some satisfaction that employment is up, unemployment is down and there is a marked improvement in this respect. I remember very well that beginning with the year 1961 that condition began to show itself, namely that employment was rising and unemployment was showing a marked decline. When I pointed this out with some satisfaction on a number of occasions in the House of Commons, those who now claim there is a marked improvement in this connection were very critical and spent many hours pointing up the fact that unemployment was a very serious problem. Of course it still is, Mr. Chairman; because how can anyone say with a straight face that there is a marked improvement in the employment situation in this country when there were only 28,000 fewer unemployed in July of this year than there were last year?

However, as I pointed out during the discussion on interim supply, this points up a very important aspect of the employment picture in this country, in that not sufficient jobs are being created to take care of the teen agers who are entering the labour force; because in this respect the figures show an increase—I might say a marked increase, to use the same words as the minister—over the same period last year. The Minister of Labour has not treated this as a serious matter, nor has he told us what is being done to create jobs for these teen agers who are entering our labour market.

The minister made reference to what he termed the special programs this government has introduced to deal with seasonal unemployment. Are they new programs he is talking about, Mr. Chairman? I ask this question because at the moment I can think of only one program that has met with success, and that is the winter-built homes program. Even here it remains to be seen whether success will be achieved this coming winter in the same way that the programs introduced by the previous administration in 1958, 1959 and 1961 met with success.

The other program mentioned by the Minister of Labour was the employment of older workers. It seems to me that if a program is not successful it is termed experimental. There seems to be a tendency to make statements that sound as though something is actually being done. I take as an example the Postmaster General's statement in a press release today. He said it is his intention, in co-operation with the Minister of Public Works, to help the winter unemployment situation by building a number of small post office buildings throughout Canada in designated areas. This is a program that was started back in the time this party was in office, and it met with a great deal of success. However, Mr. Chairman, an excuse is being offered in this release by saying that many of those buildings under the Post Office Department were not proceeded with because of site problems, cost and staff limitations. We also had the announcement today that some 185 locations were involved in the post office building program, subject to satisfactory arrangements being made with respect to the acquisition of suitable sites and to obtaining tenders reasonable in cost.

All this is very fine, but I would ask, in view of the failure during the past year to undertake any part of this program, whether this is only a fine sounding statement which is being put out, or will any actual developments take place as a result of the announcement. We must take things as they are presented to us and hope that some steps will be taken.

Mention has been made of the municipal winter works program, in which I realize the Minister of Labour takes great pride, as well he should. The municipal winter works program was not looked upon, when it was

first introduced in 1958-59, as something which would be of a permanent character. As a matter of fact it was looked upon as something that would fail, as a puny effort. Yet it has been a successful program in that year after year there has been a marked increase in activity and a greater participation in the program on the part of the municipalities. It is a program that is here for many years to come.

We should like to know, with regard to the experimental program for the employment of older workers, what was the total cost of this experiment. I am not critical of this program in this respect, because we are all interested in the welfare of the older workers; certainly I have been interested in them in the past. I should like to know whether the cost is so great that the experiment is not worth while. I realize that the policing of the program must be a terrible headache, and whether it can be carried out successfully in view of the stringent regulations which are applied to it is something the Minister of Labour should tell us today during the discussion of his estimates.

The minister did not touch upon a number of matters about which I think we are entitled to know, particularly matters on which action has continually been promised. We would like to know what is the state of the unemployment insurance fund and whether this fund will be sufficiently strong to carry itself in the coming winter months, or whether more loans have to be made to bolster it. What has happened to the report of the Gill commission on which the government has been sitting for over a year and a half? The only action which has been taken is the announcement that the national employment service will be transferred to the jurisdiction of the labour department; and I understand that change is now in the process of being brought about. But what has happened to the rest of the report of the Gill commission? It is a report on which the present government said they would act immediately on assuming office. Where is the labour code? The Minister says he will have a resolution on the order paper before the calendar changes to October. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre queried that and wanted to know in what year. Time has dragged on and no action has been taken in this regard.

What about the promised legislation on hours of work? What about the promised legislation on minimum wages? What has been done about these matters? Nothing has been done to our knowledge. Certainly nothing has appeared on the order paper to show that the government wish to carry out the promises they have made. What about this most important subject now being discussed and which has been discussed for a number of years—a matter which has been looked at with some apprehension by those who may be affected—automation and technological change? We endeavoured to do something about it through the introduction of a bill in the House of Commons. We planned to call a conference between industry and labour to work out regulations and details respecting such a co-operative plan with the provinces. Today we hear that all that is being done is some research and study on the subject. Although that may be necessary, I venture the guess that research and study of this problem has been carried to the point where some action could now be taken by the department to see whether an alleviation of this problem could be brought about.

We made a start on labour-management co-operation with the setting up of the productivity council, and I think one of its most important achievements was in being able to bring about better understanding between management and labour for the first time in the history of this country. But with the elimination of the productivity council by the government nothing further has been heard about labour-management co-operation. The meetings which used to be held under the jurisdiction of the productivity council now seem to have been discontinued altogether, and we hear no more about the worth-while effort which was made at that time.

As far as the trusteeship on the great lakes is concerned I might say that no one—at least not I—has any intention of trying to upset or interfere in the affairs of those who work on the great lakes, because I think it is necessary to bring about some peace on the great lakes in order not to jeopardize our economy. However, I am not satisfied with the manner in which trustees have proceeded, and I am far from satisfied that they have brought about a solution, in the long run, to the problems on the great lakes. It seems to me that the trustees, who were appointed as a result of the recommendations made in the Norris report, have ignored the report completely. As a matter of fact, on reading the summary of the whole situation we find that Mr. Millard never even read the Norris report; he felt he could proceed on his own.

In my opinion the trusteeship was set up because of the Norris report; indeed, one of its main recommendations was the setting up of the trusteeship. It seems to me as though the trustees are trying during their term of office to create an atmosphere on the great lakes in which there will be no disturbance of Canadian ships in United States ports. That seems to me to be their main objective. And that they have done, by whatever methods they have used to arrive at an agreement with Mr. Paul Hall, the head of the S.I.U. in the United States. It seems obvious to me that some satisfactory arrangement was made to him, because we have had no harassment of Canadian ships in United States ports during this present season.

What is going to happen when the trustees, who seem to be anxious to get rid of the undertaking that parliament gave them, move out of the picture? Is the whole situation going to revert to what it was originally? I cannot see how the problem has been solved by the trustees in any way so far as the days ahead are concerned. We read that a democratic vote is to be held, but we also read with some apprehension that those who would oppose the present incumbent in office are being shifted around to get them out of the way so they cannot participate. The trustees only act when public opinion brings these matters to their attention. Then they endeavour to rectify the situation and do so, but some doubt is left in my mind with regard to whether the trustees are really on the job and actually know what is happening.

It is fine for the trustees to say that many of the people who were associated with the former president have now atoned for their sins, have gone through purgatory and are prepared to lead a new life.

Mr. Diefenbaker: They have gone through a whitewash.

Mr. Starr: That is all to their credit, but certainly their actions with regard to the holding of a democratic vote on the great lakes would lead me to believe they have not spent enough time in purgatory. I am worried that the trustees are too anxious to finish the job and leave the situation in the same position it was when they came into the picture. I see no reason why this will not be so, because I can see no great changes in the situation. There has been a temporary lull only, and when the trustees move out I think the situation will revert to what it was previously.

With Labour day coming on Monday, when all of us pay tribute to those who have left their mark on the Canadian labour movement, I wish to add my words to those of the Minister of Labour and say how much we appreciate those men and women in the labour force who have dedicated their lives and energy to the betterment of conditions for those people engaged in the building of our country, those engaged in the labour movement and the protection of our democratic way of life.

It is with a great deal of regret that I refer to the passing of William Jenoves who was called "Mr. Labour" in the Toronto area and who played such a tremendous part in the labour movement in Canada. He passed away recently, and I understand his funeral will be held in Toronto on Tuesday. It is men such as Billy Jenoves who have worked unselfishly in the interests of the men and women of our labour force in years gone by and who have laid a firm foundation and created a truly good reputation for the labour people of this country. To such men we are thankful, because it is through their participation and co-operation that we are now able to enjoy the Canada that we have today.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Chairman, it would be easy for me to make a speech of the labour estimates simply by referring to last year's *Hansard* and looking at the speeches which members made then, because really nothing of any importance has been accomplished since the minister made his introductory remarks last year and members commented upon them in discussing the labour estimates.

It was good to hear the minister say today in his concluding remarks that he expected to bring in a resolution or bill dealing with a national labour code before the end of the month. It is good to hear this, but we in this group have been hearing such statements by other Liberal cabinet ministers ever since Mackenzie King made such a statement in a speech in 1919. It is probably just as well that the hon. member for Hamilton East is not here at the moment, in that I expect he would be on his feet interrupting me as he interrupted the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre last year, because he would construe my approach as a partisan one.

In recent years members of various parties including our own have presented private members' bills calling for the provision of fair wages, a maximum work week and holidays with pay. When the Liberal party were in opposition they supported us, of course, but now they say we do not need such

legislation because the government is going to introduce a national labour code which will provide for all these things. I was glad to hear the minister say that it would at least be on the order paper before the end of the month. When the government will proceed with it is, of course, a very good question. I hope the minister will not be too surprised if I say I am from Missouri and am even a little sceptical about his promise it will be on the order paper this month.

So far as fair wages are concerned, I hope the code will provide a minimum of $1.25 an hour for all federal employees. In case the minister and other members of the house do not know it, I direct their attention to the fact that there are people working for the federal government who still do not receive that much an hour. The charwomen who clean the offices in this building are prevailing rate employees, and they are paid the munificient sum of 95 cents an hour. I wish the minister would not only bring in the new code but would also use his influence on his colleague, the President of the Privy Council, who apparently is in charge of this matter, to get him to undo the zipper on his heart and take some action for the benefit of these people. It is long overdue.

Surely it is also time something was done about establishing a maximum work week. Surely we do not have to wait for the new labour code to be introduced. The same applies to the provision of holidays with pay. Certainly we need a national labour code which will provide that everyone is entitled to holidays with pay after working for the greater part of the year, but do we need that kind of law before the government lives up to the spirit contained in such a law? Surely it is time every person working for the federal government should be protected in this way.

This includes the secretaries who work for members of parliament. They are human beings like everybody else, and are entitled to the same rights as everybody else. Since they have now been working for well over a year without holidays, surely they are entitled to holidays with pay now. I hope the rumours we have heard that treasury board has turned this down are false. If they are true, I hope treasury board will reconsider its recommendation and come forward with a favourable decision very quickly. I am sorry; I am wrong. It is the internal economy commission, and I hope they will reconsider this matter and come in with a favourable recommendation very quickly.

I know, Mr. Chairman, that the matter of collective bargaining for government employees does not come directly or exclusively under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Labour. However, I want to say that personally I am very disappointed that the Liberal party, having announced several years ago that it favoured the extension of collective bargaining to federal employees, has failed to implement that promise. I recognize some of the difficulties in implementing this kind of principle. I recognize that the organizations which represent the employees overlap, and that there are large problems of detail in implementing this promise. It would seem to me, however, that the difficulties could have been and should have been overcome by now. I hope it will not be too long before the promise made by the Liberal party that federal government employees would have the right to bargain collectively with regard to wages, salaries and working conditions, will be implemented.

If this promise had been implemented, as I think it should have been by now, we would not be faced with the present hassle with regard to the salary increases recently granted to group B employees. Here we have 65,000 employees working for the government and I am told that 10,000 of those, even after the latest increases have been approved, will still make less than $3,000 annually after they reach the maximum of the salary classification to which they belong. If you take into account all those who have not reached their maximum the figure of 10,000 would probably be doubled. This means that we have clerks, typists, office equipment operators, messengers and clerical assistants who are still making less than $60 per week. I wonder how those of us who are interested in the welfare of the ordinary citizen can believe these people are able to live on any decent standard. It seems to me obvious that something ought to be done now.

I do not know whether the rumours are true to the effect that the civil service commission recommended a substantially greater increase than the government finally approved. Nor do I know whether it is true that the President of the Privy Council was one of those who opposed the increase which the civil service commission recommended. I do know that if the government had implemented its promise that civil servants would have the right to bargain collec-

tively, this kind of difficulty which we are now facing would have been overcome; because it would have been settled in the normal and proper way in which all employee problems should be settled, that is by collective bargaining.

I should like to say something very briefly Mr. Chairman, about the comments of the minister with regard to the unemployment situation, with regard to the programs which the federal government implemented for retraining and to deal with such problems as automation. I am not at all satisfied that we have licked the problem of unemployment. It is standard procedure for the old parties, when they are in opposition, to say that the rate of unemployment is too high; but when those parties become the government they say the situation is much better, that the number of unemployed is less than it was. Of course the number of unemployed is less than it was this time last year. However, the rate is still one which is of great concern, and it should be of great concern to all of us The rate at which unemployment is dropping has decreased very sharply in each month recently.

I should like to point out to the members of this committee that as respected and as conservative an economist as Dr. Firestone has predicted that unemployment will increase rather sharply in the next couple of years. I have heard nothing from the minister or from any other government spokesman which would indicate the government really has any plans for dealing with this basic problem. I think to a large extent the reduction in unemployment is an accident for which this government should not take any credit. The minister shakes his head. This is my opinion, and I feel that if we have a chance to discuss the problem in detail we can demonstrate this very clearly.

The minister referred in some detail to the programs the government has introduced to take care of retraining. Certainly we are doing more than we have done in other years, but I suggest to the minister and the government that the programs really only go a small way toward meeting the problem. It is not my intention to deal with this aspect in any detail today, but there have been some very disquieting reports in newspapers like the Toronto *Star*, which is not noted for its hostility to this government. These reports have referred to the large number of people who begin the training program but who drop out before their training period has been completed. They drop out because the amount of money they are given to help them maintain themselves and their families while they are taking this training is woefully inadequate. I suggest to the minister that he give consideration to arranging for the industrial relations committee to meet so we could discuss in detail these training programs which the government has begun or is planning. We could also hear representatives from the Canadian Labour Congress, the Canadian Manufacturers' Association and other organizations interested in labour problems.

I want to deal with a question which has concerned this house for the last couple of years, Mr. Chairman, and with which the minister dealt very briefly today. I refer to the situation on the great lakes. I want to try to do this is a non-partisan way. What I say will to some extent be my own personal opinion. It is no secret that there were and are differences of opinion in all parties about what happened in the past on the great lakes, about what was done when we passed the legislation establishing the board of trustees, and about how well the trustees have succeeded in accomplishing the job entrusted to them.

I begin by saying I view with a great deal of scepticism the criticisms, comments and questions which have been raised on this issue by members of the official opposition. Listening to them one would think all the fault lies with the government, but the fact is that Mr. Banks was head of the S.I.U. of Canada for a long period of time, including the six years during which the present official opposition was the government. That government was acquainted with some of the things Mr. Banks was doing.

I remind members of the committee that on one occasion the president of one of the large shipping companies wrote to an official of the Department of Labour, Mr. Wilson, enclosing a copy of a letter from Mr. Banks in which he asked the company to ignore the provisions of Canadian labour legislation, to ignore decisions of the Canada labour relations board, and to recognize certain members of the S.I.U. as being entitled to employment even though the Canadian labour relations board had ruled these people were covered by an agreement with another union. In his letter Mr. Banks promised to indemnify the shipping company if it were sued for damages.

That was an obvious breach of the Canada Labour Relations Act but the former minister of labour, who is now sitting on the opposition benches, did nothing about it. When the

opposition talks about Mr. Banks it must accept part of the responsibility for not having taken any action while it was in power. I have noted members of the opposition patting themselves on the back because they appointed Mr. Justice Norris to inquire into the situation, but the fact is that they did not establish the Norris commission until the Canadian Labour Congress and the unions affiliated with it tied up the St. Lawrence seaway.

In discussing this matter of the great lakes I wish to say I was amazed and shocked that a member of the House of Commons, in the year 1964, would make the kind of speech which was made by the hon. member for Athabasca in the house on July 25 last. I wish to quote a couple of lines from his speech on that occasion, and members can find his words recorded on *Hansard* at pages 6044 to 6048. This is one of the things he said:

> "I do not believe we need labour unions at all, if we do our job in this House of Commons."

There is not a democratic country in the world which does not have labour unions, which is not proud of the labour unions it has, and which does not encourage their growth; but I have not heard a single member of the hon. member's party repudiate his statement. Further on he said:

> This is still a jungle and the labour bosses are the biggest apes in the jungle....We should put these labour bosses with criminal records out of business for five years at least.

There have been very few labour officials, let alone labour leaders, convicted of any crime in this country. Further on the hon. member enumerated some of the things of which he accused labour leaders of being guilty:

> —sedition, violence upon the person, organized murder, conspiracy to maim—

I am sure hon. members in all parties who are interested in labour will agree with me when I reject completely the allegation that labour leaders in this country have been guilty of these kinds of crimes. The hon. member ought to list the number of labour leaders who have been convicted or even charged with such crimes. I say this is false and has no truth at all in it. I also say I am surprised that the former minister of labour in the Conservative government did not make mention of this when he talked about Labour day and the importance of labour.

Returning to the question of the S.I.U., I am one who voted for the legislation which established the board of trustees for the maritime unions. I recognized then, and I recognize now, that the trustees would not have an easy job. After all, the United States government has indicated its support for as few changes as possible. The United States labour movement has supported Mr. Paul Hall and the S.I.U. of North America.

During the years Mr. Banks was in power the Canadian shipping companies, especially Canada Steamship Lines, were happy to go along with Mr. Banks to the mutual advantage of both. I recognized the fact that the legislation was a new departure and that the job of the trustees would not be easy. I was quite happy with the members who were appointed to the board. I had great respect for the contribution which Mr. Millard had made to the labour movement. I knew of Judge Lippe's activities as a successful arbiter of labour disputes, and we had heard good things about Mr. Justice Dryer.

I have not discussed this with other members of my party or members of other parties; I speak for myself alone, and I must say that I am disappointed with the progress which has been made. It is true that harassment of Canadian ships in United States ports has stopped, but I wonder how much credit the trustees can take for that. After all, there was no harassment of Canadian ships so long as Mr. Banks was in power. Harassment of Canadian ships did not start until steps were taken by the Canadian labour movement and by the government, through this legislation, to clip the wings of Mr. Banks. If all we wanted to do was stop the harassment of Canadian ships we would not have got involved in the legislation; therefore I do not give the trustees very much credit for this situation.

What else have the trustees done? Well, Mr. Banks is out. I do not know why they finally removed him from the presidency of the S.I.U. Stories in Canadian newspapers which continued until a day or two before he was removed indicated that on the whole the trustees were not unhappy with him. I do not know whether the fact that Mr. Banks apparently arranged for the tapping of the telephones of the trustees was responsible for the decision.

The point I wish to make is this. The officials who worked with Mr. Banks, the officials who were part of the conspiracy in the gangster empire he built up, are still in power. A good public relations job has been done—I do not want now to discuss who has done it—to try to convince the Canadian people that the S.I.U. was not so bad, that

Mr. Justice Norris was prejudiced, that he had exaggerated, and so on. I do not wish to repeat what Mr. Justice Norris said about Mr. McLaughlin, Mr. Heinekey and Mr. Swait, because members of this committee who are interested will have read the Norris report. I wish to quote just a couple of paragraphs from the *Globe and Mail* of May 2, 1964 under the heading "Court found It Impossible to Believe Testimony of Banks". This is a summary of the judgment by Judge Wagner, now attorney general of the province of Quebec, the judge who sentenced Mr. Banks to five years in prison. I want to read a couple of paragraphs to make clear what Judge Wagner had to say about Mr. McLaughlin.

Leonard (Red) McLaughlin, SIU vice president and heir apparent to the union presidency under the federal trusteeship—Judge Wagner described him as Banks' trusted adviser and the man who endeavoured to come to Bank's rescue during the trial. He referred to Richard Greaves' evidence that McLaughlin in August, 1957, "has appeared with the daily report referring to the doings of Capt. Walsh" and said this was the signal of an explosion.

"The court wishes to state that it entertains very little regard for the conduct in this respect of Mr. McLaughlin who more than any other member of the union was familiar with the sentiments of the man at the top," the Judge said.

"This Mr. McLaughlin in his testimony before the court gave us the definite impression that he was bent on favouring the accused by attempting to minimize the motives which had prompted the beating of Capt. Walsh."

I could go on, but I think this indicates clearly that Judge Wagner at least shared the sentiments of Mr. Justice Norris with regard to Mr. McLaughlin. Yet the trustees have obviously decided that despite the voluminous testimony relating to Mr. McLaughlin and other top officials of the S.I.U. of Canada they should be permitted—indeed, I would go further and say that in my opinion they are being encouraged—to continue as leaders of the union. Speaking for myself—and I wish to make it clear I am speaking only for myself—may I say that if the total accomplishment by the passage of the legislation establishing the board of trustees will be the removal of Mr. Banks as president of the S.I.U.; if this is to be the total accomplishment which we shall see from the trustees, then I for one shall be sorry I voted for the legislation setting up this board.

I know the trustees have been faced with a difficult task. It may be that I am wrong. It may be they have done a great deal more than we know about. I hope the minister can prevail on the trustees to come to Ottawa and appear before the industrial relations committee, not next November or December or in January of 1965, but now. They should appear now, because if they are doing a job as claimed this is the place where they can tell us what they are doing.

I wish to mention some of the questions I should like—

The Chairman: I have to interrupt the hon. member because his time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Go on.

The Chairman: Does the committee give unanimous consent for the hon. member to continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Orlikow: Just five minutes. I should like to know from the trustees why union elections are being held now. I have carefully examined the constitution of the S.I.U. of Canada, and I suggest the Minister of Labour should do the same. I read it in the presence of one of the most eminent labour lawyers in Canada.

An hon. Member: Mr. Lewis?

Mr. Orlikow: Not Mr. Lewis. As I read the constitution, the election should not have been held until 1965. I suggest to the Minister of Labour and to the trustees that if they wish to develop the democratic forces of the S.I.U. the constitutional provisions calling for elections in 1965 should have been adhered to, so there might have been another year for the rank and file democratic, clean forces to develop and organize. It seems to me that what you have now is an election as between two slates of officers each intimately connected with the Banks machine.

I should like to know why the do not ship list is in fact still being enforced at the present time, despite all the protestations of the trustees that the list was destroyed and no longer exists. A number of people have applied for readmission to the S.I.U., people who were placed on the do not ship list. They applied to the board of trustees, and my information is that they were referred to Commodore Robertson who heads the appeal committee set up by Mr. Banks and continued by the trustees.

A number of people, 25 or more, have applied for readmission. In the last issue of the *Canadian Sailor* published by the S.I.U. under the supervision of the board of trustees there appears a report by Commodore Robertson on his work. He lists the people who have applied for readmission and the disposition of their cases. One of those who applied for readmission was a Mr. Carmel

Deguire. Mr. Deguire was turned down by Commodore Robertson on the ground that he could not prove his membership in the S.I.U. and that the S.I.U. of Canada has no record of his membership. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Deguire's name appeared on a do not ship list which was filed with the Norris commission as exhibit 0-269 and attested to by Mr. Banks on the witness stand as being a correct extract from the do not ship list.

Similarly, Mr. Chairman, a Mr. Ken Lewis was turned down on the ground that there was no record that he had been a member of the S.I.U. Mr. Lewis' name also appears on the do not ship list in exhibit 0-269. The transcript of the evidence which Mr. Justice Norris heard and all the material which was filed with Mr. Justice Norris is under the supervision and control of Mr. Justice Dryer and the trustees. Aren't they interested? Don't they care? Aren't they going to take the trouble to look at what those exhibits show?

Here is another man, Mr. Donald Swan. He appealed to Commodore Robertson for readmission to the S.I.U. Commodore Robertson turned him down, and I quote from his report which is published in *The Canadian Sailor*, which says that the applicant was unable to produce evidence of membership and, further, that the S.I.U. could not trace membership.

If the Minister of Labour will take the trouble to look at the report of Mr. Justice Norris, the second part entitled "Schedule", at page 569, in a section of about 20 pages which lists people whose names appeared on the do not ship list, he will find the name of Donald Swan. How much more, I ask, do the board of trustees need?

Then there is David Bath, who applied for readmission and was turned down on the same ground by Commodore Robertson. His name appears at page 537 of the Norris report. Here is a really difficult one. A Mr. Henry Ranta appealed for readmission to the S.I.U. and was turned down on the ground that the applicant was unable to produce evidence of membership in the S.I.U. Well, Mr. Chairman, his name appears on page 564 of the Norris report. It may be that Commodore Robertson and the trustees have difficulty in this instance because instead of his name being spelled "Ranta" it is spelled "Ranto". I realize there is a tremendous difference between "Ranta" and "Ranto" and intelligent people who read might have difficulty in making that connection.

I do not wish to take up the time of the committee, Mr. Chairman; I think I have indicated enough to show that there is a great deal which the trustees need to look at and which in my opinion and in the opinion of many others they have not yet looked at.

I wish to close by referring to just one other case. This concerns a Mr. John Wood, a former official—I think a vice president—of the S.I.U. of Canada. He was expelled—he was not on the do not ship list—after one of the kangaroo court trials which the S.I.U. was so prone to hold under Mr. Banks. Mr. John Wood tried to get back to work. After all, like the rest of us, he has to eat. After he failed in various other ways he wrote to the president pro tem, Mr. Charles Turner, asking for permission to go back to work. Mr. Turner wrote a letter to Mr. Wood, and in this connection I might say I am personally ashamed that any official of a trade union would write such a letter. The Minister of Labour knows about this letter because I sent him a copy. He said to Mr. Wood, in effect, "Yes, we will let you go back to work under certain conditions".

What were those conditions, Mr. Chairman? I wish to just read a couple of them. One was that Mr. Wood would tender to the union, in a form suitable to S.I.U. counsel, an agreement not to participate in union affairs, and another was that he would not engage in activities hostile or harmful to the status of the union and its international in any areas of union interest. In other words "You can come back to work if you keep your mouth shut and never do anything to disturb the status quo; never say anything that will get members of the S.I.U. to vote for somebody other than Mr. McLaughlin" and the rest of the thugs who are still in control of the S.I.U.

I wrote a letter to Mr. Justice Dryer asking him if this was not a violation of the provisions of the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act. I had no answer except an acknowledgment. There may be a legal question as to whether this action comes within the provisions of that act. But, Mr. Chairman, how can any reasonable person, how can the board of trustees justify this action in any way on the basis of equity or justice?

I hope the board of trustees will appear before the industrial relations committee next week and give us information which will indicate that the things I have said and which other members have said are wrong. I want to say now that if they do; if they can show they have done the work which was entrusted to them in accordance with the pro-

visions of the act, and have done the things which I think they have not done, I will be the first to commend them and to apologize for making the kind of speech I have made today. However, I say that until they do that —and the sooner they do it the better, and I would again urge on the Minister of Labour that he appeal to them to come before the industrial relations committee quickly—I for one am, to say the least, disappointed with the job they have done. I do not believe they have moved quickly enough or that they have dealt with the basic problems that were with us when we discussed the legislation which the minister proposed and voted for the establishment of the board of maritime trustees.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Chairman, the estimates of the Department of Labour are rather interesting, because they enable us to deal with extremely sensitive points of our economy, especially with one which is now giving rise to most of the problems and requires most of our attention, unemployment.

When the minister introduced his estimates, he pointed out the progress made during the past year in that particular field.

Of course, we can only be delighted with him at the progress generally accomplished by our economy and as a result of which unemployment has been considerably reduced throughout the country.

However, Mr. Chairman, we must recognize that even though the situation has improved in certain parts of the country, it remains that in the province of Quebec and in the maritime provinces, unemployment is still a nightmare. Indeed, hundreds of thousands of workers are unemployed and have to rely only on unemployment insurance and social assistance benefits to provide for their needs.

For a few years, we have noticed on many occasions that in certain areas, unemployment seems to be a more serious problem than elsewhere in the country.

Last year, when the Minister of Labour (Mr. MacEachen), together with the Minister of Industry (Mr. Drury), decided to designate in our country areas which would receive special attention from the government, we witnessed the recognition by the government of a regional problem. In fact, the government recognized implicitly that our unemployment was regional in character and that the solutions which had to be applied had to be based on the fact that it was a regional situation. Solutions could no longer be applied from coast to coast. A solution taking into account regional characteristics was needed.

Of course, when those areas were designated, like several others I was a little disappointed to see the yardstick which had been followed to designate them.

We therefore have made representations to the effect that other criteria be used when the list of those designated areas is revised.

I hope that the Minister of Labour, in cooperation with the Minister of Industry, will be able to say, when a decision is announced in this regard, that he has taken into account the representations and remarks we have made, and I hope the decision will be to everyone's satisfaction.

However, we must admit that the designation of those areas has not solved the problem entirely. Even if the Minister of Industry did state that in 23 out of 35 areas, new industries had been established, we are nevertheless deploring the fact that it has been many years now since a new industry has settled in the Saguenay area. I can only draw the attention of the minister on this very special situation in my area.

I believe that the activities of the area development agency, which I admit, is under the Department of Industry, but in which the Minister of Labour is surely interested, should be enlarged. It should be given more definite work to do because, in my opinion, this area development agency offers real possibilities for bringing solutions to the problems.

At this time, I should like to strongly urge the Minister of Labour to put pressure on his colleague the Minister of Industry, and stress the point with him so that this agency might be given more latitude and a very definite policy, in short a certain authority in that field which apparently is going to be given to it.

A while ago, the minister mentioned the large technical training program, the vocational training schools, as they are called. That program was introduced in 1960 and 1961 by the previous government.

Of course, we must be all satisfied with that favourable development. But I sometimes wonder whether we really consider the problem as a whole, since as late as last week, I had an opportunity to read the report of an American sociologist who had carried a detailed investigation on the future implications of general automation and mechanization in industry.

That same sociologist claims that in the next 50 years, workers will have to change trade or profession at least four times. I

think that is a phenomenon which will certainly cause a great upheaval in the general labour situation and in the economy, and which will create tremendous social problems.

It will not be easy for a man who worked in a precise field for ten years and who made all the necessary sacrifices in order to get the technical know-how required in his trade, to qualify in a new field, since the work for which he had qualifications no longer exists.

I feel that if we contemplate the development of manpower in this light, we will have to prepare today the education of future workers, and to prepare it at school, in order to give them a sufficient basis to enable them to acquire very quickly the varied knowledge they will need to cope with the economic development of their future work.

Of course, all that illustrates the need for labour in order to achieve production.

I cannot help thinking of some of the ideas advocated by Social Credit supporters on this question of labour requirement versus production. I must say that, in time, it will be proved that this first idea was good and justified. I think that some of the solutions which have been advocated will have to be applied.

We produce for consumption. Man does not work merely for the pleasure of working; he works in order to obtain the things he needs. If, in future, automation allows us to produce without resorting to labour, I think that we will have to reconsider all our economic, financial, monetary and social philosophy, which will have to undergo far reaching changes.

I would now like, Mr. Chairman, to refer to the winter works program. The minister mentioned earlier today the thousands of man days made possible by this program. Obviously, when I refer to the discussions which took place in 1957 and 1958, when the project was launched by the former government, I can only laugh to myself when recalling the objections from the Liberal benches with regard to that project, when they were still in the opposition. And now that they are in office, they seem to find this formula a successful one, which makes me smile. When in opposition, people have not the same ideas than when they sit on the treasury benches with regard to the same legislative program.

That concept was a happy one under the circumstances, but considering that the great majority of Canadians want to be sincere in this field, it remains that this is only a porary measure, a poultice, so to speak, and that, in the end, the unemployment problem has not been solved. Indeed, I believe that this formula to encourage winter employment should be entirely reconsidered, because it has become a permanent measure.

If this program designed to alleviate winter unemployment is to be made a permanent fixture, I think it should be established in such a way as to be applicable only to works considered useful, since fantastic amounts are paid to carry them out. In my opinion, it would be logical that this program be reconsidered so that instead of being a winter works program only, it will be a program of year-round municipal works, so that the country and its people can draw the maximum benefits possible, considering the sums invested.

We must all recognize the geographical situation of our country.

The climate in which we live, the millions of dollars we spend during December, January and February to carry out certain municipal works, must be considered. Since these are all municipal works requiring social capital, I believe that 50 per cent of this money is at present being spent unwisely. Moreover, the municipalities cannot do otherwise because of the public pressure they have to bear. In my opinion, the government has given up one of its greatest responsibilities, shifting it upon public managers, our small municipalities. It merely said to the municipalities: You will solve the unemployment problem.

Of course, the municipalities can contribute, but I believe that at this time the full responsibility is put on their shoulders in that field, We put them in a kind of strait-jacket, in the sense that they must complete such works during the period provided for winter works. We make their task doubly difficult, on top of the fact that they are unable to carry out works they feel necessarily useful, sound and suitable. Unfortunately, they are compelled by public opinion, due to pressures brought to bear by citizens, to undertake works that are not always justified.

I believe that, at present, our municipalities are piling up debts while we are squandering public funds by carrying out projects which do not serve, in any way, the general interest of the country.

I suggest that Canada, if it wishes to achieve a reasonable economic status, cannot—in view of its population, its economic position and the burden of its present debt—afford to invest one single dollar of its future credit in an uneconomic project. This is implying a lot, as I believe we are obviously making an

uneconomic investment, and we have practically had to make it for five years. I would even say that, for more than five years, we have invested hundreds of millions in uneconomic municipal works.

I maintain that Canada cannot afford this luxury any more.

We must use all our past, present and future savings, as well as all our credit, for investments in productive fields. We must produce.

Services are not the most desirable thing, at the present time, in the country. We certainly need services, but what we need most, is to develop the field of production, and unless we make such change in our philosophy, we shall continue to face the same economic problem, for that problem is linked with unemployment. The present rate of unemployment may well decrease in a given year, but it will inevitably rise acutely subsequently. An economist forecast recently a forthcoming and quite marked increase in unemployment in this country. This is very encouraging.

I wonder whether we are not in the process of hiding our heads in the sand by encouraging the winter works program in fields which do not create any jobs or production, in fields where investments cannot be recovered.

In saying this, I am thinking of something in particular. In carrying out works under the winter works legislation, productive municipal investments in such fields should be authorized. Obviously the government is unable to create jobs everywhere, to build plants in all sections of the country to create production, but if the government allowed municipalities, within the framework of the winter works formula, to build plants or buildings that could be sublet to small organizations able to undertake some production, I believe this would be a step forward. There are many people with imaginative ideas, who could undertake the production of some articles we presently import; unfortunately, they cannot afford to tie down large sums in a building at the present time. If such a formula were adopted, and if municipalities were allowed to erect buildings they could sublet at so much per square foot to such organizations, I believe that part of our investments could be recovered. We could thus hope to offset the steady increase in our imports.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, I would like, within the framework of the winter works program, to make a remark on another small problem our municipalities are facing. This small problem, in the end, becomes a major one. When our municipalities undertake winter works, they start by borrowing. Why? In order to finance those works until both federal and provincial subsidies are paid. Since the works start in November and are completed in April, municipalities have to bear this rather heavy burden for six months. I am told that the federal and provincial governments have not yet paid all the money to municipalities for works completed last year. As a result, municipalities must finance the entire cost of winter works for a whole year, and in the long run, after six or seven years, this burden is beginning to be heavily felt in the budgets of our municipalities and to such an extent that I think the saturation point has been reached. Our municipalities will soon be unable to continue to operate under the winter works program.

Last year, Quebec had a remarkable year, but I think that next year there will be a tremendous reduction. Such a reduction or a decrease would neither reflect a lack of needs nor full employment, but the impossibility for administrators to find the necessary financial means for those projects. The only solution would be an increase of municipal taxes which are already excessively high. It is generally known in Quebec as in other provinces that municipal and federal taxes have considerably increased. We are bound to draw the following conclusion: If municipal and school taxes had to be boosted, it was in direct proportion to the increase in municipal expenses under the winter works program. That formula was good up to a certain point but it was only a temporary solution, and I think its best years are over. I feel it will have to be replaced by a more adequate formula. Otherwise, Mr. Chairman, we will find ourselves in the same situation as in 1957-58 when we had three quarters of a million unemployed, if not more, in Canada.

I should like to deal with another point, the $500 bonus for wintertime house construction. The minister seemed quite happy with the apparent results. I say "apparent" because I cannot do otherwise than think that the houses built in winter will reduce summer construction. That is self-evident. Therefore, it means that in the course of a whole year there will not be one house built in excess of those which would have normally been built. I wonder on what evidence the minister has based his statement that the $500 winter house construction incentive has increased the number of houses built.

I think the increase is entirely due to normal growth and had nothing to do with this $500 incentive; the only reason is that there was a need for so many family units. Unless you want to build houses which will remain unoccupied, there is no logical reason to state that that grant contributed to the increase in the number of houses built. Statistics will show that the number of family units built in a year will decrease within a certain period of time.

Now, still about the bonus, I wonder just how fair it is. I have a brother who built himself a house last year. He could not benefit from this $500 subsidy, but if I were to build myself a home this winter, I could get it. How can the minister maintain that this is fair and just? After all, that amount of $500 was taken from the pockets of Canadian taxpayers through the levy of taxes in general. Is this really fair? It may have encouraged housing construction over a longer period and a spread over a 12 month rather than an eight month period, but that program does not change the problem at all and in no way increases the number of days or hours of work in the building industry. I had a look at the results it was able to achieve in the Saguenay area, and I could prove to you that those houses built during the winter were merely projects which would have been carried out in summer and were undertaken a few months ahead of time.

Therefore, not a single additional hour of work was provided by this formula in the area. I believe the same thing goes for many other regions.

Another matter I should like to deal with is unemployment insurance. In our capacity as members of parliament, we are in some way the father-confessors of people who come to us with their problems. In regard to unemployment insurance, I must in all fairness pay tribute to the majority of the employees of that department, especially to those of the local office in my riding, for the manner in which they discuss things over with those who consult them.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, there is a rather sensitive point I would like to deal with. Workers are not lawyers in general. It would be uncommon to find lawyers among them. Therefore, they do not know how the act is applied. They cannot interpret all the regulations of an act and I would even say that the great majority of workers know nothing about the Unemployment Insurance Act.

Obviously, the government should not be blamed for that, and I do not intend to blame them. Nevertheless, I wonder whether it could not be possible to undertake some program to educate the working class through unions, the employment office or unemployment insurance offices. I wonder also whether or not a way could be found to publish a pamphlet summing up in language workers would easily understand, how the act is applied, what are their actual rights and how they can assert them. The procedure to be followed in connection with the administration of the Unemployment Insurance Act could then be explained to them in a simplified manner. For my part, I have read two or three times the Unemployment Insurance Act and I must admit that it is not easy to understand its clauses. Therefore, as is the case with any other act, it is hard to interpret.

It refers us from one section to another and finally we have to read three sections at the same time to try to understand part of a section.

In short, it is extremely complicated, and that is why the worker does not understand the act and does not try to understand it in many cases. Consequently, I wonder if the government could not undertake an advertising campaign along the lines I suggested.

What happens, Mr. Chairman, is that the worker who applies for unemployment insurance benefits is unaware of the basic conditions required and fills his application in a way that disqualifies him completely. Two or three weeks later, he receives a letter telling him that he is not eligible for such and such a reason. Of course, he goes to the unemployment office and says: That is not what I meant. And he is answered: But that is what you said.

Thus, because he did not understand the law and was unable to interpret it, the worker is disqualified, sometimes after having paid his unemployment insurance contributions during quite a long period of time.

A case has even come to my knowledge where a man who had paid his contributions to the unemployment insurance fund since its creation was disqualified the first time he applied for benefits. He had paid his contributions through the years, ever since the operation of unemployment insurance, but he was unable to get insurance benefits because, in his application, he made a statement which simply disqualified him.

In short, Mr. Chairman, it seems that one has to be either a lawyer, to know the legisla-

tion and use it, or a liar and be able to get away with giving a more or less honest answer to the questions that the officials of unemployment insurance offices ask, as they have to—I do not blame the officials for asking those question; they have a job to do and that is their responsibility—because of the drafting of those questions and because of the situation in which the worker who is not used to report to offices finds himself. That is how it happens that the worker gives answers which disqualify him.

That is why I ask the Minister of Labour whether it would not be possible to undertake an education program concerning the applications for unemployment insurance benefits.

Mr. Chairman, that was about all the remarks I had to make on the estimates of the Department of Labour.

To sum it up, I should like to point out to the minister that there is still much to be done in that field to meet general requirements.

I think that improvements have been made. The minister indicated that there is a labour code being prepared and that very soon, we will have to discuss a revision of the whole labour legislation.

This is of course a very complex field. We must take into consideration quite a large number of economic or psychological factors. But I think it would be a good thing if the government, as soon as possible and with the co-operation of all organizations involved, were to see to it that this code which will govern the administration of labour legislation within the framework of federal jurisdiction is drafted in clearer terms.

Mr. Perron: Mr. Chairman, my remarks on the estimates of the Department of Labour will be brief.

First I want to congratulate the minister for the huge task he has achieved.

I know that he endeavours with all his might to solve problems which today are facing the whole country, and other nations as well. Indeed, the labour problem is one which requires a more and more serious and thorough study, so that definite solutions might be found, which seems impossible within the present structure of our economic and political system.

I know that various programs have been developed, especially in the last ten years, to solve the problem of winter unemployment. By various publicity campaigns and the application of some legislation, there have been endeavours to remedy as far as possible the plague of winter unemployment.

There were agreements made with the provinces to promote winter works at the municipal level. This experience has been going on for a few years.

Several municipalities experienced this method and they have come to the conclusion that this was certainly not the most efficient formula, because it created rather complicated financial problems for them. Some municipalities no longer dare resort to this method to help their people, because they encounter too many complications and the burden in the final analysis falls on the shoulders of taxpayers, and property owners, in turn, complain that this situation is not for the best.

Of course, they tried another formula, last year, in order to encourage home building.

They maintain, according to the report that was issued, that out of 32,000 applications, more than 24,000 were accepted, whereby the owners building during the December-March period qualified for the $500 bonus. I am wondering whether they can really boast about the efficiency of the $500 bonus. I am sure that out of the 32,000 applications, thousands of homes would have been built during the winter, even without this legislation. Employment possibilities may have been increased or facilitated, but I do not believe it was really a performance to boast about as regards the solving of the winter employment problem.

On the other hand, in the field of home building, it must be admitted that, during the summer, according to builders and suppliers of building materials, there has been a decline in the building of private homes compared to the increases of the past years, because the demand is being held down not by the lack of a real need for new homes, but by the financing capabilities of various institutions established in order to assist in the building of homes, such as the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation and of the prospective owners themselves.

Therefore, it cannot be said that those palliatives are a solution to the problem we have to face, and which will become more and more difficult, if we go on, in the context of today's economy, linking the rights of the consumers, and of human beings to obtain the essentials of life—like food, clothing, housing and even those things that are considered a luxury in certain cases—to the sole criteria of work. Those days are gone forever.

Automation was briefly mentioned by the Minister of Labour, when he said that he will make another statement later today on

the subject. As regards this problem which baffles us today, economists serving the presidents or economic organizations in the United States alleged, a few months ago, in a statement to the press, as well as in recommendations to the American congress, that automation should be studied in a concrete and precise manner, because the American economy will have to meet problems still more serious than the post-war ones.

We are going through a century of rapid development, where production techniques are forced upon us to such an extent that we sometimes hardly know where to turn to find a solution. In order to do this, we try enacting legislation, for instance with regard to the rehabilitation of the unemployed by technical training, but people do not seem to realize that, in the twentieth century, it becomes increasingly possible to produce essential goods, services and even modern comfort while liberating more and more people from manual labour.

The tendency is rather to multiply the positions, to try and create new jobs by all possible means, while more and more efforts should be made to free human beings, in this technical age which can produce faster and better, with the quick production we experienced in the twentieth century, besides meeting human needs.

It is mostly along those lines that the remarks I intend to make must be considered.

Our universities now graduate experts in the fields of space development, technical methods and applications, in all production fields. Even large corporations, the powerful economic interests, under the leadership of private enterprise, hire experts, pay bonuses to their own employees in order to find solutions likely to improve the means of production in their own plants. This will necessarily bring about after a few years, when those suggestions are implemented, the dismissal of their own fellow workers.

Under the pressure of labour unions, working hours have been reduced. As recently as 25 or 30 years ago, the labour class had still to work 60 or 65 hours a week, while today the burden of factory workers has been reduced by approximately 50 per cent, as far as working hours are concerned.

The same thing happens in the field of farm production. Through commercial farms, the setting up of larger and larger farms, new production techniques are continually developed. In that same field, production techniques were also developed by all kinds of technical, scientific and progressive procedures in order to free human beings from work.

Therefore, I wonder whether the time has not come for the Minister of Labour to ask the government to set up a commission especially instructed, in co-operation with other departments, to seek the development of programs that would provide, not full employment, but especially security for all, a well thought-out security, consistent with the tremendous production capacity of this country.

We are fortunate in having as neighbour a country where science and modern techniques are developed to the highest possible level. We, in Canada, have access to the scientific know-how of that country. Our young nation, Canada, with a population of barely 20 million people, with almost infinitely diversified resources, in the ground and underground, with an industrious population, as we proved it during the last war, had no unemployment problem during the years 1939-45. All those who were able to fill some kind of a job, civilian or military, were given work. There was no problem. There was no need to set up a Senate committee made up of members of parliament to study the ill effects of unemployment in Canada during those years.

So now, in peacetime, is it not abnormal to find such a large number of people deprived of the necessaries of life for lack of a job, while warehouses throughout the country are overflowing with consumer goods?

I suggest, therefore, that we must turn to solutions other than devices such as winter works as applied to housing or post office construction throughout Canada.

I do not think this can really provide us with a worth-while solution to deal with the problem now facing the Canadian parliament and hundreds of thousands of Canadians.

Time and time again, during those last ten years when the two governments have been in office, we have been given statistical data on unemployment.

Let us examine the unemployment figures for Canada. Quebec still leads the rest of the country with over 100,000 unemployed, and this in a province claiming to be in full development, supposedly going through a quiet revolution, in short, in a province where some ministers are paying lip service to co-operative federalism.

No solution has really been found to the problem of poverty amid plenty, to the problem of workers who are unemployed today.

Whether it be through lack of technical training, the trained or untrained unemployed is nevertheless a human being who, in many cases, is head of a family, with three, four, five mouths to feed; he does not believe in those far fetched formulas causing him to be idle over the last ten or 15 years, from the end of the war until now.

Is it not time a social security program were considered, conceived and implemented, in order to meet the needs of the Canadian people, in accordance with the opportunities provided by the economic potential of Canada?

Mr. Chairman, there is not a single minister or hon. member here who sincerely wonders whether, in six or 12 months from now, we will have enough consumer goods to meet the needs of a population of 18 or 19 million. Nobody worries about that because we are all convinced of our tremendous production potential and, at the same time, of our possibilities in the field of foreign trade. In fact, we can easily sell to other countries the consumer goods we produce, but nobody worries about our surpluses in various fields.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, in spite of the efforts made by all of us here to find solutions to our present problems, thousands of Canadians are wary about the future and wonder if we will be able to meet our obligations, considering the lack of employment opportunities in our industries. In fact, it must be remembered that numerous Canadian workers are being laid off on account of new production techniques.

In the province of Quebec, certain plants which formerly employed 800 to 1,000 people can now double their output with a staff of 300 only.

Of the 600 or 700 people who were laid off, there are maybe 300 or 400 who have been able to get new jobs because of new needs but the 200 or 300 others remain unemployed. The latter may get temporary employment for four or five months in the year. In fact, many of Quebec's unemployed work four or five months a year because they are unable to find jobs which would keep them busy all year round.

As was pointed out by the hon. member for Lake St. John (Mr. Lessard), all possible efforts are being made, in certain quarters, to find answers to those problems through very complex laws, and it is thought that the needs of the unemployed are thus being met. Perhaps those efforts would be successful if it were not necessary in this field, to cope with reserve funds that are always depleted and have to be bolstered by yearly $50 million grants by the Canadian government. It seems that we try, as far as possible, to run with the hare and hunt with the hounds, as the party in office is wont to do.

Attempts are made to save money and to prevent abuses by those who are not entitled or who would be entitled to unemployment insurance benefits, by passing complicated laws, and by creating situations whereby the applicants practically disqualify themselves from unemployment insurance benefits.

Formalities are getting more complicated than ever and investigations upon investigations are being made. At first attempts are made to obtain and even to suggest to some extent an answer from the person being investigated.

The unemployed is asked whether he would like to work in his own locality to which he answers "yes", which is quite normal. So, it is jotted down on his card that he wishes to work in his own locality.

Subsequently, a suggestion is made to him, and the answer to the following question is practically put in his mouth: "What salary would you accept? About $40 or $50 a week?" The applicant of course will not reply: "I am prepared to work for $18 or $20 a week". He will say: "Yes, $45 or $50 a week would be fine".

And then, after two or three weeks, he receives a notice to the effect that his application was rejected under section 52 of the Unemployment Insurance Act because he has stated that he would work only in his own locality. Of course he can appeal to the court of referees; he is even entitled to secure counsel, but at his own expense. More often than not, the poor labourer does not know anything about the numerous regulations which today are no longer a summary of the act as it was passed and which has been consolidated in 10, 12 and even 15 volumes. In fact, the act is so complicated that unemployment officers have to get legal advice in order to interpret every section of the act or its regulations which today are consolidated in a certain number of volumes and which baffle the layman.

Then the poor unemployed gets a notice of suspension because his eligibility to unemployment insurance benefits is limited since he stated that he wanted to work in his own locality.

Four weeks go by and then another reason is found to refuse him benefits. It is claimed that he limited his employment opportunities by requesting a higher salary than the average salary paid in his locality or region,

since he stated that he wanted $45, $50 or $60 a week. A way is found to stop his benefits again for another period. And when that is not done, he is offered a low paid job so that, in most cases, after paying some essential expenses out of the weekly salary he could earn in a given locality in his region or county, he would not even be left with $18 or $20 a week.

He is offered a job which, because of the cost or the lack of transportation will require him to keep two homes, that is his home in his locality and room and board which will cost him $25, $30 or even $40; in the end, that job will bring him much less than the unemployment insurance benefits he is entitled to and would normally get. And we are satisfied with increasing the complexity of the various existing acts or to pass new ones.

Much was made of the winter works program and the great number of jobs it would create but we seem to forget today that there are between 250,000 and 300,000 summer unemployed in Canada. As I said many times, summer unemployment, just like winter unemployment, is a serious problem which creates hardship within the family.

Those unemployed people are unable to provide for their family's essential needs. Therefore, is it not about time for us to face the unemployment problem from another angle and to consider employment as a means to cope with abundance, to solve the private or public charity problem or the distress problem, at a time when want and insecurity which are prevailing in many Canadian homes are not due to the lack of production of consumers' goods or of services meant for Canadian citizens?

Mr. Chairman, it is often said that "one must live by the sweat of one's brow". But when the bread is on the table, when it is delivered to our homes, I am wondering whether enough sweat was not accumulated already to enable the human being to eat this bread at least with a little dignity.

Is not the real purpose of production to meet human needs? Also, is not the real function of industry, that of creating employment or producing adequate quantities of goods to satisfy human needs?

Let us stop requiring private enterprise and crown corporations to create employment, since the real function of any human activity should be to allow human beings to live in dignity within society.

We could even make a comparison on this subject. If a man who owned five dogs gave them only one bone to chew on, we can well imagine the most tremendous dog-fight ever seen. The same situation applies to human beings. Why attempt to create jobs, why centre upon the finding of jobs all our efforts to solve the problem of insecurity in Canada, when work should not necessarily be considered nowadays as essential to ensure adequate production.

If the human mind succeeded in developing methods of producing more easily and more quickly the goods necessary, not only to meet our essential needs, but also to provide comfort to the Canadian people in this twentieth century, those goods should serve a useful purpose.

Our universities have found a way to produce scientists who have not only conquered space but who also know a lot of other things. But the same universities failed to form economists able to set up a system of social security which would meet the needs of human beings.

The field of economics includes also financial and monetary matters, and it is said: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread". In this regard, economists have become theologians and, for 35 or 40 years, those theologians have tormented us with this sentence: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread".

Yesterday, I read in the newspapers of the province of Quebec a letter from the Canadian bishops warning legislators and those who look after the problem of labour management relations to prepare for tomorrow a social security program for the Canadian people and not merely create jobs, because automation is here and we must face it seriously in order to improve the situation for the years to come.

If to manage one must anticipate, I feel that it is time more than ever for the minister to urge his colleagues, especially the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss LaMarsh), to set up a commission which would prepare plans for the uplifting of human beings, by enabling them to benefit more widely from our wealth, instead of being offered a stopgap. It is imperative to set up a commission which will plan for the years to come the distribution of wealth to each and every Canadian citizen.

[*Text*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to go into detail respecting the estimates of this department; the hon. member for Ontario, a former minister of labour and a successful one, dealt and has already given a general outline. However, there are

one or two observations that I would make with respect to the general position of unemployment. I recall, when hon. gentlemen opposite were sitting over here, how often the very walls of this chamber shook with the condemnation that was heaped on us because there was unemployment.

They promised an end of unemployment. They promised a new heaven and a new earth in the field of human relations. The minister now gives a statement to the committee in which he has to admit grudgingly that the problem of unemployment has been little improved in the last year and a half; and in that year and a half there has been an expansion, as there was during the days we were in office from 1961 on, when our policies started to work. Those policies which were condemned by the hon. gentlemen who sit opposite, now having been adopted by them, become the cornerstones of the economic development of this country.

They have brought into effect one or two measures—one of which I shall refer to—to meet the unemployment problem; but generally speaking they have taken no action whatsoever in this connection. The legislation placed on the statute books between 1957 and 1963, including the vocational training schools act, has been carried on. Despite an economic improvement in North America, we still have a very large measure of unemployment. We were told they had the solution. No longer does it appear in the press as being a serious problem, despite the fact that hundreds of thousands are still unemployed.

Those who sit in the front benches today had the answers during the period 1957 to 1963. It was folly, they said, on our part to compare unemployment in Canada with that in the United States, where the same situation prevailed, where unemployment ran very high, and where, despite all the efforts of economists and leaders in government, unemployment mounted and was approximately on the same level as Canada's, with the exception of course that we have peculiar and serious climatic conditions in the winter.

They were unable to place before you, Mr. Chairman, anything which they had done; they merely adopted the policies of the former government which they had condemned. I am not going to go into the pegging of the dollar, but I can never forget the counterfeit currency which was distributed across Canada to indicate a serious economic condition in Canada and to draw attention to the claim that what we had done was detrimental to the country. Today it is the cornerstone. The heresy of yesterday is the Liberal orthodoxy of today in this connection.

Now, what has the government done? True enough, there has been economic change for the better in North America. One has only to read the United States press. There has been a very considerable economic development in the last year and a half. But we have problems which this government refuses to face. They are problems which must be faced if the question of employment is to be met and assured and Canada's national growth is to continue. These problems face us and we find our trade position with imports exceeding exports. With bankruptcies greater than they have been for many years, with agriculture, at least in the central and maritime provinces, suffering very severely and thereby detrimentally affecting not only our economy but also the employment situation, the government spends its time trying to secure passage of a resolution to provide for a flag. Last night they had the opportunity to bring in legislation, which is not ready and has not been prepared, but they chose to vote against being given that opportunity.

One matter which was boasted about was the $500 bonus for winter building. We are told that was a success. We are told that it brought unusual development, and therefore jobs. We have said it was not a success. We have said that what it actually did was to transfer building construction from one part of the year to another, to the detriment of the consumer or householder. I should like to quote as a supporting witness in this connection the hon. member for York East. He is an experienced builder. He was of those, along with the hon. member for Essex South, who in a recent television program revealed their thinking, exposed their hearts and spoke with frankness. I should like to refer to what the experienced builder had to say. He deals with the fact that a number of private members of parliament are not being considered by the present government. Both of these hon. members to whom I have referred said that. Then he said something to this effect: "We are all considered as privates and they think they are colonels". Mr. Chairman, I have never seen that relationship but apparently it exists. Then the hon. member for York East spoke of the difficulties under which these hon. members operate. Take, for example this question of the $500 winter bonus. He said:

> —let us suppose that I had something to do with national housing and that I was on the committee to advise.

He has not and he was not. but he said "suppose". He went on:

I would have advised them—

I think that must be the Minister of Labour.

—immediately that the $500 winter bonus is absolutely useless—

When the evidence is given by an experienced member supporting the government, Mr. Chairman, its importance cannot be overemphasized.

—because having been in the business and knowing what the cost of winter construction is, knowing that most builders would rather give you $500 than to build a house in the wintertime. I could have told them that and saved embarrassment, because with the great boom of construction, $500 purports to be the reason. It is not the reason at all.

I think the Minister of Labour, when he is looking around for experts, might just have a whispered conversation with the hon. member for York East, who is experienced in such matters. He goes on:

It is not the reason at all. The reason is that there is a feeling of expansion.

I need go no further, Mr. Chairman, to answer the minister and any other ministers who speak so fulsomely of this $500 winter bonus scheme, than to quote the words of the hon. member for York East, who tells us on the basis of experience that he knows what he is talking about, but that the minister does not.

It is an amazing revelation, Mr. Chairman. Those two hon. members were away from the whip on that day and spoke with great authority. I was amazed to hear one hon. member say that so difficult is it for these ministers to carry on that the minister of defence, when he produced the white paper, wrote it in longhand.

Then he said:

He did not even trust it to be typed by the establishment.

These are not the revelations of members of the opposition, Mr. Chairman. These are the considered opinions of members supporting the government, men who have had experience. The hon. member for Essex South said that he has had long experience, but that he is no good down in Ottawa because that government there would not listen to experience.

Mr. Whelan: Would the Leader of the Opposition permit a question? Is he aware of the fact that most congratulations which I received on how accurate I was came from members of his party?

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member ever got commendation for anything I do not mind his boasting about it, because I have never seen any reason why he should. I say that in the kindness of spirit to one who at all times is the essence of affability.

Mr. Nicholson: You have not heard him in caucus.

Mr. Diefenbaker: If the hon. gentleman has a question, I do not mind.

Mr. Nicholson: No, I am sorry; I should not have interrupted. The right hon. gentleman said that the hon. member is always the essence of affability, and I could not resist the temptation to say: "You should hear him in caucus".

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I did not get the interruption, but I know it was a semi-judicial pronouncement and one with which I am sure I would not agree.

I am simply pointing out that the $500 bonus scheme was no good, and the only member on the other side of the house who knows anything about building, according to what was said on this broadcast, says that it was worthless and he would not have established it if he had had anything to do with the matter.

What has the government done to meet the unemployment situation? Simply continued the policies of the past, with one or two stunts such as the $500 bonus; but I am not going to deal with that any more because it was dealt with so well and effectively by the hon. member. How are we going to meet this problem? When we said that automation made greater unemployment inevitable and that it would take time in order to produce the necessary skills and training for men and women to be able to operate modern machinery, we were ridiculed. The plan that was brought into effect by the hon. member for Ontario when he was minister of labour will be a monument throughout the years to the wisdom and the capacity of that hon. member. He brought into being a plan that provides for the training of over 100,000 Canadians a year to enable them to carry out the responsibilities of operating difficult machinery.

That brings me to another phase in connection with this department. Mention has already been made of the Norris report. I was amazed that one of the trustees admitted he had never read the report in full. One of the maritime trustees, whose responsibility it is to carry out the principles inherent in

that report, had not read the report in question. The rest of us have read that report and it is a report that will be a must for all who would understand the developments in the S.I.U.

What has the government done about it? They appointed a board of trustees. That board of trustees has not yet been brought before a committee of parliament. Questions are asked and we are told the committee is to meet at some time in the future. I want to get the assurance from the minister that these trustees are going to appear before a committee now, not next fall, not next winter, but now. Many questions have related to the administration of the maritime board of trustees. Answers have not been given. The attitude of the minister has simply been that ultimately the members of the board or a member will come before a committee of parliament.

One of the recommendations had to do with Hal Banks and also with McLaughlin who today occupies the top position in the S.I.U. Read that report. Imagine Mr. Millard saying he had not read it. Is that the reason that McLaughlin, who was condemned in almost as strong terms as Banks, still occupies the number one position, the controlling position, in the S.I.U.? Is it because a member of the board has not read the report that the same old list still exists, with the result that from time to time decent, respectable seamen come to members of parliament and point out that they cannot break through the wall, that they are on the no ship list? What is the reason for this? Why does the board of maritime trustees permit these conditions to continue? Why cannot we have any information about the arrangements that were made between Mr. Hall of the S.I.U. and the Canadian government or the board of trustees?

What about Banks? One cannot speak of him without referring to his absence from the demands of justice. Recently much was made by the minister of the fact that the government had prosecuted Banks pursuant to the report to the Department of Labour by the Norris commission. They prosecuted him. Yes, they prosecuted him for conspiracy.

An hon. Member: And kissed him goodbye.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Over the years he had been one of the pally boys of the Liberal party. Whenever he was in difficulty somehow or other an order in council could be passed to relieve him from being removed from our country. When he was prosecuted and convicted he then disappeared. He supplied a bail bond.

Sir, the record of the government in connection with Banks is one of the highest negligence, and worse. They prosecuted him. He was let out on bail. Your Honour knows that one of the first principles of a bail bond, as set forth in all bail bonds, except on an appeal in which case it may be inserted, is that the person involved does not depart the said court without leave. If he was awaiting trial he could not depart from the jurisdiction of Quebec or Canada without leave. We wondered about that. We asked whether provision was made for that. As far back as May 11 the hon. member for Bow River asked this question, as found on page 3115 of *Hansard*:

> According to newspaper reports an order was made by the chief justice of Quebec granting bail to Mr. Banks. I wonder whether the terms of that recognizance include a condition which would prevent Mr. Banks from leaving Canada?

The member for Bow River wondered whether this would be the course followed. If there was no solicitude for Banks, Mr. Chairman, there was certainly negligence in dealing with Banks. When an ordinary man is arrested, charged with an offence and enters into a bond he has to undertake not to leave the jurisdiction. But Banks, with a five year sentence hanging over him, could sign a bond for $25,000 which, to use a vulgarism, is just peanuts in that league, without a provision that he must not leave Canada, he being a United States citizen.

We followed this matter throughout and asked questions. On July 27 and succeeding days we asked the government over and over again what they were going to do about the matter. The government did nothing. Banks disappeared. We have been trying to get information for weeks with regard to what is being done to find Banks. I believe that the reason the government does not give us any information is that the government knows that Banks cannot be extradited on the charge of conspiracy, with regard to which he was out on bail, and he certainly cannot be extradited on the other charges, one of contempt of court and the other a further charge of conspiracy yet to be tried.

Here is the interesting part. The law officers of the crown and special counsel allowed this man out on bail when they must have known that if he walked over into the United States he could stay clear of any danger of being apprehended. This is, to me, the most ridiculous thing that has ever happened in connection with Canadian justice.

Ordinarily I would not use the expression, but one of the great supporters of the Liberal party, the Toronto *Daily Star* said, on August 19, "Mr. Banks thumbs his nose".

Hal Banks seems to be thumbing his nose successfully at Canadian justice.

He is. Any one of the law officers must have known that you could not extradite him if he got across the line. What a commentary upon the administration of justice upon which we in this country pride ourselves. Here is a man who comes into the country, disregards our laws in connection with immigration status as no one else could do, is prosecuted and let out on a bail bond that will not be effective because it does not prevent him from leaving the jurisdiction of the court.

Mr. Winch: May I ask the hon. member a question because I am interested in this? I should like to ask the hon. member if he can say, from his legal knowledge and as a former prime minister, whether or not it is possible for a person in Canada, under indictment and on bail, to leave Canada without there being a record with immigration or other authorities?

Mr. Diefenbaker: I have never tried to leave Canada that way, and neither has the hon. gentleman.

Mr. Knowles: Have you ever been out on bail?

Mr. Diefenbaker: No; but the bail bond did not prevent his doing what he did. This is a very good question.

Mr. Winch: This is a very serious question. Is it possible for a person to cross the line under these circumstances without the Canadian or United States authorities having a record of his doing so?

Mr. Diefenbaker: I can only say that the hon. gentleman's question indicates that it could not be. I cannot disagree with the apparent conclusion that he has in mind, having regard to the nature of his question, that Mr. Banks crossed the line into the United States. When he did so, they would say, "Canadian or American?" They would not require an answer, perhaps, but when the name Banks was given they would know him. Even if the name was not given as Hal Banks, if you had seen him once you would never forget him.

Is this man in the United States? Here is an interesting thing, Mr. Chairman. Weeks after the event I asked the minister if he had ascertained from the immigration officers of the United States whether or not he entered there. He said, I will make inquiries. One newspaper reported that a minister had said within the last few days Banks was in New York. He does not need to conceal himself. In my opinion, he cannot be extradited. Having first read the Extradition Act, I then made inquiries from other counsel and they told me they cannot believe it possible that he could be brought back to Canada. Is that the reason we get the kind of supercilious answer we receive when we ask this question?—"We have spoken to the F.B.I. in the United States." Imagine a criminal who flouted every law he could flout according to the Norris report, convicted and given five years—how he must laugh at the administration of Canadian justice. Already there is evidence in the United States that people are asking why it is that Canadian justice, which has always had the highest reputation, should have allowed itself to be circumvented in this way. Why can we not get any answers?

Sir, here is a man with a record of violence who, after conviction in September, I believe, came to Ottawa. The law officers did not pick him up then, they charged him with that offence later for which he will face trial. Why would a government that was anxious to get its hands on Banks fail for five long weeks to ascertain from United States immigration authorities whether or not he had gone into the United States? This is not only a frightful commentary, but one for which responsibility rests on the government. I say that without any fear of successful contradiction. They do not seem to want him. They go through the motions. They let him out on bail. I am not arguing that; the court did that. They let him out on a bail bond to which they could have objected.

An ordinary man suspected of crime cannot leave the jurisdiction of a court. Banks, convicted of a crime, could and apparently did. This is one of the great mysteries of our times. He never had anything to worry about. The trials meant nothing to him because he must have known when those trials started that so long as he was able to get back to his own country, whatever the penalties might be in Canada, they would not be imposed if a bail bond were provided. He had nothing to worry about, nothing whatever.

Sir, we want to get to the bottom of this. I asked for an investigation and the answer given by the government was, you do not need an investigation. I am beginning to think that is right. It is as obvious as the nose on one's face that if he were not extraditable, if he were convicted of con-

spiracy and allowed to go out on bail under a bond that did not prevent leaving the jurisdiction, this would provide him with an opportunity of which he was not slow to take advantage. I warned about that in May and in July. The answer I received from the Minister of Justice in July, I believe it was, was that we have a sufficient guarantee he will be in court on September 14 to take his trial. Well, it is a great mystery. The boss of the S.I.U. in the past can still exercise that authority through his vice president. The boss, convicted of a serious crime, subject to what the Supreme Court of Canada may do on appeal, is able to walk out of this country, drive out or leave in any other way, fly from any responsibility and simply vanish, and I say he vanished without there being any apparent concern on the part of the government.

The Minister of Justice, in a very suave way, indicates that we have got hopes that we will get him. You do not bring honour to the administration of Canadian justice by allowing a wrongdoer, a gangster, to act as he will, to dominate as he feels, and then when he faces the law, when he loses, to escape entirely.

I come back to the question of investigation. The government of Canada, despite the very lucid circumstances connected with this matter, owes it to the people of Canada to give an opportunity for examination into the looseness with which this man played with the law of Canada. At the same time the other, who is to face a charge of conspiracy with Banks, I think on September 14, is still in the seats of the mighty—McLaughlin.

The hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg asked a very simple question as to whether anybody had inquired from the S.I.U. where Banks was as he received his salary cheque from the S.I.U. Mr. Chairman, I believe that they never thought of that across the way. Do you? They would have had an awful shock if they had thought of asking that question. This is one of the most serious things the government has permitted to take place, to make a laughingstock of justice, to place a foreign gangster in a position where he can well boast in the United States how he achieved his objectives, broke the law, was convicted, and served outside of jail in another country, the land of his birth.

This Banks' record has left a legacy to the S.I.U. that must be discharged, and we want to know whether it is being discharged. We find these seamen who state that they are being denied jobs because of a do not ship list. The minister says there is none that he knows of. This is something that requires to be looked into.

There are many things that separate us that often are of no great consequence but, sir, when you find the law of the land trampled on and made ridiculous, the mystery of Hal Banks deserves to be looked into. I am not going over what I said before, but for years he was the anointed of Liberalism. When he could have been deported for smuggling—any other person would have been—an order in council was passed by the St. Laurent government to give him landed status, and it omitted his conviction.

When he came into Canada he had a record. Sometimes I have felt that some portions of the imprisonment imposed on him were not just—14 years for the issuing of bouncing cheques seems to me to be beyond what is within the realm of reason, but that was his sentence and, lo and behold, when he came to Canada the immigration officers forgot to enter that he had a record, or he could not have gotten in. Then when he established another record in Canada, when the order in council was made the Liberal government of that day forgot to include the conviction. In 1964 they forgot to get a forwarding address.

Mr. Winch: In view of the emphasis the Leader of the Opposition has placed on this matter of Hal Banks and the S.I.U. and the points he has brought to the attention of the committee, I would like to ask if in his opinion there should be a request made for a complete and an exhaustive examination as to how a man having a criminal record in the United States was allowed into Canada, how a man having broken the law of Canada on smuggling and being convicted, and having broken that law again, has now escaped from Canada—how all this could occur from beginning to end unless there is a suspicion of conspiracy? Is the right hon. member prepared to state in view of his own remarks that this is a matter into which members of the House of Commons have a right to demand a complete and exhaustive examination?

Mr. Diefenbaker: It is, exactly. I am not accepting the principle of conspiracy—I am not dealing with that; but I would like to see an investigation all through the past—

Mr. MacEachen: From 1957?

Mr. Diefenbaker: From three or four months before he came to Canada, and the correspondence from then on with the officials.

We tried to get rid of him when we were in office.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Look at the record. But he had landed rights and an order in council that gave him those rights and we could not deport him. Otherwise we would have.

Mr. Nicholson: Will the right hon. gentleman permit a question?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Yes.

Mr. Nicholson: I ask the question because I am quite sure the right hon. gentleman would not wish to be misunderstood. Did I understand him correctly when he said that the Minister of Justice had stated that there was no list?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Yes, that he knew of no list. Yes, that is what I said.

Mr. Nicholson: Does the right hon. gentleman not recall that the statement of the Minister of Labour was that he had been assured by the chairman of the maritime commission, a distinguished member of the supreme court of my province—that he had the assurance of this eminent justice, the chairman of the commission, that there was no list?

Mr. Diefenbaker: I do not doubt you had an assurance. But you can have an assurance, and the man who is out of a job and who cannot get one because he was on the black list knows whether there was a list or not.

Mr. Macdonald: We have just heard the Leader of the Opposition making certain references to what he calls the mystery of Hal Banks. But perhaps the greatest mystery, when we remember that this occurred in 1957, and that the facts were known to the former government, is why he was not brought to justice earlier. Why did they do nothing about Hal Banks until 1961, when the seaway had been physically blocked by the contending parties? That is the great mystery about this. I should like an answer to that question, and I am sure the country would like one as well.

The Leader of the Opposition also made certain assertions about the legal process and the practice of the courts. I am sure he would not want to mislead the house with regard to what I think are principles generally accepted by lawyers. First, he asserted that there had been negligence on the part of the law officers of the crown in permitting Banks to go free on bail.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Mr. Diefenbaker: No. I never said that. I said in letting him go free on bail without the inclusion of the words "shall not depart the court without leave".

Mr. Macdonald: I appreciate the right hon. gentleman's intervention and I would refer him specifically to form 28 of the Canadian Criminal Code and the subsection contained in that form which specifically excepts from the provisions with regard to bail on appeal the words which he has used. Some months ago in this house the hon. member for Bow River made an assertion that this was a customary and standard inclusion in any form of bail bond. I point out now, as I did then, that that is entirely false. It is not a provision of the Criminal Code and I am advised by the senior counsel acting for the crown in this case that it is not the practice of the courts in Quebec to insert that provision in bail bonds, and that such a provision could not have been expected in this case. I emphasize again that the request of the law officers of the crown to the court was that Mr. Banks should not be allowed out on bail at all but that he should be kept in custody. But I would also remind hon. members that it is, after all, up to the judge to decide in what circumstances a man should be allowed bail, and it was the judgment of Mr. Justice Tremblay, the chief justice of Quebec that he should be granted this privilege. It is a damaging and misleading statement to suggest that the law officers of the crown were responsible for letting Banks out on bail. Decisions as to bail are, after all, the duty of the court. Moreover, it is the duty of the Minister of Justice, as well as the rest of us, to respect the decisions of the courts, and that is what we are doing.

The decision in accordance with the Criminal Code was that this man should be set at liberty. I do not know what the right hon. gentleman's concept of liberty is, but one would gather from him that he believes it means keeping a man under 24 hour surveillance and taking him into custody if he makes one move outside his house. That is not the law of this country, and I hope it will never be. I am surprised that the Leader of the Opposition should suggest, in any way, that it should be. All appropriate steps had been taken by the law officers of the crown to lay all possible charges against Hal Banks. The prosecution was pressed as soon as possible, and a conviction was secured. Proceedings were taken to make certain that Banks would be available for the hearing—

Some hon. Members: Where is he?

Mr. Macdonald: Let me point out again to hon. members who would like to muddy the record that it was a decision of the Quebec courts exercising their jurisdiction that he should be allowed liberty. We have heard too often in this house the suggestion that in some way or other the decision of the court should have been disregarded and that this prisoner, or any prisoner, if let out on bail should be subjected to surveillance. It would be a mockery of justice if the law officers of the crown were to disregard orders of the court, specifically that a man should be allowed out at liberty.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I should like to reply to two questions—

The Chairman: Perhaps before the right hon. gentleman replies to the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Justice I should bring to his attention and to the attention of all hon. members that our debate in committee this afternoon seems to have strayed away from the labour aspect of this situation. I realize it is not easy to determine what part of this matter involves justice and what part involves labour. But I would remind hon. members who will take part in the debate from now on that they should try to address their remarks to the estimates of the Department of Labour.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I was trying so hard to do just what Your Honour has suggested. But you, yourself, have made apparent the difficulty of deciding where the Department of Justice ends and the Department of Labour begins. That is one of the great difficulties in this case. There are two departments involved. If I tried to bring this matter up on the estimates of the Department of Justice, the answer would be—the Norris commission.

But to answer the hon. gentleman, there was no suggestion that the person convicted should not be let out on bail so long as it was assured he would be there to take his punishment. No one suggested there should be any onus on the part of the crown to watch a person as he went from place to place while he was free. What I did suggest was this—that it is a strange commentary on the administration of justice that a gangster who has a sentence of five years should be free to go as he will to the United States or any other place, yet if a man who has a good record in the past is charged with an offence and let out on bail, the provision made in respect of him is as follows—I will read the form:

Whereas by order dated the—day of—reciting that A.B., hereinafter called the accused, was charged before me for a certain offence herein mentioned, and that—

I am sorry. I have been reading from the wrong form.

Some hon. Members: Oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: They both appear on the same page. This is the one. This is form 28.

The condition of the written recognizance is such that whereas the accused was this day charged before the justices within mentioned for that—

And here appear details of the charge

—if, therefore, the accused appears at the next superior court of criminal jurisdiction (or court of general or quarter sessions of the peace) to be holden in and for the said county and there surrenders himself into the custody of the keeper of the common gaol (or lock-up house), and pleads to such indictment as may be found against him by the grand jury, for and in respect to the charge aforesaid, and takes his trial upon the same, and does not depart the said court without leave, then the said recognizance to be void, otherwise to stand in full force and virtue.

Talk about travesties. A man who had committed no known offence, but a prima facie case of the crown has been made out against him, cannot leave the jurisdiction of the courts. But if he had about him the halo of Banks, he can. I have nothing to say about the decision of the court to grant bail. The crown asked for high bail. The judge fixed it at $25,000. But what I do say is that it had the appearance of being more than coincidence that the solicitude for Banks shown during the years still continues, when the bail bond was made out.

The hon. gentleman asked: why did we not prosecute him? As a matter of fact, we set up the Norris commission. That commission found the evidence, and then this government prosecuted on the basis of the evidence the Norris commission brought out.

An hon. Member: With reluctance.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I would not like to say that; I would say, after undue delay. Indeed, I do not forget that the former minister of justice, the predecessor of the present minister, withheld action on the warrant for Banks' arrest when he was available to be arrested.

Mr. MacEachen: This is a very important point, Mr. Chairman, and I think it ought to be underlined. The incident for which Mr. Banks was convicted occurred in 1957. It occurred after the right hon. gentleman became prime minister of Canada. No new facts

were uncovered subsequent to the Norris commission.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Oh, yes.

Mr. MacEachen: These facts were investigated at the time and were made known to the government of the day. It was open to that government for all those years to prosecute Mr. Banks for an incident that took place in August, 1957. That is one mystery that I would like to have cleared up by the Leader of the Opposition. Why did he annoint and coddle Mr. Banks and refuse to prosecute him on facts that were known in August, 1957 and widely publicized at that time?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, the statement that we refused to prosecute is as completely without foundation as is possible.

Mr. MacEachen: It is a fact.

Mr. Diefenbaker: It is unjustified, and untrue.

Mr. MacEachen: It is a fact.

Mr. Diefenbaker: And it is untrue, if a fact can be untrue.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, will the Leader of the Opposition deny that this case was investigated by the R.C.M. Police at that time? Will he deny that? He cannot deny it.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I can understand the heated feelings that are aroused in the minister by the revelation of these facts. The way in which this government uses smokescreens such as this to cover up their negligence in connection with Banks is equal only to the solicitude shown throughout the years to him.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, would the Leader of the Opposition permit a question?

Mr. Diefenbaker: The evidence was forthcoming—

Mr. MacEachen: Would the Leader of the Opposition permit a question?

Mr. Diefenbaker: —in the Norris report. Mr. Chairman, I have never known two to speak at once, and one intelligently; and I am speaking intelligently. I can understand the feeling in this regard. While we argue and the government defends what took place, Banks enjoys his liberty at the expense of the reputation of Canadian justice.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, there are two things with which I should like the Leader of the Opposition to deal. Will he deny that the incident which took place in 1957 was investigated at that time by the police? Will he deny that? Second, will he deny that these facts were made known to the government of the day?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, I immediately deny the second question, and as far as the first is concerned, my recollection is that we did everything we could to be sure that if we prosecuted, we would have a case. It was not until Mr. Justice Norris investigated this matter for months and months that sufficient evidence became available—because these employees of the S.I.U. would not talk; they dare not talk; they had hanging over them the tyranny of Banks, and McLaughlin too, and they were afraid to talk and bring out the necessary corroborative evidence.

Mr. MacEachen: The Leader of the Opposition has now made it quite clear that this case was investigated in 1957. He has made it quite clear that at that time the government of the day must have concluded that there were not sufficient grounds for prosecution. The evidence upon which Mr. Banks was convicted was not drawn in any way from the Norris report, not at all; it was drawn from evidence collected by the special counsel who were appointed subsequently on the recommendation of Mr. Justice Norris. Mr. Justice Norris asked that special counsel be appointed to investigate all the activities of Mr. Banks. This government appointed those special counsel; they undertook the investigation, with the assistance of the police, and sufficient evidence was accumulated to secure a conviction. It was open to the Leader of the Opposition in 1957, as head of the government, to instruct that special counsel be appointed to secure the evidence with regard to an event that took place when he was prime minister. But the fact is that the government of that day failed to take action, and it is as a result of action taken by this government that Mr. Banks was convicted.

Mr. Diefenbaker: And he is free.

Mr. Rhéaume: Where is he now?

Mr. Starr: Mr. Chairman, I can understand the heated argument the Minister of Labour is putting up in respect of this matter. But if we look at the Norris commission report we will see it was recommended there that special counsel be appointed by the government to look into the evidence submitted to the Norris commission.

Mr. MacEachen: No.

Mr. Starr: That was in order to ascertain whether a charge could be laid as a result of the evidence submitted to the Norris commission and to see whether proper evidence could be brought out in order to prosecute. It was only after the Norris commission report came out and that recommendation was made that we pressed the government to appoint these counsel. It was months afterwards that counsel made a report, and it was months afterwards that the revelations of the report were made and action, based on the prodding of the opposition, was taken to prosecute. This was based on the recommendation that there was enough evidence in the Norris commission report to justify proceeding with the laying of charges.

Mr. Rhéaume: Then they helped him across the line, too.

Mr. Macdonald: Mr. Chairman, first I would confirm what the Minister of Labour said—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Macdonald: —that the previous minister of justice, the minister of justice of the former government, had before him substantially the evidence upon which Banks was convicted in 1963.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Substantially.

Mr. Macdonald: That government failed to take action on it. Therefore it does not lie with them to accuse anyone of being dilatory or a friend of Banks. They failed to follow up the evidence that was before their noses. Second, Mr. Chairman, there was another misrepresentation from the other side of the house. The right hon. Leader of the Opposition very solemnly read to the committee a part of the Criminal Code. He started by reading the wrong page, but he got on to the right page.

Mr. Diefenbaker: No; the right page, but the wrong form.

Mr. Macdonald: He read to the committee the form of bail bond where an accused is being committed for trial. He was very careful not to read the form used in appeal proceedings such as these, which is subparagraph (g) and which contains nothing like the provisions he read to the committee. There is no provision in that appeal bail bond form set out in the Criminal Code preventing the accused from leaving the jurisdiction or requiring him to remain continuously within the jurisdiction of the court before the day set for the appeal.

Mr. Rhéaume: Where is Banks? Where is your buddy?

Mr. Gelber: Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word about automation and manpower consultative services.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Gelber: I would like to comment on the words of the right hon. Leader of the Opposition when he referred to Hal Banks and said he was anointed of Liberalism. I wonder what protection the anointed of Liberalism had under Conservatism, because it took some years before he was brought to court. Certainly the evidence upon which Mr. Banks was convicted is only one aspect of the Norris commission report. There are other matters that were certainly brought to the attention of the government. There was the agreement between a shipping company of Sarnia and the S.I.U. which Mr. Justice Norris considered was in defiance of the law. This matter was discussed at the highest echelons of the government at the time of the previous administration, and nothing was done.

Another matter the right hon. gentleman mentioned was the $500 bonus for winter home building. He quoted the hon. member for York East as a builder. I think if he moved around the construction workers of York South and ascertained that for the first time in many years there was a higher rate of employment during those dour months, he would understand why there is wide support for the very successful enterprise carried on by this government in order to encourage winter employment.

I was very much impressed with the report of the American council on education with regard to the state of employment in the United States. They pointed out that while there were five million unemployed in the United States, there were four million unfilled job opportunities. We are moving into a period when more and more the employment demand will be for skilled personnel. Unskilled people without training, people with deficiencies in education, will find it more and more difficult to gain employment.

In a speech at Queen's University last May the Minister of Labour pointed out that 90 per cent of the light bulbs and tubes manufactured in the United States, with the exception of picture tubes, are produced by 14 machine operators. This is one aspect of the development of automation which does require skilled personnel and yet displaces a lot of workers. The automobile industry in

the United States in 1963 produced seven million cars. The automobile industry in the United States in 1955 also produced seven million cars. But in 1963 the industry produced seven million cars with 17 per cent less labour force. This is an important problem which sets up a challenge that this government must meet. It sets up a challenge in terms of the means of production and distribution, a means which will completely revolutionize our social and economic system. This is based largely on the development of automation and a highly sophisticated production system.

Automation is based on three main components. First of all, there is the self-regulating system. For example, the simple thermostat which one has in one's house is a self-regulating system. Second, there is the electronic computer which stores information and is capable of logical decision making. This has made possible the development of our economy and the use of the many services which otherwise would not be available to us. Yet this highly sophisticated and mature machine, the electronic computer, represents a threat to our society and threatens the jobs of hundreds of thousands of workers. The third component is the highly organized assembly system of laying out work. These three components when placed together are the basis of automation.

Automation requires certain types of materials. The hard substances which we use in our economy today are not easily absorbed in a highly automated assembly. Therefore, automation requires new substances, and science is busily engaged in producing these new substances to feed a highly automated system. Someone pointed out that whereas formerly the consumer would set up demand and would set in motion the process of production by his requirements, today it is the scientist and the engineer who are skilfully engaged in determining what such a system can produce and who are putting into reverse the well known saying and showing, as one wag put it, that invention is becoming the mother of necessity.

What are we in this country doing in order to meet the need for skills, and what are we doing in terms of planning? We have a system of joint training projects to which the Minister of Labour has referred. We have engaged in these systems of training, which are joint programs between the provinces and the federal government, in the 12-month period ending March 31, 287,187 Canadians. Of these, 164,420 were people who were being trained in vocational schools and high schools. That means that out of a labour force of 6,600,000 or more there are only 123,000 people receiving training through the joint programs. Of the 164,000 people who are at school more than half are taking business courses. Although these are important it means that only a small number of people in vocational and high schools are getting the skills necessary to absorb them in the productive mechanism which is so important.

It is my contention that we will never be able to build the schools and engage the people to provide the training which is required, unless more is done. The steps already taken by the government help, and the programs started by the previous government are also of assistance. But in the conception of the total problem it seems to me that we are not sufficiently imaginative and must do more. The greatest school for providing industrial skills is industry itself. Industry has the equipment, the knowhow and the leadership. It seems to me that we must conceive of industry not only as producing commodities but also as producing skills which will upgrade the labour force in this country and make it possible in this twentieth century to meet the challenge of automation. We must do more to give inducements to industry, and we must provide the opportunities to develop skilled tradesmen and craftsmen who are so much demanded by our society.

The program announced by the Minister of Labour some months ago, and which he mentioned again today—the manpower consultative service—is one step toward mobilizing our resources toward meeting this objective. We must look to industry as the most important school for retraining our labour force and as the most important school for giving that capability to our workers to meet the challenge of 1964.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, now that we are back on the estimates of the Department of Labour, I should like to say that I was pleased that the hon. member for Ontario made the reference that he did to William Jenoves, who passed away yesterday. I agree with the hon. member for Ontario that in paying tribute to this man who spent six decades working in the trade union movement we are paying tribute to all those who over the years have helped to build this very important and living aspect of our democratic way of life.

We have a Minister of Labour at the present time who is not only an honourable gentleman; he is also a gentleman. That is our trouble. He is a very fine man and is very charming. In fact, with all his charm and his capacity for making promises it mystifies me that he is still a bachelor. And I am saying that in 1964, a leap year at that. As everyone knows he seems in the labour field to be the epitome of the capacity of the Liberals over the years to make promises, and to make them in such a charming way that we are lulled into believing that they are going to be kept. He did it again today, and this time I hope he not only meant it but that it will come true. He went just as far as he could in saying that before the end of the month of September—and when I questioned him he said he meant 1964—legislation for a national labour code would be on the order paper. I hope I do not sound cynical if I refer to the fact that this is the kind of promise that has been made over and over again. True, this minister has never become quite so specific in terms of time. Thus far he has told us it would come "soon" or "as soon as possible" or "very soon" or "just as soon as we can make it", and so on. I hope that this time he has pinned himself down.

I remind him that, as he well knows, when we were dealing with his estimates last year we were able to pin him down fairly well on November 8, 1963. On that day we were dealing with the estimates of the Department of Labour for last year and we got out of the Minister of Labour what seemed like a promise to bring in a national labour code at this session. I was anxious to pin him down on that, and on a couple of other matters as well, and so on page 4605 of *Hansard* for November 8, 1963, I referred in particular to three matters, amending the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act, a labour code, and doing something about the Unemployment Insurance Act. I asked the minister if he would not summon up his courage and assure us that action would be taken on those three matters during the following session of parliament, namely the session now with us. On page 4605 of *Hansard* for November 8, 1963, I read this paragraph:

> Mr. MacEachen: Subject to the approval of a number of other persons directly involved, I have no hesitation in saying that we will want to take action on the Unemployment Insurance Act and the labour code within the time mentioned by my hon. friend.

I interject to say that I thought that was a pretty clear promise that at this session we would get action on those two things, the Unemployment Insurance Act and a national labour code. I continue the quotation:

> I would be very rash indeed to give the same kind of assurance with respect to the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act, because, as at the present time, I have not, nor has my department given the kind of consideration in depth—

That is a great phrase.

> —to the proposals put forward to justify my giving an assurance of that kind. However, we will consider these proposals and perhaps at a later date I will be glad to add this particular suggestion to the rather optimistic prospect I have given in connection with the other two.

I found the Minister of Labour so charming and such a gentleman last year that I thought it was a certainty that at this session we would get action on the Unemployment Insurance Act and on a national labour code, and that there was a possibility that we would get action on amendments to the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act. It is now clear that the only one of these three with regard to which there is any hope so far as this session is concerned is the national labour code. I hope it will be on the order paper shortly and I hope the Minister of Labour will make the strongest representations he can to the Prime Minister, the house leader and those who are responsible for things around here to see to it that we get at that item as soon as possible after it gets on the order paper. I need not take any time discussing what is happening to the business of the house at this session, but it still seems to me that some of our time, no matter what else we may have to deal with, should be spent on other legislation and that this is one of the items that should be got through at this session, no matter what happens.

I hope that the labour code will be a substantial document. I hope that at least it will deal with the ingredients that we discussed last year, the first being a minimum wage. I hope that the provision for a minimum wage in the labour code will not be a pious hope. I trust it will not be something that is flexible, permitting different rates in different parts of the country. I hope the minister is aware of the fact that the Canadian Labour Congress, which for a few years was proposing $1.25 an hour as a minimum wage, decided at its last convention that under today's conditions the minimum should be $1.50 an hour.

I also trust there will be provision in the code for maximum number of hours of work per day, a maximum work week and certain other matters. In particular, I hope the labour

code will improve the vacations with pay legislation, which is the only ingredient of a national labour code that we now have on the statute books. As the minister knows, this was not put on the statute books by the Liberals, but by the Conservatives when they were in power a few years ago. In my view the provisions with respect to that matter should be improved along the lines of certain private members' public bills that I have introduced. There should also be provision for statutory holidays with pay.

As I say, I hope that these five ingredients at least will be in the national labour code. It may be that a national labour code is also the place to make certain provisions regarding safety and other matters to protect workers who come under federal labour jurisdiction. As the minister said when he was making his remarks earlier, this is a subject about which some of us have been having a good deal to say for a good many years, but I will not today do as I so often do, pull out the 1919 program of the Liberal party. That is a long way back now, but at any rate let us have implementation at this session of the promises that the present generation of Liberals have made to us.

I also hope the minister will pay some attention to what he said on November 8, 1963, regarding the Unemployment Insurance Act. He led us to believe then that action on that matter at this session was on a parallel with the intended action on the national labour code, but there has been no indication at this session that anything of that nature is in store for us. Likewise, even though his commitment last year was not very strong, we feel that improvements are needed in the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act. If the minister wonders what the details are, he can find them in the record of the debate on these estimates a year ago.

As my colleague, the hon. member for Winnipeg North, said, when we started to prepare for this day's debate we wondered what there was to say that we did not say a year ago. We said it all then and virtually nothing has happened in the meantime, except that the minister has given us the benefit of his charm and has made these promises. A year ago we felt that at least he was coping with some very difficult problems involving a number of disputes and so on that were on his doorstep, and we gave him full marks for the courageous and active way he was coping with them. He earned quite a reputation. Even my hon. friend, the columnist who sits in front of me was rating him very high in the cabinet of that day; but in the meantime we have to settle for his charm. They are wonderful—

Mr. MacEachen: Just for a month.

Mr. Knowles: Just for a month?

Mr. MacEachen: You should have more by the end of the month.

Mr. Knowles: I hope the minister is not going to turn his charm off at the end of the month—

Mr. MacEachen: Charm, plus.

Mr. Knowles: —but that we will have something solid in terms of legislation.

Mr. Fisher: No LaMarshian stuff.

Mr. Knowles: But even now he is asking me to settle for the one piece of legislation which he promised earlier today, namely a national labour code. It is going to be good to get that, but I suggest that these other items should also be proceeded with at the earliest possible date.

We welcome the fact that there is on the order paper government order No. 39 calling for parliament to approve of the I.L.O. convention regarding discrimination in employment. We hope there will be an early opportunity for parliament to deal with that and we hope that the government will bring other I.L.O. conventions before parliament for its approval.

Because, as I say, most of what we might say we said last year, and because those things we asked for last year have not yet been implemented, and because other members wish to speak I intend to keep my remarks very brief.

There is just this other point to which I should like to give expression and it was mentioned last year after other members had spoken by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands. It has been mentioned from time to time by other hon. members. I have the feeling that during the time it has taken the Liberals to implement their 1919 promises, time has moved on. Those things that would have been of tremendous advantage to the working people of Canada in the twenties, thirties, forties, and fifties, such as the national labour code that we are now perhaps going to get, are not enough to meet the conditions of our time. Automation, to which the last speaker referred, technological changes and all the changes in our economic and social structure, will make necessary far more sweeping changes than are involved

even in things like a good national labour code.

People are recognizing the fact, and economists of various schools have been speaking in this direction, that the day may soon come when we may have to provide people with an income, even though they are not engaged in what is sometimes called productive work. The whole process of automation by which we are able to produce things to make up the affluent society can change our society tremendously, and some brand new, imaginative thinking has to be done in this field. This involves more than the Department of Labour. It certainly involves the Department of Finance, it involves the whole of government policy, but the Minister of Labour is the person who should be the spokesman in the government for the great mass of our people, and in our view he should be taking the lead in any government to which he belongs to try to get some new thinking in this field. The day is going to come when, entirely apart from any productive work there may be for people to do, we are going to have to do things to expand our educational horizons; we are going to have to make it possible for people to make a contribution to our life and to our times in other ways than just trying to run machines or even pushing the buttons of an automated plant.

This is a tremendous field. I know that the minister with his academic background, is interested in it. I call upon him to bring to bear those academic thoughts that he has on the practical problem of improving the situation for the labouring people, and indeed for all the people of this country. We welcome, as I say, the improvements that are at long last in prospect, improvements promised by the Liberals 45 years ago. I suggest to the minister that if we are going to make life in Canada in the affluent sixties and seventies what it ought to be, not just for a privileged few at the top but for all the working people of the country, he still has a great deal to do. I trust he will add this as an additional supplement to the promises he has already made.

Mr. Regan: Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a few comments on the matter of the S.I.U. trustees and some of the other aspects of the estimates that have been dealt with earlier this afternoon. First of all, Mr. Chairman, I was somewhat taken aback by the exchange between the right hon. Leader of the Opposition and members on the government side with regard to the matter of Hal Banks. Much was said about it this afternoon and it perhaps is not necessary for me to add to it, but I cannot help but think that if we were to accept that which was stated by the Leader of the Opposition in his final submission this afternoon, when he said that the administration of justice under his government in 1957 was unable to get people in this country to talk and give evidence on the crimes that had been committed and the only way that the administration some six years later could get evidence of these same crimes was through a royal commission, certainly it would be a sad commentary on the efficiency of the administration of justice under the former regime. I would be extremely surprised if the minister of justice of that time would agree with the remarks made by the right hon. gentleman this afternoon.

Actually of course it was a very clever effort on the part of the Leader of the Opposition to escape what must be the decision of history that the Conservative government between 1957 and 1962 did absolutely nothing. These were the years when Hal Banks was only beginning to stretch his octopus-like tentacles across the Canadian labour movement. During those years between 1957 and 1962—

Mr. Fisher: Oh, oh.

Mr. Regan: Has the hon. member got a pain? During those years between 1957 and 1962—

Mr. Fisher: I sure have.

Mr. Regan: —he extended and expanded his grasp of the labour movement. During those years, the troubles on the great lakes grew. I cannot help but admire the sheer audacity of the right hon. Leader of the Opposition. I am somewhat reminded of the statement that all "gall" is divided into three parts, and he has all three parts. He has the unmitigated gall to come in here and, despite the fact no action was taken against Hal Banks and the S.I.U. gangsters during his regime because the administration of justice was inefficient, say that we should have done something about Hal Banks.

Mr. Herridge: Members of the opposition had been urging the Liberal government for years to take action.

Mr. Regan: It finally came to the point where only a royal commission could get the evidence needed. Yet, in spite of this the Leader of the Opposition does not avoid the point. He has the gall to come in here, change the facts around and try to say that it has

been the Liberals who have protected Banks over the years. I am sure that if the government finds Mr. Banks they will make every effort to extradite him, bring him back to Canada and face a trial. So far as I am concerned, personally, I am not sure I am in favour of that. So far as I am concerned, far more important than Hal Banks or all the Hal Bankses, is the re-establishment of peace on the great lakes. This has been accomplished through the efficiency of our present Minister of Labour. Then, I should like to see a democratic system established in the S.I.U. so that that union could be brought back into the main stream of the Canadian trade union movement.

There has been some criticism here today, somewhat disturbing criticism, of the actions of the trustees. I hope that criticism is not accurate. I hope that some time this fall the Minister of Labour will be able to prevail upon the trustees to appear before the industrial relations committee so that we may have an opportunity of discussing with the trustees what their actions have been. Until the contrary is shown to me, I am inclined to believe the trustees have been doing an effective job and that they are making progress towards the objectives that we set for them. Let us remember that hon. members who sit in the group directly opposite my very back bench—

Mr. Skoreyko: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Regan: —were the ones who urged the setting up of this board of trustees.

The Chairman: Order please. Would the hon. member who has the floor permit a question?

Mr. Regan: It would be an exquisite pleasure.

Mr. Skoreyko: Will the hon. member agree with the Minister of Labour that Mr. Millard is doing an effective job when he claims he has not even read the Norris report?

Mr. Regan: I am not aware whether Mr. Millard has read the Norris report or not, but I am not at all convinced that is essential to doing an effective job in his position. I believe that the trustees were set up to run the union, to return it to a democratic type of system, and to see to it we had peace on the great lakes.

I was starting out to say, and I think this pertains to the question asked by the hon. member, that members of the group directly opposite me were among those who urged at the time that the trustees be given a free hand once the board was established to run the union, so that parliament would not be attempting to be the board of trustees itself. Actually Mr. Millard, who I presume is quite acceptable to that group because he was once an N.D.P. candidate, and the other trustees, have shown successful results. We have seen the fact that we do have peace, that commerce is moving between Canada and the United States across the great lakes.

Mr. Herridge: At any price.

Mr. Regan: I am not going into the subject of how much I as a Haligonian am in favour of great lakes commerce, particularly in wintertime; but coming back to the point, the trustees should not be subjected to slighting remarks because of little differences between what they have done and what individual hon. members, 265 of them, feel that they should do. Obviously every step they take is not going to meet with the approval of everyone in this chamber; but what they have done is (a) brought peace on the lakes and (b) have brought about the position that elections are coming up in the S.I.U. in which, for the first time in many years, there will be the opportunity for the rank and file members of the S.I.U. to campaign effectively for office. We can take note of the fact that there is going to be a three cornered contest for the presidency, and contests for other positions, and I do not know what more the trustees could do than what they have done towards moving to return the S.I.U. to the rank and file of the workers and to the mainstream of Canadian democratic unionism.

I certainly deplore the fact that in some corners of this chamber every effort is made to suggest that either the trustees or the government are anxious to defend Harold Banks. Such has not been the case and I hope when the trustees do appear before a committee of the house there will be ample opportunity for this to be displayed.

Before taking my seat I wish to mention one or two other matters. I noted with interest the minister's report on the older workers' program, and I have to agree with him that it has at least reasonable success, judging from the number of older workers who had been unemployed for six to eight months prior to their applications and who have received benefits and employment. However, I think the minister and the committee would be quick to agree in this era of automation that this is only a beginning

exercise in assisting older workers, but it is a good beginning. The department should and must examine other ways by which the older worker, who becomes redundant or whose job disappears because of automation or technological changes, can make a worthwhile contribution to our economic processes and support himself and his family.

We look forward with interest to the forthcoming introduction of the national labour code, but beyond the introduction of that I would remind the minister that the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act itself is badly in need of overhaul because many of its sections are out of date with conditions as they exist in industry today, and I trust the time is rapidly approaching when it will be possible to give that act a complete overhaul.

Mr. More: I was very interested in the remarks of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Regan) who mentioned that he hoped the trustees would be appearing soon before a committee of the house. I think hon. members on all sides have expressed strong enough feelings to justify the trustees or the board chairman appearing before a committee, so that members may understand the facts. We want to know what price has been paid for the achievements of the board, as recited by the hon. member.

We know the price we paid under a Liberal administration for ridding the lakes of so-called communists. They involved us with gangsters and we are not out of that yet. We still have McLaughlin in the seats of the mighty, and therefore it is imperative that the trustees appear as soon as possible before a committee of the house. Will the minister tell the committee very definitely when arrangements are going to be made for the trustees, or the chairman, to appear before a committee of the house to give the facts about the S.I.U., Banks and the situation on the great lakes?

The Chairman: The hon. member for Moose Jaw-Lake Centre.

Mr. More: Is the minister not going to give an answer to that very direct question?

The Chairman: Order. May I suggest for the sake of good order in the work of the committee that we have contributions from hon. members, and the minister may answer questions later.

Mr. Pascoe: Mr. Chairman, other speakers have referred to the winter works program, but not quite along the lines on which I want to discuss it briefly. I think it important to bring certain points to the direct attention of the minister before he formulates his winter works program for this year.

I believe the minister has received a brief from the Regina housebuilders association, which has a membership of 96 firms. I represent part of Regina and I am associated with the hon. member for Regina City in outlining the main points in the brief, and the points which I shall bring out also apply to my home city of Moose Jaw, and other Saskatchewan and prairie cities.

The right hon. Leader of the Opposition referred to the defects in last winter's $500 house bonus program, and these defects are certainly apparent on the prairies. To support that assertion I will quote portions of the brief from the Regina housebuilders association. I believe the minister has received it and I imagine he has answered it, but I would like to put a few points on record. It says:

> This brief from the Regina housebuilders association with a membership of 96 firms, is requesting certain changes in the $500 house bonus program of the federal government's winter works scheme.

Before proceeding to discuss the brief from the Regina housebuilders association I should like to point out that they are not opposed to a winter works incentive program but merely to the federal government's house bonus program in its present form. Members of the association feel the success or failure of this year's winter works program in their region is dependant upon certain necessary changes being made in the regulations. The brief stresses two points. One is the short period of winter employment support offered in 1963-64, namely, from December 1 to March 31. This would compare with the winter works program of the former government which started on October 15 and ended April 30. The second point they bring out is that winter building costs on the prairies greatly affect the success or failure of a winter works program. In this regard I should like to quote from the brief as follows:

> Members of the Regina housebuilders association maintain that winter building costs greatly affect the success or failure of a winter works program. A national housebuilders survey of winter building costs across Canada established extra cost for winter building at from $300 to $1,100 depending on the region in Canada in which the house is built. This means builders in areas that have an average extra winter building cost of $300 have a $200 incentive to offer their purchasers if they buy a winter built house...but builders in areas where climatic conditions are very

severe, such as those in the prairie region, have nothing to offer except costs in excess of the bonus amount.

A further point made in the brief is this:

In addition, winter works houses this year will have to bear the increase of most of the cost of the 3 per cent sales tax increase to go into effect January 1, 1965.

They are referring to the fact that on January 1 there will be a federal sales tax of 11 per cent on building materials. The recommendation in the brief on this particular point is:

The Regina housebuilders association, therefore, respectfully requests the Department of Labour to increase the amount of the winter works bonus paid the purchaser by an amount equal to the difference between winter costs in the most favourable region of Canada and those found in the region in which the house is being built.

I think this is a reasonable recommendation to place before the minister and I hope it will be given consideration. The brief goes on:

Regina housebuilders realize the federal government's winter works bonus plan has been designed to stimulate construction and create employment during the winter months when unemployment is usually at a peak. They also acknowledge that the 1963-64 winter works program was designed to alleviate this condition by promoting employment between December 1 and March 31 each winter.

However, unemployment in the prairie region occurs earlier in the fall and remains later in the spring than in other areas of Canada.

The recommendation made to the minister is as follows:

We therefore respectfully request the federal Department of Labour to consider the merits of extending the winter works $500 house bonus program to include the spring and fall periods of unemployment in the prairie regions...especially November and April.

As I mentioned before, the program of the last government began on October 15 and ended on April 30.

Another point brought out in the brief is this:

Regina housebuilders wish to point out that during the 1963-64 winter works bonus program, the Department of Labour refused to recognize an irrevocable assignment or power of attorney from the purchaser, thus enabling the builder to collect the $500 bonus amount from the government as part of the purchaser's house payment. Builders maintained they were entitled to payment for a completed product before occupancy and refused occupancy until payment was forthcoming. Consequently, many purchasers, and especially those in the lower income groups, were unable to raise the required amount and were forced by this requirement to find other accommodation at additional expense until their bonus application was processed by the government.

The recommendation in this respect is as follows:

[Mr. Pascoe.]

The association therefore, respectfully requests the Department of Labour to recognize a standard irrevocable assignment by the purchaser of the $500 bonus amount.

Again I would point out that though this is a brief presented by the Regina housebuilders association, in bringing it forward I am speaking also for other builders in Moose Jaw, Saskatoon and the prairies generally. The brief, at its conclusion, makes the following request:

Members of the Regina housebuilders association would strongly urge the federal Department of Labour to give immediate consideration to the recommendations for change as outlined in this brief so that they may be implemented before the 1964-65 winter works house bonus program goes into effect this fall.

I trust the minister will carefully consider these recommendations and incorporate them in the winter works program.

Mr. Fisher: I am inclined to agree, if I may say this on entering the discussion, with the comments made by my colleague about the minister's charm. It would appear to me that after the first flush of success which the minister enjoyed he has, in the last year, somewhat faded away. The only thing I have discovered about him in the last six or seven months is that he does not know much about baseball, compared with the Prime Minister. I do not suppose that is a serious handicap.

Some of us regret that he did not accept the position offered him as leader of the house. In view of the fact that he has been able to bring forward little of his legislative program and that he has not been embroiled in any great labour difficulty such as arises from time to time in connection with the railroads, I might comment that the hon. gentleman might well have accepted that position. If he had done so, maybe, with his charm, we would have been further along with our work this session.

I have one concrete proposal to put to the minister. It is at least current in that it ties in with the discussion going on in the country with regard to the appointment of an ombudsman fired by the visit of Sir Guy Powles of New Zealand. In my experience in labour matters, and because of my work in relation to railway unions in particular, between six and a dozen cases are brought to my notice every year of grievances felt by workers, sometimes with their own unions but more often with the way their complaints have been processed and the difficulties which arise in dealing with an international union whose final decisions are taken in the United States.

I had a case brought to my attention the other day, a case from Cornwall involving a man by the name of Kuntz who was in difficulty with the hospital employees union. It was taken up through the Canadian vice president and then it went before the Ontario labour relations board. The grievance was not upheld but in my judgment, having reviewed all the files—this is not a federal matter and I am mentioning it only as an example—this man still needs assistance. This case still needs review. I myself can see, implicit in the case in which he is involved, a tremendous tendency for the agents of the union and of the employers to co-operate in snuffing out this man's complaint, because of the trouble it would cause in terms of both the unit in which the case is involved and the membership of the union.

I have another case in connection with a railway trainman on the west coast, a man by the name of Woods, who for three years has been trying to get a grievance settled. He has lost out partly by default, it seems to me, within the union processes. I have taken it up with management and they always come back to me and say there are the proper arrangements within the contract for the man to settle his grievance.

I would like to suggest that in the United States at least one union, the steelworkers, has set up an outside court. Even the S.I.U., in the last gesture, I believe, that Mr. Banks made of any substance to indicate that the S.I.U. was a good union, created this appeal board with Commander Robertson in charge. I think there is a spirit in the labour movement, particularly in some of the more progressive unions, in the United States to say that it is a great advantage to labour if, when a particular worker has a grievance and suspects collusion between the union leadership and management, he can go to someone who is above and beyond management, government or labour—someone, in a sense, in the judicial field who has almost a judicial status and the kind of freedom to move that an ombudsman has—to settle his grievance.

Obviously, Mr. Chairman, if we are to get this kind of an officer in Canada it is going to take a great deal of co-operation in developing the idea of the office; because it needs a co-operative program perhaps on the part of 11 different departments of labour and it needs the substantial support of an organization such as the Canadian Labour Congress, and even the unions that are sometimes referred to as maverick unions that are outside the Canadian Labour Congress. I think this is a very, very worth-while idea. Partly it is a good defensive move for the labour movement itself, and partly it appeals to me because I have become more and more concerned, in my time in politics, with the poor individual citizen who gets caught up within a bureaucracy, whether it is of management, labour or government. This is something that is of increasing difficulty. I think it is a feather in the cap of the trade union movement as I know it that so few cases do come forward; that their grievance procedure does settle so many things.

I do not think there would be a welter of these complaints. I do not think it would have any effect on the normal working of the grievance procedure. But I do suggest that the minister should consider giving the lead in trying to obtain co-operation from the provincial departments of labour and from the labour movement as a whole in setting up in Canada the kind of organization and system based upon a labour ombudsman, and having some similarity in its terms of reference to what has been created in the United States by the united steelworkers. It seems to me that if the terms of reference for such an office were properly worked out, for example so that the office did not get involved in any jurisdictional disputes, and if there was a question of jurisdictional difference that would be wiped out, this would benefit those in the labour field.

One of the most important reasons for our needing this office is that judicial recourse is so rarely useful or so rarely open to a worker with this kind of grievance. This gentleman who came to see me from Cornwall has been out of work for two years. He had difficulty getting the bus fare to come to Ottawa, let alone the money necessary to hire a lawyer. I have just enough of these cases, four or five a year, to indicate to me —and I assume that other members have had similar cases brought to their attention—that this would be a very worth-while move to consider. Perhaps we should expect the unions to develop this idea in the way that Commander Robertson has developed it within the S.I.U. But I suggest it would be an imaginative step if we had such an office for the whole country. I would like the minister to give this suggestion serious consideration. I think it would be a real contribution.

One of the points where government and bureaucracy madden me is, for example, with the little gandy dance that has gone on between the minister and the hon. member for

Danforth in connection with the unemployment insurance commission, the Toronto newspaper strike and the question as to whether the strikers, or the people who have been locked out, as they claim, should be eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. We have this whole question of 85 per cent production. Why in the name of heavens in a case like this cannot there be a bit more dispatch? I have connections with one newspaper, and to a degree with another newspaper, at both the management and union level. It has been apparent for more than two weeks that those newspapers are in practically full production. When we hear this talk about a production of 85 per cent, we realize it is nonsense when we read the editions of the *Telegram* and *Star*. They have been putting out 76-page and 72-page editions. When you look at the amount of classified advertising, this point is brought home, because you do not get a paper of 76 pages in the city of Toronto unless you have a very large output. Having talked to the management of at least one of the papers, who say they are as efficient, if not more efficient, than they were before the strike started, I do not know how the minister can be satisfied with this kind of delay. Maybe to the bureaucrat's mind a delay of one, two or three weeks is not much; but it sure means a great deal to those strikers and the income they have, in comparison with what they seem to me to be entitled to from the unemployment insurance commission.

I certainly think the minister could, in co-operation with the head of the unemployment insurance commission, settle this matter with about three phone calls to Toronto. Maybe this is not the way you should do things; maybe you should send registered letters—I don't know. But I think three phone calls would confirm to the minister's satisfaction that there is a lot more than 85 per cent production in those newspapers.

One of the points I wanted to make in connection with the S.I.U., as I have heard the kettle addressing the pot here this afternoon in this connection as to who is responsible, is that it is very apparent from the correspondence that is filed in connection with the Norris report that the question of how the S.I.U. was behaving was brought to the attention of the former minister of labour and the previous government quite early on in its administration. I know it was brought to their attention right in this house, because I brought it to their attention, and so did the hon. member for Kootenay West. As a matter of fact, I received a number of virulent phone calls and letters over it. I also hope that the minister has read the speech, Hal Banks' speech, made last year at the S.I.U. international convention in the United States. I think this speech is worthy of his perusal. Hal was delighted with the Canadian situation because his buddies were back; the Liberals were back in power and all the noisiness of those silly New Democrats and the stubbornness, bullheadedness and the unfairness of the Diefenbaker government had disappeared, because his pals were back.

Mr. Benidickson: Oh, you don't believe that.

Mr. Fisher: That is what Hal Banks said.

Mr. Benidickson: But you don't believe it.

Mr. Fisher: He was convinced of it. I know there is an element of guilt amongst the Liberals in a Liberal administration over the relationship the party has had with the S.I.U. and Mr. Banks. I could get worked up about this personally, since the S.I.U. moved right into my own area to work with the Liberal organization in order to try and defeat me in two election campaigns. They were welcome; it was great to have them. But, Mr. Chairman, there has been an identity in the minds of a great many people between the Liberal party and Hal Banks. However, I do not want to go digging up again the whole business of how Mr. Banks and Mr. McLaughlin used to refer to Walter Harris as their Ottawa office.

I am not going to get into what I think is the kind of corn introduced by the former prime minister in connection with the recognition of red China, when he suggested that red China had to expiate its sins before Canada could give recognition. I am not suggesting that the minister or the government have to expiate any sin, but I do hope that their guilt makes them uncomfortable enough to feel that it will not be satisfactory just to do a little surface tidying up of the situation.

A few weeks ago I had the pleasure of going through the Welland canal on a freighter, calling at a United States port and then going on to the lakehead. I talked to the sailors and several of the men who were witnesses before the Norris commission. They all welcomed the fact that there is peace on the lakes. But not even the simplest among them is under any illusion that the situation has been cleared up or that it is permanently remedied. They do not expect the bombs to start bursting this year but they do expect it

next year. They say it is useless to think that the tactics of the S.I.U. which have been built up over a generation in the United States are suddenly going to disappear. There will probably be peace as long as we have a trusteeship, and then the battle will develop again.

It seems to me that the only alternative is for the trusteeship really to develop a democratic approach. I took a gentleman in to see the minister a week ago. This man had been fired off a ship at the lakehead. This was despite the fact that he had an excellent record and had been with that ship for a couple of years. He also had a letter from the vice president of the C.S.L. recommending him for further training for a master's ticket. He had been fired off his ship without warning by an officer of the ship, who actually was not responsible for him, and on a phony excuse —at least, according to Mr. Mallett. But the interesting thing is Mr. Mallett's position in the union. He was against the march to Ottawa last year. He had stood, with a certain amount of bravery in my mind, against the size of the union fee membership and against any special levies. He had also been told by two officials of the S.I.U.: "You just wait, mister". Well, they got him and he now is involved in a court case, which comes under the Canada Shipping Act and which I will not comment on. I think they have got him, but many difficulties have since ensued. Now, here is a man fired off a ship. There is a grievance procedure, but has it worked well? I would say it has not, because to my mind there has been collusion to a degree between management and union officials in order to get rid of an objectionable character. That is my personal opinion.

My point is that this kind of situation does not occur in a good union. You are not going to get an arbitrary firing of a man who has an excellent record just overnight for a very minor excuse. I am just dismayed at the prospect of peace so long as the trustees are there, with the trustees not carrying out a thorough enough reform to make sure that it becomes a democratic organization. I realize we have to suspend judgment for a little longer, but I have a hunch that despite the remarks of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Regan) the minister and his officials are no more enamoured with some of the things which have developed in this situation than I am. I would hope that the minister has a breaking point, and that that breaking point will be when he becomes convinced that real reform is not taking place. I trust that he will then let us know, and that any guilt complex which may exist will reinforce my contention that he should let us know. We will look forward to hearing the trustees before the committee.

I want to switch now to a matter which has been a very great disappointment both to myself and to a number of other members of the house, particularly to a number of Conservative members who represent railway points. I think of the late Sherwood Rideout and of all the work he did for the railway workers. It is a fact that last year the committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines had before it the subject matter of a bill which I brought in. That committee almost unanimously—there was one exception—after long hearings listening to the vice presidents of both railways and hearing labour representatives, led off by the senior citizen of Canadian railway labour, Frank Hall, brought in recommendations in connection with the Railway Act. But we have in the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate—that Manitoba carpetbagger who got into Newfoundland and took charge of the department—a very skilful person at sitting on something so that all you get is inaction, inertia, and finally disappearance.

I put it to the minister that amongst the railway workers this issue has not disappeared, despite the fact that contracts have been signed. I also put it to the minister that the Minister of Transport promised when Donald Gordon was before the committee some time ago that as these recommendations which we made in connection with dislocation costs and the effects of automation and technical changes on the railways was so large an issue it should properly fall within the scope of the Department of Labour. That is what he said and I think there is a certain amount of reasonableness to it. Then he was prodded about this and said yes, he thought the Minister of Labour would be interested and that it should be within that framework. But we have not heard a damned thing about it since. It seems to me that it is almost typical of the slowness with which this administration works.

The minister knows, despite the big glossy title of Minister of Labour for Canada, that the main group of workers who come under his jurisdiction are the railway workers of Canada. I think he would acknowledge that the great bulk of his routine work in labour relations matters is connected with the railroad. I am surprised that the minister and his officials have had so little interest in the recommendations of that committee. Those

recommendations were made by a committee of this parliament on which members of the party to which he belongs took quite an active part. I would suggest to him that one of the answers we would like at this time in discussing his estimates is what he is going to do about this matter. I can be quite specific about it. If he wants to check the evidence given by the Minister of Transport before the special committee which heard Donald Gordon, he will find it all in the report, and in several places the Minister of Transport made statements which I had certainly assumed would lead to some kind of communication with the government, so that the minister would have some answer.

Another question I want to put to the minister is this. I, and I think a lot of other hon. members, would like an assessment of the vocational and technical school building program into which the federal government has poured so many millions of dollars. I was staggered when I saw that the Ontario minister of education is going to throw up another $4 million structure for retraining purposes somewhere soon. Wherever I go across the province I run into these big piles of schools which have come out of recent programs. For example, in the lakehead we have a number of them. We have some very good programs going on, but a great many people—educators, teachers, even the unemployed and the people in the unemployment insurance commission and national employment service—are not convinced that we are providing the right kind of facilities or offering the right kind of courses.

We have had an excellent crop of buildings, but in view of the fact that the federal government has put hundreds of millions of dollars into this program I think it is about time that we had some kind of assessment from the government of what has followed from all this building. I want to repeat one of my suspicions in connection with this matter. I think many of the provinces have got good, new secondary school plants out of the program but I am not so sure we have really created enough space of the right kind for a real retraining program. I think we need an assessment.

One of the reasons why I ask the minister for this is that I have great respect for the work of Mr. Ford of his department, although I do not know him personally. I have read enough of the contributions to the written record that Mr. Ford has made at various times to sense that he has been concerned and somewhat disturbed about this huge program which is moving along on an ad hoc basis. I think we should have an appreciation as to how successful this big spending program has been in terms of concrete results leading to work.

[Mr. Fisher.]

The last point I want to make to the minister relates to the publications of his department dealing with automation. I have just seen the first occasional paper by a Mr. McDonald in connection with office automation. I thought it standard was much higher than most I have seen from the department. It was much higher in the sense that it was both readable and yet had enough substance to it that you had something more than just the big bulky mimeographed reports that we used to get from the department in connection with matters like this and which always seemed to be a welter of statistics. I should like to suggest that the department should be encouraged to produce more papers like this and to give them wide distribution and as much publicity as possible. I certainly know that out of that one paper I can get a great deal of material to answer workers in offices in all kinds of industries. I should like to compliment the department on this particular publication and I hope there will be more of them. There are all kinds of things one can raise on this issue.

I suppose I should pay a compliment to the minister on two things, since they deal with his officials. In the last few months I have noticed a remarkable dropping off in individual complaints about the unemployment insurance commission and its officials. Part of that may be due to good times but I think a part of it is the result of the fact that things have finally settled down to an even keel after the adjustment that took place as a result of the tightening of the regulations a year or two ago. From my experience I think the commission should be complimented on this.

The other point on which I should like to compliment the minister also relates to the work of the unemployment insurance commission. If I can judge by my own area and by what I see in the newspapers of other areas the unemployment insurance commission is having much more success in the last while in moving in a public relations way to lead people to see that the commission is more than just a routine organization and that they tie in closely with the national employment service and with educational institutions and job opportunities. I may be wrong in sensing this improvement, but I certainly see it in my own area.

There are other matters in relation to the Department of Labour that I might mention to the minister. Really he has the same challenge as the Minister of Forestry in trying to develop joint programs. His department is really enmeshed in joint programs, particularly with regard to anything concerning education. I think that some day some educator in this country who has political responsibility, and the minister is an educator, is going to have the courage to get up and say: Joint programs are all very well but they are massive, they are slow and they are complicated. This minister is going to ask for more federal authority in this field, particularly with regard to retraining. He is going to ask for the surrender by the provinces of some of their privileges in this particular educational area. I should like to think that the present minister would be the one who would consider doing that.

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to take part in the discussion this afternoon but after listening to the remarks of the last speaker with regard to the strike in Toronto involving the three daily newspapers I feel I must rise. I wish to congratulate the hon. member for being truthful and honest in calling the episode now in progress in Toronto a strike. It is a strike. There was an endeavour to call it a lockout, but an injunction was secured in the supreme court of Ontario prohibiting the use of that term because it is a strike and not a lockout.

I should like to congratulate the Department of Labour and the minister for the manner in which they are handling the unemployment insurance fund in this specific case. We would all be howling to high heaven if the federal government in any manner, shape or form should appear to be acting as a strikebreaker in a strike, and I am sure we would also complain if the federal government should in any way appear to be financing a strike. I have no quarrel with the manner in which the Department of Labour is handling the unemployment insurance fund with regard to this situation in Toronto. These men all had good positions and were well paid, and paid regularly. They chose to strike of their own volition. It is no function of the unemployment insurance fund to finance them if they now find the going a little tough, after having made this decision themselves.

I should almost like to ask the question whether the last speaker was showing some self-interest in this matter. The strikers were somewhat riled over his crossing the picket lines, and any request to the Minister of Labour to release money to these strikers may be with the idea that this money will assuage their feelings toward a man who crossed the picket lines. I should like to congratulate the Minister of Labour on the way in which he is handling this matter and to tell him not to be in too much of a hurry to meet the request of the last speaker on this point.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Chairman, I shall be just as brief as the hon. member who spoke before me.

As one who represents an essentially rural constituency, I should just like to say that I would be most happy if farm labourers came under the Unemployment Insurance Act. Our farmers are looking for cheap labour. They are often accused of mechanizing their farms, but if relatively cheap labour were available, they would undoubtedly take advantage of it.

Most often, such labour is not available because farm hands are not covered by unemployment insurance. I have taken every opportunity to bring this discrepancy to the attention of the authorities and once again I should like to advocate that farm labourers be entitled to unemployment insurance benefits.

[*Text*]

Mr. Rhéaume: Mr. Chairman, I want to take only a few moments to make certain remarks to the minister. I know he is anxious to conclude the debate. I know he has promised the committee to give them certain specific pieces of information and I am sure he is anxious to get his estimates through. I want to bring to his attention a situation I have mentioned before in the house. My experience of the twenty sixth parliament is that sometimes you have to say something many, many times before it even registers either with the ministers or with their officials.

I am particularly pleased to see the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources in the house at this time because the suggestion I want to make to the Minister of Labour is a constructive one and almost involves a joint endeavour. The house is probably aware that there is absolutely no labour legislation whatsoever in the Northwest Territories. I think it is unfortunate that in 1964, when we are approaching the celebration of our 100th birthday, there should be a part of Canada where there is no protection whatsoever for the working man.

There are no laws guaranteeing minimum wages. There are no laws concerning hours of work, paid holidays, overtime pay or any of these things. I know, before the minister or anyone else tells me, that it is essentially a matter for the territorial council to provide legislation on these subjects. This is really where the minister of northern affairs comes in. At this particular juncture the minister of northern affairs has the peculiar responsibility of giving leadership to the council to see that this kind of legisation is prepared, in co-operation with the Minister of Labour, and presented to the territorial council. The fact of the matter is that the bulk of the councillors on that council are appointed by the cabinet, so there is an extra measure of federal control.

I say it is a serious problem because when we are talking about unemployment in Canada and the efforts the various administrations have made and are making to combat it, I think it is worth observing that in some of the more northerly areas of Canada at certain times of the year the unemployment rate is in fact 100 per cent. Now, this may not involve very many people in terms of the Canadian population. However, I suggest to you that it involves parts of the country that have a total population of approximately 100,000. I am thinking of the northerly parts of the provinces and, in particular, of the two northern territories. At times, the people who live in those parts of the country have absolutely no means of obtaining employment. These people are nearly all Indian or Eskimo people who have, over the course of the past few years, lost not only their initiative in connection with trapping, hunting and fishing, but in many cases have lost the skills necessary to conduct those activities properly.

I was pleased at the statement issued yesterday by the minister of northern affairs as a result of another northern tour which he has just completed, and a most successful one. This statement referred to the educational programs which are so desperately needed and which will have a long term effect on the life of the northern people. All that we have succeeded in doing so far is taking the Indian and Eskimo children and moving them out of their own way of life into a no man's land. I know of several communities in the Northwest Territories and the northern parts of the provinces where at times of the year when hunting, fishing and fur trapping are not profitable, the entire community may be out of work. When the minister is giving a statement on unemployment in Canada, it must be a source of irritation to him that there are still these pockets in our country where unemployment may reach as high as 90 per cent for a few months in the year.

I want to make a suggestion to the minister. I was interested in his opening remarks about the economic research branch and the kind of analyses the branch is doing or is planning to do. I want to suggest to him that it would be worth while if he asked this branch to conduct a survey of the unemployment situation in Canada's northerly regions. I mean a real survey and not something that is done in a week or ten days. The minister should give this branch the task of finding out what the situation really is; what skills there are in the groups of people who are, as I suggested earlier, Indian and Eskimo people. He should ascertain methods by which they can be brought back into the employment stream. I suggest the Department of Labour do this, rather than the department of northern affairs, because the federal department of northern affairs is already involved in providing an ameliorating program, if you can call it that. I refer to the educational facilities, and so on.

Quite often when a federal department like northern affairs is so intimately involved in the administration of an area their survey would tend to be an apology for what they have been doing or have not been doing. Quite often the officials of a department, particularly northern affairs, will say that everything is fine and the programs they have been conducting are wonderful; there are no other methods that could be followed. I ask the Minister of Labour to conduct this survey through the economic research branch. This is a specific task and it may take some months. Certainly, from his description of the branch it would be the ideal organization to undertake this work. They would be really rendering a service to northern Canadians wherever they may be found, not only in the territories but also in the provinces.

I want to make a suggestion to him. I should like the department to look into the possibility of the government of Canada, which is the largest single employer in the Canadian north, making more use of local labour. The record of the government of Canada over the years in employing local people has not been good. Quite often, and I speak on the basis of experience in the Canadian north as a federal employee, we were pressuring private enterprise, construction companies that came in to work on projects and so on, to give work to the Indian

and Eskimo people. We said, you should not be importing thousands of labourers from the south when we have all these people here. However the record of the government itself has not been good. For this reason I suggest the Department of Labour, because it represents the only federal department that is not in the Northwest Territories in a major way. They have nothing to protect, not even any empire to preserve. I use those words advisedly. I think they would have to take action with objectivity, with a special perspective that would allow the officials of this department to do the work. I urgently request the minister to consider this.

There is just one other thing I want to request the minister to do, and that is to establish at least one office for the unemployment insurance commission and the national employment service in the northern territories. At the present time if a person wishes to qualify for unemployment insurance benefits or even attempt to find work in other parts of the country, the nearest office is Edmonton which is some 500 miles south of our southerly border. If you live over in the eastern part of the territories you have to contact Montreal. I have placed a question on the order paper before about this and received an answer from the minister's officials that there is no need for the Department of Labour to establish either an employment office or an unemployment insurance office in the Northwest Territories; everything is fine; the officials are watching things and it is under constant survey.

The bitter truth in relation to this situation was revealed when one of the producing gold mines in Yellowknife shut down last winter and some 150 men were put out of work for a few months. The unemployment insurance office did not even have enough forms in Edmonton to handle the situation. I suggest to the minister that the volume of business in the Canadian Northwest Territories justifies a full scale office and it would be advisable to have one set up. I can guarantee him that business will be booming, if he does in fact provide facilities. Right now people just have to depend on neighbours or friends to do this. It is not as good as the service that is being provided by the unemployment insurance commission in many, many regions. Many residents who are eligible for benefits simply do not know about it and consequently use other facilities offered through the department of northern affairs, such as the public welfare program and relief, when in fact they could be benefiting from the placement service.

Before taking my seat to allow the minister to make his concluding comments, I want to bring his attention to the situation on the distant early warning line. He promised me previously that he would look into it. The situation is one which has been going on for some years and I would like him to indicate now, or later to me privately, whether his department is looking into the complaint that American employees of the Federal Electric Corporation receive substantially more pay than Canadian employees doing the same work. I have had this complaint for some months now. I was dimly aware of it when I worked along the distant early warning line, but more recently it has been brought forcibly to my attention.

Mr. Laing: My intervention in this debate will be short and is caused only by the fact the previous speaker referred to labour conditions in the territories. I want to assure him we have been aware of the complaints that have been registered in respect of the letting of contracts in Edmonton, with no requirement in the territories covering the normal rates of pay that exist in Edmonton. There has also been a complaint in respect to the workmen's compensation in the territories, on the basis of inadequacy.

We are not unaware of this, and I would hope the hon. member would give us some marks for the fact that we have forthrightly attempted to take care of these matters in the appointment within our power of at least one member of the Northwest Territories council. We have appointed to that council Mr. Stuart Hodgson, who is an extremely well known and highly regarded member of the international woodworkers of America.

I have asked him to act in respect of these matters as a labour man might be expected to act, and nothing more. I know he called the labour council in the city of Edmonton to meet them. They gave him an entire day and I have reports from them that they were exceedingly well pleased for what they described as the first time a government had attempted to meet them in respect of these matters.

My hon. friend is aware of the difficulties in respect of using and incorporating the indigenous people in the work force there. I think we have made pretty fair progress and I believe he thinks so too. At one time we had 100 Eskimos working in a mine in the territories and they turned out to be extremely adept in using machinery, and

competent of adopting new techniques. Unfortunately the mine ran out of ore, but we transferred a number of them to other mines. There are now 10 Eskimo families working at Yellowknife, respected and accepted by the white community, and doing a very splendid job for the firms employing them. These are conditions towards which we are moving, and we will do our best in co-operation with the Northwest Territories council to take care of these matters brought before the committee.

Mr. Herridge: Mr. Chairman, I think I hear the Secretary of State murmur a bit because he sees me rise, but I can tell him right away I am going to have my say because I promised a number of people in B.C. that I would make a few remarks on the estimates of the Department of Labour.

Mr. Lamontagne: Excuse me, I did not.

Mr. Herridge: Then I apologize. I must have had a poor ear. This is a most inspiring atmosphere in which to deal with labour matters; I can see the committee is in a very cheerful and agreeable mood. I wish to say I listened to the minister's opening statement with interest and appreciation, as he outlined certain policies and programs of the department. I am not going to deal with those, except to say that I for one am very pleased to see willingness to experiment. I am not one who would criticize if an experiment fails. In this field the idea of experimenting is well worth while. We are entering into a new era so far as labour relations, automation and so on are concerned, and I am sure the only way to find sound solutions is as a result of experimentation from time to time. I am very glad to see these experiments being carried on with respect to legislation programs, and administration.

I have a few remarks to make on other matters which concern a number of workers. I am one of those persons who keep in touch with the rank and file of the workers organizations and unions because I have always found that if I keep close to the rank and file of labour, the farmers, and people in general, I have nothing to fear regardless of what anybody else says.

I have a few comments to make in respect to the maritime trustees and the famous Hal Banks binge, as I was possibly the first member to raise the question in the house of his activities, his past record and so on. As a result of that I aroused his ire, and he sent one of his colleagues around my constituency circulating literature wherever he could find an opportunity to distribute it, in stores, Legion branches, clubs and trade union offices, condemning me as a proper bounder. Anyway I was very pleased because once people read his opinion of me their regard for me was higher than it was previously. That was before the 1957 election.

I support the remarks made by the hon. member for Port Arthur in respect to this question. We in this group have some concern as to the ultimate conclusion of the operations of the maritime union trustees. I am not underestimating their difficulties. Some members have been critical of the former government with respect to this situation, but at least a royal commission was appointed by that government, a commission that finally brought out the facts and caused some action to be taken. On numerous occasions during 1956 and the early part of 1957 hon. members of the opposition rose in the house and urged the Liberal government to take some action with respect to this man. I repeatedly urged that he be deported and, regardless of the situation now, let us not forget that this man was brought to Canada as a result of action of the Liberal government in which I consider there was monkey-work with the immigration papers when he arrived, which concealed his former criminal record.

There should be an early appearance of the maritime trustees before the industrial relations committee because I remember that on April 4, Mr. Charles Millard, one of the trustees, issued a joint statement with Mr. Paul Hall, president of the S.I.U. of North America, announcing they had reached agreement. Their peace formula included the following, and I quote:

> The vice president of the S.I.U., Leonard McLaughlin, would take over as president of the S.I.U.
>
> Active management of the S.I.U. would be turned back to S.I.U. leaders.
>
> The Canadian S.I.U. will continue as part of the S.I.U. of North America.
>
> Maritime unions on the great lakes will be integrated.
>
> Later it was stated that integration meant that the two Canadian unions on the great lakes—the Canadian maritime union and the seamen's section of the Canadian brotherhood of railway and transport workers—would be taken over by the S.I.U.

That peace formula has not developed, but it indicates Mr. Millard's line of thought and I for one object very strongly to any action to permit the S.I.U. to take over these unions which fought the good fight against Hal Banks and his S.I.U. associates when the going was very difficult. These Canadian

unions did a great deal to bring the matter to a head, focus public attention upon it and, ultimately, bring about action by the government.

I think the trustees should appear before a committee of this house and give us some idea of their objectives and their methods, as well as some understanding of what they have achieved to date. I am not understimating the difficulties. I think everyone wants to see this question resolved satisfactorily and for all time. I hope the committee members will have the opportunity to question the trustees—not just the chairman, but all of the trustees. Some of us would like to put certain questions to them individually, and I hope the minister will make this possible at an early date.

There is another matter I should like to bring to the attention of the minister. I have mentioned it before in the house and I repeat it at the request of union members concerned with the British Columbia hydro power authority legislation. Members of the unions directly concerned are anxious about this, as is the trade union movement generally in British Columbia. In 1954, Premier Duplessis had an amendment made to the Quebec labour legislation making it illegal for all unions connected with public services to strike. That law was in effect until recent times. Owing to the strong position taken by Quebec trade unions—and I give them full credit for it—Premier Lesage has agreed to amend this act and delete those vicious clauses so that employees of public services will have the right to strike; they will have this freedom returned to them. Only the firefighters and the police are excepted.

Just the reverse is happening in British Columbia. At the last session of the legislature, amendments were made to the hydro and power authority act making it illegal for employees of the hydro authority to strike. In case the minister has not noticed this, I refer to subsection (2) of section 56 of the act which passed third reading in the legislature of British Columbia on March 10, 1964. It reads as follows:

> No person shall declare or authorize a strike, and no employee of the authority shall strike, and the authority shall not lock out any employee or employees.

I have mentioned this before and brought it to the attention of the Minister of Justice. I mentioned it again at the request of many of the employees concerned. They are disturbed about it and I cannot understand the authority supporting this legislation. This is a type of organization within which strikes are most infrequent and I cannot understand them damaging public relations with their employees by having this provision included in the hydro and power authority act. I urge the minister to discuss this matter with the Minister of Justice because, like a good many other people, I think there are sound grounds for the disallowance of this legislation as a transgression of the Canadian Bill of Rights. The federal government has the right to disallow legislation if there is sound reason for doing so. I bring this to the attention of the minister because I know that at heart he is a small "l" liberal who is very conscious of this aspect of our social fabric. I know many trade unions in British Columbia would welcome an assurance that this legislation will be disallowed.

Now I wish to deal with another question for a few minutes. I do so at the request of trade unionists because of the coming developments on the Columbia in the course of which large contracts will be let. Undoubtedly a good many of these contracts will go to corporations controlled in the United States, because many of these companies have the type of equipment required and are able to underbid Canadian firms. I mention this because we had one experience during the construction of the pipe line in British Columbia which brings it to mind. I speak particularly of southeastern British Columbia where I know what happened from personal experience. Hundreds of United States workers crossed the line into Canada as landed immigrants. I am not blaming them for seeking employment. Of course they had to indicate that they intended to settle in Canada. On the whole, these were completely false declarations. They came to Canada and worked on these pipe line jobs for periods of between three months and six months to my knowledge. In order to find out whether or not these people were landed immigrants, the R.C.M.P. checked their cards, and practically all of them had visitors' permits saying they intended to return to the United States within a few months. These men obtained employment from United States controlled construction companies while Canadian workers in the area were unemployed. Students at the university of British Columbia who were looking forward to making a little extra money in the summer months were denied the opportunity to do so because of the number of United States citizens who had come in as landed immigrants to take employment in connection with the construc-

tion of the pipe line and who then, with very few exceptions, returned to the United States.

The second thing I wish to complain of is this. These companies completely ignored the national employment service. I talked to the manager of the employment service at Nelson at that time and he told me that the manager of one of these companies had said: We are not going to be bothered with your petty national employment service; we shall employ whom we wish and in the way we wish. I thought this was a high handed way to treat our national employment service. The office there had a list of local people for 200 miles around who were anxious to get employment on these projects. I bring this up because, as I said before, numerous United States controlled companies will undoubtedly get contracts in connection with the Columbia development project and I suggest to the minister that some consideration be given to amending the Immigration Act or to tightening up the regulations or to checking more closely so as to make certain that those who apply to come to Canada as landed immigrants really intend to settle in Canada. I fully agree there must be reciprocity on this question. We have Canadians who wish to enter the United States to take up employment, not so much from western Canada as from the eastern areas. But I do think something could be done to amend the act or the regulations and strengthen the hands of the officials at the ports of entry so that they can check this practice. The British Columbia hydro and power authority has indicated that it would employ persons who have been in Canada for 60 days. Well, it is easy to come to Canada for a couple of months to await the commencement of a four or five year program. I suggest the department should do something to see that the services of the national employment service are used by these organizations. I think it is highly improper that the national facilities should be ignored to the disadvantage of Canadian citizens. I would also suggest that it would be a good idea for the Department of Labour to have occasional observers at these large construction projects to find out how the law and the regulations are being complied with, to see how the national employment service is being used, and for the government to get well informed, from a national angle, as to the application of labour law and regulations to the advantage of Canadian citizens.

I had intended to speak for another ten or 15 minutes, Mr. Chairman; but I will leave my further remarks to another occasion in order to give the minister an opportunity to reply at this time if he wishes to do so.

[Mr. Herridge.]

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, I thank the hon. member who has just resumed his seat for his consideration in shortening his remarks so I might have a chance to make some comments on a number of points that have been raised by hon. gentlemen in the discussion this afternoon. I certainly thank hon. members for the searching examination they have given the work of the Department of Labour and the unemployment insurance commission. I especially wish to thank them for the well merited commendations they have paid to members of my department and the unemployment insurance commission. I have already stated that it is the intention of the government to introduce comprehensive labour standards legislation at this session, and it is my firm expectation that it will be placed on the order paper in the month of September. I believe that once we have enacted this legislation the federal Department of Labour will be in a stronger position to undertake some of the activities suggested by the hon. member for Kootenay West.

A number of hon. members have discussed, and understandably so, the operation of the board of maritime trustees. I have always maintained that the board of trustees should be accountable to parliament, and it is for this reason that I joined my request to the request made by other hon. members that the board of trustees appear before a parliamentary committee. I have received an assurance from the chairman of the board of trustees that such an appearance will be made at this session of parliament. It is the suggestion of the chairman of the board that this appearance be later in the fall. I have concurred in that suggestion, or at least I have expressed my appreciation of the reasons that may be in the mind of the chairman of the board. I undertake, of course, to arrange such a meeting with the board of trustees at this session of parliament. On that occasion members of parliament will have an opportunity to receive more detailed information on the matters that are causing them the concern which they have expressed today.

On August 4 I made in the House of Commons a rather long statement on the operation of the board of trustees. My views expressed at that time with respect to the operation of the board still stand. I do not intend to repeat them today, except to say that I do appreciate the concern expressed by

hon. members with respect to human rights affecting seamen. The board of trustees have already taken action to add members to the maritime appeals board in order to permit additional panels to deal where necessary with these outstanding cases. I understand the board of trustees will be making an announcement in this regard shortly, and I trust this will have the effect of adding further to the confidence that has already been expressed in the integrity and competence of Commander Robertson who has been operating as a one-man appeal board in hearing these cases.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North dealt extensively with the question of the "do not ship" list. He raised a number of important questions concerning which the officials of the Department of Labour have undertaken discussions with the board of trustees. These discussions will continue in an effort to remove any concern that may exist with respect to these cases.

I have no intention of continuing the discussion with respect to the employment programs of the Department of Labour, except to state that in my view the winter-built housing program has been an undoubted success. I believe this success is demonstrated beyond all debate by the considerable increase in housing starts in January and February of this year in comparison with the same months in 1963. The percentage increase in housing starts as a result of this program has been estimated at well over 70 per cent in these two crucial months when seasonal unemployment is at its highest.

May I just say in connection with the operation of the winter-built housing program that all the terms and conditions of that program will continue this winter. We have, of course, examined the proposals made by the Regina housebuilders which were later supplemented by proposals made by the national housebuilders. In considering proposals from the builders and representations from areas of the country experiencing severe climate we have decided that the commencement of the program this winter will be on November 15 rather than on December 1. The program will be in effect, in other words, from November 15, 1964, to March 31, 1965.

A number of hon. members have referred to the municipal winter works incentive program. May I just say that the terms and conditions of this program will continue as they did last year, except that we intend to make provision to assist certain municipalities where there is high winter unemployment and municipalities located in designated areas. Provision will be made for certain projects to be continued during the month of May, to compensate for periods during the winter when it is clearly demonstrated that work could not continue due to severe weather conditions. Work on such projects in these areas will continue, provided they had been started during November and are projects of at least five months duration.

The hon. member for Port Arthur made a suggestion, among quite a number of others, that particularly impressed me. I refer to the hon. member's suggestion with respect to the desirability of considering ways and means of strengthening the appeal procedures in cases affecting human rights of union members. He suggested that discussions ought to be undertaken with provincial departments of labour, and possibly the Canadian Labour Congress, with regard to methods by which this could be done. I certainly undertake to place this item on the agenda of the next conference of labour ministers, which would include all provincial ministers and the federal Minister of Labour. A number of questions have been asked with respect to the cost of the older worker program. Incentive payments to July 31 on behalf of older workers under this program amounted to $413,000. This was disbursed on behalf of 941 older workers and amounts to $440 per person. I suggest this cannot be considered excessive when you consider the retraining aspect of this expenditure and the possible savings to the unemployment insurance fund.

The hon. member for Ontario asked me about the state of the unemployment insurance fund. The unemployment insurance fund stood at $559,000 on July 31. During the period April 1, 1964 to May 29, 1964 the sum of $26.5 million was borrowed. All of this has been repaid, and in addition $21 million invested in non-marketable securities redeemable at par practically on demand.

The hon. member for the Northwest Territories raised a number of questions with respect to the administration of labour relations in the Northwest Territories and the operations of the Federal Electric Company. I am sure he knows that at present there is an outstanding conciliation board case affecting the workers and the employer in this case. The conciliation board report has not yet reached me, but when it does it may contain the solution to a number of the problems raised by my hon. friend. He can be assured that this point which he has raised

will be fully considered, and if possible his suggestions will be implemented by the department.

If there are any other questions which hon. members would like me to answer I would be very glad to try and do so.

Mr. More: Mr. Chairman, I just want to ask the minister about his remarks in connection with the appearance of the trustees before a committee of this house. His remarks were pretty general. I could hazard a guess as to the reason he agreed that the meeting of this committee should be later, but what has he in mind? September, October? Could he pin it down to a definite area of time, say within a month?

Mr. MacEachen: I do not want to be pinned down to a definite date because this is a matter which involves the house leader; but it is certainly my intention to advocate the setting up of this committee this fall. That ought to satisfy my hon. friend because this fall is not very far away.

Item agreed to.

Annuities Act—

20. Administration and government's contribution to annuities agents pension account in accordance with regulations made pursuant to vote 181, Appropriation Act No. 5, 1961, $1,229,500.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the minister would make a statement with regard to the annuities act. In particular, could the minister tell us whether the government has any plans for enlarging the provisions of the Government Annuities Act or for extending the promotion of this legislation. As the minister may know from his reading of history—because I believe I am now referring to something which took place before he became a member of this house—it is the fact that about 14 years or so ago the Liberal government of that day brought in a measure to raise the ceiling on the amount of government annuities and to make certain other changes. It is also a matter of record that although that legislation was given second reading in the house and approval by the industrial relations committee of that day, the government allowed it to die on the order paper. I should like to know whether any thought has been given by the present minister or by his department since he became minister to make improvements of that kind in the Government Annuities Act.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, I have two things to say, if I may, in reply to my hon. friend. The hon. member may recall that this spring we did increase the interest rates on government annuities. The interest rates used in the calculation of premiums for immediate annuities for persons aged 55 and over and for group annuities have been increased from 4 per cent to 5¼ and 5 per cent respectively. These changes in government annuity interest rates were necessary to bring the rates more in line with the yield on other good investments. It was apparent that the lower yield on government annuities certainly put the act at a disadvantage in the market, and we took this action in order to remove this disability.

The second thing I should like to say is that we are actively discussing and considering in the Department of Labour the relationship between the government annuities program and the Canada pension plan.

Mr. Knowles: First of all, may I welcome the first of the two statements the minister has just made. This of course is something that the government can do by order in council under the terms of the Government Annuities Act, namely change the applicable rate of interest from time to time. The minister will recall that I referred to the proposal the government made some years ago to raise the maximum amount of annuity obtainable under the act from $100 a month to $200 a month. Is the government now giving consideration to picking up that proposal, which as I say it made and then dropped in about 1950 or 1951?

While I am on my feet perhaps I might ask the minister whether he could be a little more specific as to what he has in mind about the relationship between the Government Annuities Act and the Canada pension plan.

Mr. MacEachen: The answer to the first question, Mr. Chairman, is no. There is no current consideration being given to the proposal which was considered some years ago. The specific answer I can give to the second question is that the annuities program is being considered especially in relation to industrial pensions. However, we have not made any decisions; it is purely in the consideration stage.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Chairman, I would not want to do anything to delay the passage of these estimates but at the same time you did go rather quickly and I suppose it is my fault for not getting to my feet fast enough. We passed item 15, the one just before this, and a number of questions were asked on this item. I asked about the newspaper reports to

the effect that there were a large number of people dropping out of the training courses because the allowances they are given are not large enough to live on while taking training. Then the hon. member for Port Arthur asked whether very careful assessment has been made, is being made or will be made of the number of technical schools which are being and will be built; and he also asked whether the types of courses being offered are designed to meet the needs of 1964, and so on. I wonder whether the minister could deal with these questions at some point.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, so far as the adequacy of training allowances for the unemployed is concerned, we presently pay 90 per cent of these allowances to persons under program 5. The Department of Labour have agreed to pay 90 per cent of an allowance of $55 a week for a married person. That is the present maximum training allowance which we have authorized. We are also quite interested in the usefulness of our training facilities and the expansion of capital facilities. There is a provision in these estimates that will authorize the Department of Labour to enter into agreements with provincial governments to undertake the kind of research that will enable us to evaluate the efficacy of the training programs and establish the relationship of the courses offered to the requirements of industry. Certainly each one of us ought to be concerned that the courses offered are the right kind of courses and meet the requirements of industry. We have under consideration at present meetings with officials of the labour and education departments of the provincial governments to consider how best these courses can be related to the requirements of industry.

Mr. More: Mr. Chairman, we have exceeded the clock at this point and may I say that to my mind it is proper that we should exceed it. I suggest that we will be quite willing to ask for unanimous consent. The hon. member for Winnipeg North posed a question to which he received an answer and we did not object when the time limit was exceeded. As his bill is to be dealt with under private members' business, perhaps he would agree to the committee taking an extra 20 minutes or so at this time to complete these estimates.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Chairman, I have no personal objection. At the same time I do not think I can agree because there are a number of members not here at this time who are interested in matters which come under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labour and who I think will want to speak. Some of them have left town because it is a Friday afternoon with a long week end coming up. I do not think it would be fair to those members who are not here to pass all these estimates at this time. I think we have had a good discussion with no disposition on the part of any member or party to hold up the estimates unnecessarily, and I am sure that when we return to them they will be passed expeditiously. I do not think any real purpose would be served by passing them all now.

The Chairman: May I bring to the attention of hon. members that the last question asked by the hon. member for Winnipeg North related to a previous item and since that item had already been passed I wonder whether it is the disposition of the committee to pass the item now before us before we report?

Item agreed to.

26a. To authorize payment of compensation in the current and subsequent fiscal years to Edgar Simms under the Government Employees Compensation Act in respect of the injury sustained by him while a seaman on board the customs cutter M.V. *Shulamite* in June, 1936, as if he incurred the injury by an accident arising out of and in the course of his employment while an employee within the meaning of the Government Employees Compensation Act, $1.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, I think it was suggested that perhaps we have gone far enough, although personally I would not mind items 26a and 27a carrying. This would bring us to more or less of a clean break and leave the unemployment insurance item for another time.

Item agreed to.

Resolutions adopted in committee of supply this day reported and concurred in.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: 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, private bills.

CRIMINAL CODE

AMENDMENT RESPECTING COMPANY HOUSING

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North) moved the second reading of Bill No. C-50, to amend the Criminal Code (company-censored housing).

He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is a very simple one. Most people in Canada, particularly people who are interested in labour-management relations, have assumed for some considerable time that the law of the country provided for the right of workers who wished to join unions of their choice to do so without discrimination against them and without difficulties being put in their way. The Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act makes this position very clear. Section 3, subsection 1 reads as follows:

> Every employee has the right to be a member of a trade union and to participate in the activities thereof.

This right has not been challenged too often in Canada. Certainly it has not been challenged in most of the cities of Canada. It has not been too difficult for trade union organizers and rank and file members of trade unions interested in getting workers in their industry to join their union, to visit people in their homes or in public places in order to make clear to them the reasons why they should join and to give them the legitimate right to join.

Difficulties have arisen in recent years as resources of Canada in previously inaccessible areas have been developed. Problems have arisen in the mining industry, in the building of hydroelectric plants and in the lumbering industry, to mention just a few. What employers who have desired to get around the provision in the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act, which I have just quoted, have done is to use a provision in the Criminal Code, which in my opinion was never meant to be used when it was drafted for the purpose of preventing union organizers from having the opportunity to speak to people on the job. Section 41, subsection 1, of the Criminal Code, which deals with defence of house or real property, reads as follows:

> Every one who is in peaceable possession of a dwelling house or real property and every one lawfully assisting him or acting under his authority is justified in using force to prevent any person from trespassing on the dwelling house or real property, or to remove a trespasser therefrom, if he uses no more force than is necessary.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the inaccessible areas of Canada when mining operations or lumber operations are opened up the companies have to build bunkhouses for the workers, since there is no other place for them to live. In my opinion the workers who live there have the same rights to have visitors as any other people living in a city or town in a house or an apartment building. This is the place where they live. In my opinion they have a right, and they ought to have a right, to have the same kind of visitors as freely and as easily as people living in the cities or towns of Canada. That has not happened. It is for this reason I have proposed in this bill to add subsection 3 to section 41 of the Criminal Code, which would read as follows:

> Except where a landlord would be therein justified under a covenant with a tenant for quiet enjoyment, nothing in this section shall be deemed to justify an employer in using force to prevent any person from having ingress to, regress over, or egress from a dwelling house or real property in or upon which the employer houses an employee or to remove any person therefrom.

I took the trouble to write some of the unions which have had difficulties in this connection and have secured some details of some of the problems with which they have had to deal. I wrote to the president of the confederation of national trade unions and I received a letter from the president, Mr. Jean Marchand who, as some members of the house will know, is now a member of the biculturalism commission. I want to read from the letter which he wrote me on March 23, 1964, and I quote:

> We are in perfect agreement with this bill which aims to amend the Criminal Code so that the companies could not arbitrarily prevent their employees from joining a union. In the past, it was an accepted policy of the companies to forbid union organizers from visiting workers. Last year, we reached an agreement with the Quebec department of forestry so that passes are issued which entitle our organizers to travel freely on the companies' properties. But the system adopted is one based on privileges. We would prefer to have the Criminal Code amended and eventually the provincial laws.
>
> We support your bill and we hope that it will get through.

I wrote to the international woodworkers of America and I received a letter from the vice president who wrote on behalf of their president on March 17, 1964. He cited a few examples of the difficulty which they had experienced, and I should like to read them into the record so members of the house will realize the type of problem which the union has had to face. I quote:

> At Hystad Bros., Valemount, B.C., Canoe river camp, in March 1962, organizers Mike Sekora, R. E. Larson, and Ed Timmath were threatened by superintendent Jack Woods with R.C.M.P. action for trespassing. The superintendent told the employees in the bunkhouse that they had no right to invite a union man in to see them.
>
> Industrial Lumber Ltd., Celeste, B.C., owned by Federated Co-operatives, organizers R. E. Larson and Clifford Michael were ordered out of the bunkhouse by Art Lloyd, manager of Federated Co-operatives, on the grounds of trespass.

All Fir Lumber Co. Ltd., McLeese Lake, B.C., organizer Ron Tweedie escorted out of bunkhouse by R.C.M.P. on the grounds of trespass.

North Western Pulp & Power Ltd., camp No. 2, Hinton, Alberta. In 1956, Frank Howard, M.P., and Michael Sekora, organizing for the I.W.A. were ordered out of the bunkhouse while signing up the crew. The superintendent, Stuart Allen, called local police to escort them from the property—the police did not respond because the local policeman happened to be an old I.W.A. member and a friend of Sekora.

I should like to cite some of the problems of the united steelworkers of America as they are set out in the "Miners' Voice" dated March, 1964. I quote:

Esterhazy, Sask.—Employees of International Minerals and Chemical Corporation (Canada) Limited who live in the trailer campsite here are being fenced in behind barbed wire and the camp has been declared by the company to be off bounds for visitors.

This latest move is another in a number of anti-union acts taken by I.M.C. to prevent union organization of its employees, charged representatives of the united steelworkers of America. That union is currently engaged in a membership drive at I.M.C. operations in nearby Yarbo.

Mr. Speaker, I am not proposing for a moment that anything be done to force workers to join a union. I believe workers have a right, under our law, to either join a union or not join a union. The point I am raising is that this provision in the Criminal Code dealing with trespass was never designed to be used to interfere with the rights of workers to join a union as it is being used now. This section of the Criminal Code, therefore, ought to be amended along the lines I have proposed. I want to cite some more cases which occurred in the province of Ontario. I shall quote from a letter which I received from the northern Ontario district council of lumber and saw mill workers unions. Here are some of the cases:

Henry Selin Forest Products—Hearst, Ontario.

Numerous attempts were made between 1946 and 1961 to get into the camp area which is seven miles off highway 11, 35 miles west of Hearst. All of these attempts failed. In the early part of 1961, the union repaired 14 miles of old winter haul road and went around the gate and into the camps with 35 organizers. At 3 a.m. a union organizer had to walk out to call the O.P.P. as Selin had blocked the road in many places with bulldozers, graders, trucks and trees. The union had over 90 per cent of the employees in the union when they came out. This shows the men wanted the union, and the union was subsequently certified by the labour relations board and had to pull a strike for a first agreement in October, 1961. Selin immediately blocked the road leaving 42 families isolated without food, medical care, etc. He barred these people from using the road. The union, at great expense, flew all the necessary supplies in to these people, and finally secured an injunction to open the road.

Numerous small operators operate in the area of Chapleau, Ontario. All operate on crown land and all have so-called private roads. Some have gates, others have not.

In the year of 1963, the union had an invitation from the employers in Chapleau Lumber to organize them. This is partly a jackpot family camp and partly bunk-houses. There is no gate on the road. The union secured permission from management to visit the camp (subsequently, this was withdrawn), when the organizers (five in number) went in, the operator called the O.P.P. and attempted to have them arrested for trespass. Charges of trespass were laid against the five and on a later occasion, on another visit, three more were charged wtih the same offence.

In my own province, Mr. Speaker, we have had the development of one of the largest industrial complexes at Thompson, Manitoba. Preparatory to building that plant it was necessary to build a power plant, which was built at Kelsey, some miles from Thompson; but despite the fact that it took two years to complete the building the trade unions were never able to get into that power plant project to discuss with the workers the advisability of their joining a union.

The only way to get into the area was by a spur line railway which was controlled by International Nickel, who instructed the C.N.R. not to sell tickets and not to permit anybody on a train except people with passes from the company. I have in my file sworn affidavits to prove that men worked on that project for as long as six months at a time, seven days a week, working as much as 100 hours a week, not because they wanted to but because they were told that unless they were prepared to work those hours they would be fired immediately.

Those men wanted to join unions, but during the entire time this project was being constructed they were unable to contact union people because the company used the provisions of the Criminal Code, which in my opinion were never meant to be used in this way to get around the very clear intent of the parliament of Canada which passed the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act, and of the provincial governments which passed labour relations acts.

In the same way, when the actual project was begun at Thompson, for two years or more it was impossible for any union organizer to get into Thompson. I know about this because as a member of the legislature I finally got them in, although I must say it took me close to three or four months to get through all the red tape and go from minister to minister, and from deputy minister to deputy minister, to try to get permission to meet the rules and the regulations.

After I had done all this and had been turned down I went on. I told the company I would go in there whether the law permitted or not. I advised the company when I would go and suggested to them that they arrange with the R.C.M.P. to arrest me. I told them I was prepared to appear in court, that I would refuse to pay the fine, which was the only penalty that could be imposed, that I would then probably be adjudged to be in contempt of court, and if the company was prepared to stand the publicity of sending a member of the legislature to jail I was prepared to go to jail for whatever period the magistrate would assess.

But this is not a way which we can get good labour management relations. What we ought to do is amend this section of the code which has been used, is being used and will be used by some unscrupulous employers to get around the very clear intent of the labour relations act.

I hope hon. members of the house will not laud this bill to death, in other words that they will not talk it out. It may be that the government has not had enough time to consider all its implications, and I know it is not very often that a bill proposed by a private member is passed by the house. But if the government is not ready to permit passage of the bill today I would urge that it agree to send the bill to the industrial relations committee where representations could be made by the people concerned, by the unions which have had the difficulties I have mentioned—and there are other unions I have not mentioned which have had difficulties—and by employers who, if they have really good reasons which I have not mentioned for carrying on the kind of activities which I have outlined, could appear and give their reasons so that the committee could consider this matter thoroughly in all its aspects, and bring back a recommendation to the house.

Mr. Macdonald: Before the hon. member takes his seat would he permit a question? Could he give the house the advantage of his understanding of the meaning and effect of the first clause of his amendment, that is, the first 17 words leading up to the comma?

Mr. Orlikow: Could the hon. member be a little more explicit in what he wants me to explain?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I have to interrupt this exchange because the hon. member's time has expired, unless the house wants to give him unanimous agreement to continue so that he may answer the question. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Orlikow: Having looked at it, it is not very difficult to explain. The purpose of this bill is to permit legitimate action. The first 17 words permit a landlord to eject from his premises anybody who is, for example, having a wild party, creating a disturbance which bothers the other tenants, and so on. I think it is quite simple.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Auguste Choquette (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I listened with much interest to the remarks made by the hon. member who spoke before me and even if he did labour his point, I doubt very much that the amendment he is submitting to the house would come under the administration of the Criminal Code.

It is clear and obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the provision he would add to section 41 of the Criminal Code is a provision essentially related to the labour code.

The Criminal Code in sections 40, 41 and 42, deals with the protection of movable property. There is first a provision for the protection of a dwelling house against breaking in or forcible entry.

There is also a provision for the defence not only of a dwelling house but also of real property against a trespasser.

There is also a provision for the assertion of right to real property by the person who is lawfully entitled, whether or not the owner claims a right.

Mr. Speaker, it is a question of establishing the right of the occupant. Is he an occupant by sufferance? Is he a tenant? Is he a landlord? It is advisable to set boundaries to know up to which point it is possible to resist the intrusion of another person. It is difficult to pass an amendment such as the one introduced because it contains many ambiguities.

It reads as follows:

(3) Except where a landlord would be therein justified under a covenant with a tenant for quiet enjoyment—

As pointed out a little earlier by the hon. member for Rosedale (Mr. Macdonald), that is when he asked a question to get more information, the beginning of this amendment leaves us wondering and makes it rather hard to understand its meaning.

The question is to find out if the landlord is ready to require his tenant to occupy the

rented premises according to the conditions set out in a lease. If such or such a condition is set out in a lease, the tenant has to comply with it, nothing more. There is no need to amend the Criminal Code to determine how the person who occupies the premises—that is whether the landlord is an employer or an employee, whatever his trade or profession—must behave; the lessee must comply with the conditions set out in the lease.

If there is no lease, reference will be made to the civil code of the province where the lease is granted, in order to know, when it is a tacit lease, in which way it must be executed, under what conditions the tenant must occupy the leased premises. The Criminal Code is concerned when the question is to determine in which way someone must face an aggression, an attack or a trespass. If someone is attacked, he has the right, under the provisions of the Criminal Code, to defend himself. The conditions for admission of self-defence are set out in sections 34 to 37 inclusive of the Criminal Code.

The conditions required to act in self-defence are the following:

A person must be illegally assaulted, must not have provoked his attacker, must not have intended to kill or seriously injure him and must not have resorted to anything else but the necessary force.

When serious injuries have been inflicted or death occurred following the quarrel created, as it were, by resisting the aggression, then, the person alleging self-defence must have had reasons to fear either death or serious injuries, or fear, for reasonable motives, that he could not himself escape death or serious injuries.

That is the theory of legitimate defence.

The case mentioned by the hon. member could occur if, after allowing his employee to occupy a property he owns, an employer sought to prevent a third party from visiting his employee on the premises in question.

Mr. Speaker, I now come to the point which interests the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow). All those things had to be explained to my hon. friend because he does not understand anything about the Criminal Code. He may be conversant with matters pertaining to labour conditions but the Criminal Code has a very distinct character, in that it contains provisions for the maintenance of public order and, in this case, for the protection, first, of the person and then of the individual's property, both real and movable.

As I said a moment ago, the amendment now before us cannot be inserted in any way in the Criminal Code, because it is in no way related to the spirit which characterizes the Criminal Code.

As I have already pointed out, if a third party comes to meet or visit someone occupying his employer's property, the question is then to determine the right of the occupant, and that only in the light of the civil code. There is no question here of applying the Criminal Code. It is a matter of finding out what rights has the occupant of those premises, in what manner he is entitled to occupy those premises as provided in a written lease or one that is merely implied.

If the employer wishes to prevent the visitor or third party from going to the place occupied by the employee, everything depends on how he will go about it. If the employer assaults the visitor or the third party, then, the Criminal Code will provide protection for the employee or the visitor if the employer illegally commits an assault.

Therefore, there is no reason to amend the Criminal Code. We only have to establish the right of a tenant and to see to what extent, under the labour legislation, union organizations can authorize such relationship with union leaders and company employees.

Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member introduces an amendment to the Criminal Code in order to determine the nature of relations between employer and employee, then, I say he goes the wrong way about it and he should merely see to it that labour legislation be amended accordingly.

[*Text*]

Mr. Grant Deachman (Vancouver Quadra): I am very sympathetic to the objectives of the hon. member who introduced this bill to the house. We have gone a long way in our democratic society in providing access for the ordinary man, the worker, to organizations to protect himself against the overwhelming power of his employer within the framework of trade unions. Everyone in this house is sympathetic to the need for legislation to protect the rights of Canadian workers.

One wonders however in looking at this bill whether the hon. member has approached the question from the right side. Is he approaching something which belongs essentially to the realm of property law? Should he have brought this provision in by means of an amendment to the labour laws or by way of a resolution? I wish to comment on one or two points which came to my mind—

and it is not a legal mind—as I read this bill and as I listened to the hon. member discussing it in the chamber today. I wonder how this measure would affect military property or, let us say, the army, where the army is the employer and where the employee is a soldier in a bunkhouse or a married soldier with a family living in married quarters on a national defence establishment. Would not the same law which he is proposing here essentially to deal with a labour matter apply in an area in which he had not anticipated it would apply?

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the hon. member would permit a question.

Mr. Deachman: I would be very glad to answer a question.

Mr. Orlikow: I am very sympathetic to labour organizations but I wonder whether the hon. member is suggesting that we should extend the rights of people to belong to a union so that the ordinary private in the army could belong to a union which would deal with his officers? Is that what the hon. member is suggesting?

Mr. Deachman: I am afraid I was not suggesting that for a moment. I was suggesting that the hon. member has brought into the house a bill which deals with the relationship between landlord and tenant, and the landlord's rights in respect of that property. If this bill were passed by the house its provisions would apply equally in the case of national defence properties, and the relationship of members of the armed forces, as it would to the landlord and tenant relationship which he has explained may exist in mill towns, and for which he really wishes this bill passed by the house.

I suggest to the hon. member that there is a great deal of difference in the relationship of a landlord or an employer with regard to bunkhouses. This was raised in letters which the hon. member quoted. I believe that in a lumber camp, a fishing cannery, or whatever it may be, where temporary quarters are constructed some discipline must apply with regard to such temporary living quarters, and there really is no tenant and no lease in respect of these bunkhouses that applies to the particular case the hon. member has in mind.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I suggest this is really not the avenue through which to approach this problem, but that adequate avenues are open to the hon. member and he would indeed be advancing the cause of labour were he to seek these avenues and bring his suggestion on to the floor of the house either through the labour laws or by way of a resolution for discussion by the house.

I have one further small point to raise after listening to my hon. friend. Under the legislation he proposes, a stranger would now have more right than a tenant in the very property in which the tenant lives. I say this because the tenant is bound by the terms of his lease, by the terms of the agreement with his landlord in regard to staying there; but the stranger who comes upon the property, under the bill of my hon. friend, could not be ejected and would indeed enjoy more freedom upon the property than the tenant himself. I do not think it was the aim of my hon. friend to bring about such a relationship when he introduced this bill.

In the early part of his discussion, in reply to a question which the hon. member answered I was not certain that the wording of this bill would prevent the committing of a nuisance on the property. I wonder whether the landlord would be able, under the wording the hon. member has given, to eject, let us say a bagpipes player who insisted on tucking the bag of his bagpipes under his arm and spanking out into action at twelve o'clock at night.

Mr. Regan: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Deachman: I will be glad to answer a question.

Mr. Regan: Would the hon. member tell us what he has against bagpipes, which produce perhaps one of the finest types of music to be heard?

Mr. More: Is this a filibuster?

Mr. Deachman: I have no objection to bagpipes, to pipe organs or to instruments of any kind, provided they are played quietly and at the proper time. But I think in a closely packed community there are limits in this regard and sometimes the landlord might have to take the necessary action to restrict the exuberance of even a bagpipes player.

Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Deachman: I am honoured, Mr. Speaker; I have never been asked so many questions. I must be doing very well today.

Mr. Walker: Does the hon. member not agree that the definition of bagpipes is an ill wind that nobody blows good?

Mr. Deachman: No; that is the definition of an oboe.

Mr. Knowles: Did you say "hobo" or "oboe"?

Mr. Deachman: That is an oboe.

I think, Mr. Speaker, some of the examples I have given are enough to indicate that there are difficulties, and very obvious difficulties, in this bill. I suggest to my hon. friend that he would find a sympathetic audience everywhere in this house if he could find the means to achieve what he wants by way of legislation with which the house can deal.

Mr. D. S. Macdonald (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I would like to follow up the remarks of previous speakers by pointing out that this is really a more appropriate provision for labour relations legislation under the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act or, in the case of Thompson, Manitoba, to which the hon. member referred, the Manitoba labour relations act. I think the weakness of the hon. member's bill was perhaps best disclosed by the hon. member himself in reply to my question as to the meaning of the starting phrase of the bill:

> Except where a landlord would be therein justified under a covenant with a tenant for quiet enjoyment—

The reply of the hon. member indicated that it was his impression that the covenant for quiet enjoyment was an obligation which required a tenant to use the property quietly. I would point out that the obligation of a covenant for quiet enjoyment is quite the reverse; it falls on the landlord and is not at all related to the purposes which to a layman like my hon. friend might appear to be most obvious. Perhaps I may refer my hon. friend to the work of a very distinguished Manitoban, the former chief justice of the court of Queen's bench, Hon. E. K. Williams. This work is entitled "Canadian Law of Landlord and Tenant", and I would refer my hon. friend to page 339 of that work, where he points out as follows:

> The covenant for quiet enjoyment is an assurance against the consequences of a defective title and of any disturbance thereupon and of any substantial interference by the covenantor or those lawfully claiming under him with the enjoyment of the premises for all usual purposes.

To restate it in perhaps less technical language, it is an undertaking either implied by law in the lease or included expressly in the lease to make it incumbent upon a landlord to ensure to his tenant, first that he is in fact the owner of the property he is purporting to lease, and the tenant will not be disturbed in it by adverse claims of ownership; and second, that the landlord will not by any act disturb the tenant in his enjoyment of the property. It is also pointed out by the learned author in the same edition of this work, at page 343:

> In order to constitute a breach of covenant for quiet enjoyment, it is sufficient that the lessee's ordinary and lawful enjoyment of the demised land be substantially interfered with by the acts of the lessor, or those lawfully claiming under him, although neither the title to the land nor the possession thereof be otherwise affected.

I would point out that this gives to the tenant in question an obvious civil right which he can pursue in the civil courts of the province to protect him against the kind of harassment to which the hon. member has been referring. Specifically Mr. Speaker, it has been held in various cases that the tenant, the tenant's invitees, those coming in to engage in business relations with him, or the tenant's licencees—that is, those coming in for non-commercial reasons—are entitled to have access to the property, and actions of the landlord which would prevent such persons or the tenant from having the normal use of the property may be the subject of an injunction under the landlord and tenant act. It would appear—

Mr. Orlikow: I wonder whether I could ask the hon. member a question. How long does he think a worker in a camp who went to his employer and said "I should like Mr. Smith, the union organizer, to come and visit me" would be able to continue before he was fired?

Mr. Macdonald: I am suggesting, and the hon. member merely underlines my argument again, that the proper course of action for him to take is not by producing garbled amendments to the Criminal Code but by producing amendments to the appropriate labour legislation, which essentially would—

Mr. Orlikow: Which you would talk out.

Mr. Macdonald: Let the hon. member bring forward an amendment to the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act and we will see.

Mr. Orlikow: Do you think we have not tried?

Mr. Knowles: We have seen, and we know.

Mr. Macdonald: The hon. member has no such legislation on the order paper and is in fact proceeding on a misunderstanding of the law applicable in these circumstances. What has to be borne in mind, as the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Deachman) pointed out so effectively, is that the effect of this particular provision would go far beyond the provisions relating to labour disputes which so much concern my hon. friend—and I do not for a moment question the legitimacy of his concern. First of all, the effect would be to prevent a landlord from taking action to expel a squatter, which is not connected with a labour dispute—someone with no colour of right to be on the land in question. Yet as my hon. friend pointed out, the amendment could apply in such a way as to protect someone who was a mere trespasser on the land with no rights whatever. It could apply far beyond the labour union situation. It could apply to the hon. member's own residence or the residence of any hon. member of this house.

I would also point out that the effect of the provision would also prevent a landlord or the person responsible for property on behalf of other occupants, such as a bunkhouse, a rooming house, an apartment or otherwise, from taking action to expel undesirable persons, persons undesirable in the view of other occupants of the premises. For example, such person as the loudmouth, the lunatic, or the drunk who might be in a particular rooming house and causing concern and disturbance to others. Under the provisions of the hon. member's amendment such person could not in any legitimate way be removed from the premises.

I would also point out to the hon. member that there is a substantial protection for persons in the form of jeopardy to which he referred. Once again while the hon. member read a great many hortatory statements into the record, he did not give any indication whether he had taken any expert advice or whether there had been any legal proceedings to determine the assertion which he made.

In this connection I refer him to section 42 (3) of the Criminal Code, and for the benefit of the house I might be permitted to read it into the record:

> Where a person
>
> (a) having peaceable possession of a dwelling house or real property under a claim of right, or
>
> (b) acting under the authority of a person who has peaceable possession of a dwelling house or real property under a claim of right, assaults any person who is lawfully entitled to possession of it and who is entering it peaceably by day to take possession of it, for the purpose of preventing him from entering, the assault shall be deemed to be provoked by the person who is entering.

The effect of the provision, therefore, is to extend the justification provisions which are already provided by section 41 and the earlier provisions of section 42 of the Criminal Code to the person who has a colour of right to be on the property, to tenants, to tenants' licensees, to tenants' invitees, permitting them to resist efforts by the landlord or the person acting on the authority of the landlord to exclude them from the premises, or otherwise be forced to prevent them from remaining on the premises. I suggest that substantially the provisions provided by the Criminal Code already give this right.

The hon. member referred at length to the practices of the International Nickel Company at Thompson, Manitoba. I have discussed these matters with the hon. member for York-Scarborough (Mr. Moreau), for example, who has himself, as has the hon. member, had experience with that particular situation. Perhaps I am out of order in referring to these but I think they bring into question other federal legislation and other lines of possible legal action which, had the hon. member for Winnipeg North and his associates done slightly more resourceful thinking, could have been followed up. For example, the hon. member referred to the actions of the C.N.R. in refusing to ticket people who did not have a pass issued by the company. The C.N.R. is, after all, a common carrier and the provisions of the Railway Act should be considered from the standpoint of taking action to prevent such misconduct. I do not condone for a moment the suggestion that union organizers should not be entitled to go on the property but I do suggest that this is not the proper type of legislation—this kind of garbled, ill-conceived and badly drawn legislation founded on a misunderstanding of the law—to best protect the rights either of the organizer or of the people who most desire the protection of the law so that they can carry on this very legitimate objective.

In closing, I might make reference to the fact that perhaps this is one of the most obscure provisions that has been introduced into this house for some time. Not only is obscurity created because of a misunderstanding of the law on the part of the hon. member, to which I have already referred, but up until the time the hon. member rose to his feet this house had not had the courtesy

of an explanation of the situation which the hon. member is trying to remedy, or an explanation of what was the purpose of the bill. I can understand that he did not have an opportunity to give this explanation when he introduced the bill, because it was introduced along with many others at the start of the session; but I do deplore the fact that the hon. member did not have the courtesy to put on the bill any explanatory note so that hon. members, and not just hon. members who may have some knowledge of the law of landlord or tenant or some knowledge of the law concerning labour relations, would know the specific problem to which the hon. member was directing himself and the effect of the provisions he is setting out. I would make these words applicable to all bills of this highly technical nature which are brought before the house. There is an obligation on hon. members to make a brief and lucid statement by way of explanatory note which is attached to the bill and serves to explain the purposes and objectives of it.

So, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the bill is founded on a mistaken knowledge of the law; that it would have application far beyond the field of labour relations to which the hon. member has sought to carry it; would have an adverse effect, as hon. members have pointed out, beyond the field of labour relations; and because there are many incidental effects which the hon. member has apparently not foreseen, I would certainly oppose passage of this measure.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hour appointed for the consideration of private members' business has expired.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Churchill: I should like to ask the acting house leader whether there will be a change of program next week due to the revolt of the government's political allies which occurred yesterday?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, in asking such a question the hon. gentleman should not have added a gratuitous allegation, or misallegation, at the end of his statement. I think by way of reply I should equally take advantage of the rules for a moment to express to each hon. member in the chamber the wish for a very pleasant and refreshing week end holiday and I would advise them that the business on Tuesday will be a continuation of the business that has been occupying our attention for all of this week, except today.

At 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 LABOUR

A—Department—

1. General administration, including grants as detailed in the estimates; the expenses of the international labour conferences; the promotion of labour-management co-operation; the promotion of a program for the employment of the older worker; the promotion of a program for combatting seasonal unemployment; the organization and use of workers for farming and related industries; and the manpower consultative service, $4,243,100.

1a. General administration, $177,000.

5. Payments to carry out the purposes of the Vocational Rehabilitation of Disabled Persons Act and agreements made thereunder, including undischarged commitments under previous agreements; payments in accordance with terms and conditions approved by the governor in council to employers of 50% of monthly wage paid or $75 per month, whichever is less, on behalf of each full time worker 45 years of age or over engaged during the period November 1, 1963 to March 31, 1964, and who is otherwise eligible under the older worker employment and training incentive program; payments to provinces under agreements entered into with the provinces by the Minister of Labour with the approval of the governor in council for the organization and use of workers for farming and related industries; and to authorize payments in accordance with agreements entered into with the approval of the governor in council by the Minister of Labour with provinces, employers and workers in respect of labour mobility and assessment incentives, $4,910,000.

7a. To authorize the governor in council to transfer the powers, duties and functions of the unemployment insurance commission under sections 21-24, inclusive, of the Unemployment Insurance Act to the Minister of Labour, and to transfer such members of the staff of the unemployment insurance commission as may be necessary to give effect to the foregoing to the Department of Labour; and to provide that the provisions made by an Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965, based on estimates 1964-65, to defray (a) expenses of the unemployment insurance commission with respect to the powers, duties and functions referred to herein; and (b) expenses for the transfer of labour to places where employment is available and expenses incidental thereto in accordance with regulations of the governor in council; shall apply to such classifications of the public service within the Department of Labour as the governor in council may determine, $1.

Technical and vocational training assistance—

10. Administration, $699,300.

10a. Administration, $86,000.

15. To carry out the purposes of the Technical and Vocational Training Assistance Act and agreements made thereunder—Payments to the provinces, $100,409,600.

15a. To carry out the purposes of the Technical and Vocational Training Assistance Act and agreements made thereunder—Payments to the provinces —To extend the purposes of vote 15 of the main estimates, 1964-65 to authorize the Minister of Labour to enter into agreements with any province subject to terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the governor in council for the purpose of sharing in provincial government expenditures or grants for research projects to provide information relating to technical and vocational training and manpower requirements; and to provide for payment of the federal share of provincial expenditures and grants under these agreements during the current fiscal year, $1.

Annuities Act—

20. Administration and government's contribution to annuities agents pension account in accordance with regulations made pursuant to vote 181, Appropriation Act No. 5, 1961, $1,229,500.

Government employees compensation—

25. Administration of the Government Employees Compensation Act, $130,000.

26a. To authorize payment of compensation in the current and subsequent fiscal years to Edgar Simms under the Government Employees Compensation Act in respect of the injury sustained by him while a seaman on board the customs cutter M.V. *Shulamite* in June, 1936, as if he incurred the injury by an accident arising out of and in the course of his employment while an employee within the meaning of the government Employees Compensation Act, $1.

27a. To authorize in the current and subsequent fiscal years payment of compensation pursuant to the Government Employees Compensation Act to the dependents of any former employee within the meaning of that act who died in Prince Edward Island during the period commencing on the 1st day of October 1935 and ending on March 15, 1961, as a result of injury arising out of and in the course of employment, in such amount as would be payable to the dependents had the said employee died on or after March 16, 1961, $1.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, September 8, 1964

The house met at 2 p.m.

RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES

Fifth report of standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines—Mr. Richard.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REPORT ON MEETING OF CANADA-JAPAN MINISTERIAL COMMITTEE

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I wish to report on the recent meeting of the Canada-Japan ministerial committee from which my colleagues and I returned last evening, and to table the final communiqué of the meeting.

The establishment of this ministerial committee was agreed upon in 1961 at the time of Prime Minister Ikeda's visit to Ottawa. This third meeting took place in the foreign ministry in Tokyo on September 4 and 5.

Japan was represented by the ministers of foreign affairs, finance, agriculture and forestry, and international trade and industry; by the director of the economic planning agency, and by Mr. Hisanaga Shimazu, the new ambassador to Canada. The ministers of finance, trade and commerce, fisheries, myself and the Canadian ambassador to Japan, Mr. Bower, formed the Canadian delegation.

This was a useful meeting. We made progress, I believe, in mutual understanding. The ministerial committee is not a negotiating body. It provides a forum in which ministers from the two countries can exchange views on relations between Canada and Japan and on international problems. We now understand better the Japanese point of view on many questions, and I think they better understand ours.

We found that Canada and Japan have to almost all situations a common approach based on common beliefs in freedom, justice and the desirability of measures to promote world prosperity. We noted the numerous occasions on which our delegations have worked together at the United Nations, particularly in the promotion of the treaty to suspend nuclear testing. Japan shares with Canada the belief that the United Nations remains the main hope for the promotion of peace in the world, and the determination that the organization should be strengthened and its finances assured. We engaged as well in discussions on the role of the United Nations in peace keeping operations.

The committee had an interesting exchange of views on the various political situations in Asia. The Japanese, like us, are concerned over the Indonesian conflict with Malaysia and share our hope that the dispute will be settled by peaceful means in accordance with the charter of the United Nations. The committee agreed as well on the urgent necessity of restoring stability and of improving the well being of the Vietnamese and the other Indochinese peoples. We found that, like ourselves, the Japanese were giving careful thought to the problem of communist China. In this and many other fields we are resolved to continue to work together in close consultation, convinced that Canada and Japan as neighbouring countries across the Pacific have a consequential role to play in the promotion of stability and in the economic development of the Asian and Pacific regions.

We reviewed the current economic position and prospects for the two economies. Canadian ministers were much impressed by the determination and purpose with which the government and people of Japan are pursuing their policies of modernization and economic growth. There is every reason to believe that Canadian exports to Japan, which have risen so rapidly in recent years, will continue to expand at a good rate as a result both of expansion of the Japanese economy and further trade liberalization.

We discussed in some detail the various quantitative restrictions and other Japanese obstacles to trade which still limit sales of Canadian goods to Japan. We expressed our expectation of early progress in liberalizing remaining Japanese restrictions and of important and meaningful negotiations between Japan and Canada in the course of the current Kennedy round of trade and tariff negotiations.

The Japanese ministers drew attention to the imbalance of trade with Canada and to

the inhibition of their sales to Canada represented by the restraints they observe on exports of certain of their products to this country to avoid disruption of our market. Canadian ministers noted that nearly all Canadian exports to Japan are essential foodstuffs or necessary industrial material, which provide the sinews of Japanese economic strength. On the other hand, most Japanese exports are manufactures and directly competitive with Canadian production. In the circumstances a trade imbalance is not unnatural.

Both sides were agreed on the desirability of an expansion of trade in both directions. It was noted that there was a variety of opportunities for the further diversification of Japanese sales to Canada. In this regard a high level Japanese economic mission will be visiting Canada in October.

Our discussions led to an improved understanding of the problem of voluntary restraints as seen from the two sides. Canadian ministers noted in this regard that no other highly industrialized country extends more liberal treatment than does Canada to Japanese imports. The communiqué records our agreement that recourse to such restraints should be kept to a minimum and that necessary consultations in this regard should be expeditious and based on mutual understanding.

We had an excellent exchange of views about international economic matters, including the status of the Kennedy round, international liquidity, the trade and development problems of the less advanced countries and east-west trade. In all these important matters there was a remarkable and gratifying similarity of interest and outlook. We found ourselves in full agreement on the objectives of trade liberalization to be pursued through the Kennedy round and expressed determination to do our respective parts to make the negotiations a success. Ministers specifically agreed to maintain close co-operation between their respective delegations throughout these important negotiations.

There was useful discussion of fisheries matters. We considered the problems facing the meeting of the parties to the north Pacific convention which opens here in Ottawa tomorrow. As a result we are hopeful that a formula will be found which will adequately reflect the interests of the three countries and result in the maintenance and development of the vital fisheries resources of the north Pacific. Other fisheries questions were considered, including the Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act of Canada. I am satisfied that as an outcome of our discussions the extent of fisheries co-operation between Canada and Japan has been enlarged and will be intensified in the years to come.

We renewed our invitation to Japan to participate in Expo '67, and we trust that a decision will soon be taken to permit a worthy representation in Montreal of the traditional culture and modern accomplishments of our Pacific neighbour.

The Minister of Finance took advantage of his visit to Japan to sign on behalf of Canada an agreement for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income. This agreement will be submitted to the house and to the Japanese Diet for approval before ratification.

I signed on behalf of Canada an exchange of notes covering the mutual waiver of certain visa requirements between the two countries.

In a different field we noted the progress made in the development of communication satellites, an area which offers the prospect of extensive future co-operation between our two countries.

I would like to express my gratitude for the conversations I was privileged to have with the Japanese prime minister. Mr. Ikeda added his personal views on many subjects, and I was particularly impressed with his qualities of statesmanship and his understanding of the international scene.

I wish to mention the all too brief visit the Minister of Trade and Commerce and I were able to make to the city of Hiroshima. We were deeply moved. The indelible message of Hiroshima cannot be adequately expressed in words. It must never be forgotten, even though a fine new city all but covers the scars.

Japan, after the United States and Great Britain, is Canada's most important trading partner, and these ministerial meetings have provided a valuable opportunity for developing closer relations with this great Pacific nation as a neighbour and a friend.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the summary given by the Secretary of State for External Affairs regarding the ministerial meetings in Japan does reveal one continuing fact, namely the close relationship between the Japanese and the Canadian peoples. The minister mentioned the visit to Hiroshima, a visit that

could result only in a greater determination that never again shall there be resort to nuclear arms. It shows the utter devastation that results from the use of an instrument which, while a tremendous power for good, also represents the sword of potential destruction.

As to the references by the minister to the Prime Minister of Japan, may I say that anyone who has met with Mr. Ikeda cannot be other than greatly impressed not only by his knowledge of international affairs, to which the minister alluded, but as well by the wealth of friendship which he shows in everything he says and does in relation to Canada.

As to what took place, I think the house will be disappointed that it has not received some concrete information. Amidst a mass of generalities and grandiloquent prose, all that emerges is that these meetings are beneficial; and they are. But what action was determined upon is left to the imagination.

In our trading relations with Japan the imbalance of trade is a matter that has continued throughout the years. I do not forget that when we were in office the Prime Minister, then leader of the opposition, on more than one occasion expressed his great concern respecting our trade imbalance with Japan. I recall one time in particular, on February 23, 1962, when he asked whether the Japanese authorities were "becoming embittered by the efforts of the federal government to keep a tight lid on exports from their country to Canada, despite a continuing increase in Canadian sales to Japan". The view of the Liberal party of that day, if that question meant what it apparently did, was that we should not endeavour, by securing mutual quotas, to prevent the dumping or the export to Canada of products in the production which Canadians could not compete. However, since the present government has come into office it has generally followed the course of the previous government despite the protestations to the contrary in the past.

Sir, all of us in this house recognize that Japan, who only a few short years ago was a major enemy, has in the intervening comparatively few years since the end of the war become an exponent of democracy, a country which practises democracy and whose watchwords are freedom and liberty, having a desire to walk side by side with the free nations in maintaining freedom in all parts of the world as well as at all times standing firmly against the onrush of communism.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, members in all parts of the house will welcome the return of the delegation of Canadian ministers from their visit to Tokyo, and we are glad to have the report today from the Secretary of State for External Affairs. I think it is encouraging to know that representatives of the Canadian government can sit down with the cabinet ministers of Japan, and that a nation with which a few years ago we were at war should now be willing to agree that the various international differences that affect the world must be worked out within the charter of the United Nations. I think we can now confidently hope that our days of difference with Japan are behind us, and that before us stretches a new vista of peaceful co-operation.

I was particularly impressed with the statement made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs regarding the liberalization of trade between Canada and Japan. The minister spoke in most optimistic terms. However, this statement is hardly in accord with that made by the Minister of Finance according to a Tokyo report, which says:

> Finance Minister Walter Gordon of Canada said yesterday his government will not tolerate damage to well established Canadian industries by unrestrained imports on low cost Japanese goods.

The minister went on to say:

> This year these restraints apply mostly to textiles, footwear and tableware and make up only one quarter of Japan's total exports to Canada of $150 million.

Then the report goes on to say that no agreement was reached on the issue of Japanese worsteds, and it points out that the Japanese government are not satisfied that Canadian industry is being hurt by the import of Japanese worsteds into this country.

I think we must recognize, Mr. Speaker, that Japan offers a great market for Canada, particularly for western Canada, and it is very important to our future economic development. We must also recognize that Japan buys from us a great deal more than we buy from her, and that if this trade is to continue we must open up avenues by which Japan can sell her goods in Canada. This might have to be a gradual adjustment of present voluntary restrictions, but it must be definite and must not merely consist of platitudes. I hope before long we will have some definitive statement from the government as to how much this liberalization of trade is to be a reality and how much of it is to be a myth.

There is one other thing I should like to say, that the minister's statement with reference to Hiroshima I am sure impressed all of

us. I think it is not only important that we say it will never be forgotten; I think we must also resolve that it will never be repeated.

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, we join in welcoming the Secretary of State for External Affairs and other members of the delegation who have returned from their journey to Japan. I believe we have a mutual feeling of appreciation for the abbreviated but still comprehensive report the minister has made to us in respect of the negotiations and actions taken in Japan at this ministerial conference.

It is significant that this particular conference should have taken place as it did, just prior to the Olympic games which will shortly begin in Japan. I think both serve to remind us of that ever-narrowing world which brings us all, nation and nation, citizen and citizen, closer together.

References to Hiroshima that have already been made, are something that strike close to the hearts of all peace-loving people and reminds us all of the awfulness of the age in which we live, should those scientific inventions that have been brought to reality be used for purposes other than peaceful development.

It is discouraging that in his remarks the minister had to mention the problem that exists today between our fellow commonwealth nations, Malaysia and Indonesia, and that the threat of war still hangs heavy in many parts of the world.

Obviously the bulk of the discussions that took place had to do with trade. The minister's remarks reminded us very clearly that trade is a two-way street, and that we cannot expect to sell unless we are likewise willing to buy. We in the west are particularly interested in the potential of trade with Japan. Within these few days while this conference has been taking place a group of Japanese industrialists have been investigating the potentials with respect to the coal necessary to feed the furnaces of Japan, in my own constituency. It is true that we have a tremendous potential in trade with Japan, but this will not come to pass unless the talks which have just taken place are extended so they become mutually satisfactory arrangements.

Certainly there is something most commendable in the fact that two countries such as Japan and Canada can sit down at the level which these talks took place and discuss these problems, and then arrive at voluntary restraints upon each other's policies, in an effort to assist each other, as they at the same time seek to ease those burdens that each nation has relating to this problem of trade. It is noted also that the minister mentioned the fisheries problems, and we know these are urgent. We are pleased that this subject has been discussed as well.

It is not necessary to go into great detail at this time, Mr. Speaker, except to say again that I think it is encouraging to find negotiations of this type taking place at this level which can also bring about such courtesies and convenient arrangements regarding visas and taxation which are to the mutual advantage of the citizens of both nations.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, we welcome this report and look forward to more details of the discussions, and the opportunity for debate at a later date in the house.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, the statement just made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs was certainly most interesting. The members of this house and the Canadian people will readily appreciate that, besides being one of the largest markets for Canadian products, Japan can also supply us with items that are not produced here.

We export goods and industrial equipment to Japan and, in so doing, we find that in addition to assisting that country, we are also helping Canadian producers. The minister is convinced that Japan represents one of the best foreign outlets in the world for our export products.

One point on which I quite agree with the minister is this. I much prefer seeing him do business with Japan than with the communist countries of the world. I doubt that Japan will use Canadian products to try through economic means to win the world over to a communist ideology. The Japanese respect the human being, just as we do here in Canada, and I feel that we must do everything that is humanly possible to improve relations between our country and Japan.

At this stage, Mr. Speaker, I wish to repeat that ahead of the Japanese market or any other market throughout the world, there is a domestic market which is not satisfied and I am anxious to see the day when the members of the cabinet, led by the Prime Minister, will propose to us solutions or means to

satisfy the domestic market first, that is the Canadian consumers, the Canadian unemployed, in short the Canadian families which also need food and perhaps industrial machinery on the eastern farms.

For instance, we are told that Japan is improving greatly, that Hiroshima was built following its destruction, and so on. However, we are not being told about the number of unemployed in Japan. Perhaps there are not any? If so, why are we not given the reasons for it, so that we could adopt the same methods in Canada and improve the living conditions of Canadians?

It seems to me that it is high time for the ministers, who travel throughout the world, to submit to us concrete and objective solutions which would set our own house in order. We could then bring this to bear on our relations with neighbouring countries.

[*Text*]

REPORT ON MEETING OF COMMONWEALTH ECONOMIC CONSULTATIVE COUNCIL

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I ask permission of the house to table a copy of the communiqué issued following the meeting of the commonwealth economic consultative council held in Kuala Lumpur on September 1 and 2, which the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Finance and I attended as representatives of the Canadian government.

Mr. Speaker: Has the minister permission to table the communiqué?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Sharp: On the way to Kuala Lumpur we paid short visits to Hong Kong and Singapore, meeting local government officials and businessmen interested in trade with Canada. While in Hong Kong we had the opportunity of discussions with representatives of the China Resources Company which, as hon. members are aware, has been buying substantial quantities of wheat from the Canadian wheat board on behalf of mainland China.

In Hong Kong, in Singapore, in Kuala Lumpur and later in Tokyo we were enormously impressed by the high rate of economic activity. Everywhere one looked factories were being erected, roads were being built, apartment houses were rising. There can be no doubt that these Pacific countries are on the march and have great potential as markets for Canadian products.

The commonwealth economic consultative council met in Kuala Lumpur on the first anniversary of the founding of Malaysia. We were happy to join in the celebrations. I regret to say that the celebrations were marred by less happy events, and I draw attention to the text of the communiqué in which the ministers from all the 18 independent commonwealth countries joined in recalling the assurance given by the commonwealth prime ministers of their sympathy and support of Malaysia's efforts to preserve its sovereign independence and integrity and to achieve a peaceful and honourable settlement of its current differences with its neighbours.

The discussions at Kuala Lumpur were notable for their emphasis upon the problems of the developing countries, both within and without the commonwealth. We were happy to be able to say that Canada is stepping up the level and quality of our external aid, particularly in the field of education, and that the government of Canada supports strongly the international efforts that are being made to improve the trading position of the developing countries.

ROYAL VISIT

REPORTED DANGER TO QUEEN IN QUEBEC

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I ask the Prime Minister if he has had brought to his attention a broadcast over the C.B.C. by Brigadier Michael Wardell regarding the prospective visit of Her Majesty the Queen. Has he, in the last few days, had any occasion to receive the views of Canadians in various parts of Canada who have suggested, as did Mr. Wardell, that in view of the continuing threats consideration should be given by the Prime Minister to recommending that the visit of Her Majesty should not take place as scheduled? Has the government given the fullest consideration to this matter, a problem that is really a difficult one and which will certainly exercise the mind of the Prime Minister, who is her adviser?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity of listening to the broadcast to which my hon. friend referred. I thought the language used in portraying the situation in Canada which would confront Her Majesty when she visits this country was extravagant and indeed extreme. I do not agree that Her Majesty in coming to

Canada, to use the words of Brigadier Wardell, is being subjected to a very awful risk. I have had no correspondence, Mr. Speaker, immediately before or since that broadcast along the lines of the views of Brigadier Wardell. The government is confident that the Queen will receive a warm welcome when she comes to Canada. I think it unfortunate that this visit should be interpreted in the terms used by the gentleman who made the broadcast to which my hon. friend referred.

UNITED NATIONS

CANADIAN POSITION ON ADMISSION OF COMMUNIST CHINA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): May I direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs regarding a press dispatch which says that external affairs minister Paul Martin expressed Canada's hope that an advance would be made during the forthcoming United Nations general assembly toward a solution of the problem of whether to admit communist China to the world organization. I should like to ask the minister if his statement in Tokyo indicates that the Canadian government, first, is going to promote the seating of mainland China in the United Nations or, second, will vote to seat mainland China in the event that this question comes before the United Nations at its coming session.

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): It was natural that in discussions with the government of Japan, that great Asian country, this problem should be raised; and it was discussed very frankly. I stated to the government of Japan what I had already stated to this house on May 22.

Mr. Douglas: May I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the minister about a further statement which is attributed to him in the same dispatch, and which is in quotation marks.

> We hope such an advance would be acceptable to the United States.

May I ask the minister whether Canadian policy is being held up until the United States indicates its willingness to have Canada take this course of action; and is United States acceptance a *sine qua non* of Canada adopting a policy for the seating of mainland China in the United Nations?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): My hon. friend will perhaps recall that in the detailed statement I made on May 22 I was discussing a situation which could affect Formosa. I had suggested that consideration be given to preliminary steps for preserving the integrity of that particular country.

With regard to the other part of the question, it is not correct to say that foreign policy is dictated as the result of action taken by another power, no matter how great or friendly; but it is elementary, and I believe desirable, that in the formulation of policy one should take into account a number of considerations. Among those considerations in this instance must be the views of the friends with whom Canada is closely associated. The United States happens to be one of these countries, as is Japan.

Mr. Herridge: The answer is yes.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

POSSIBLE MEETING BETWEEN PRIME MINISTER AND U.S. PRESIDENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the right hon. Prime Minister. Will the Prime Minister advise the house whether, as reported, consideration is being given to a meeting between himself and President Johnson at some point on the Pacific coast in the immediate future? If so, what is the purport of such a meeting so close to the United States presidential election? May I ask further, is there any basis for the invitation, which I understand was received from President Johnson, beyond a ceremonial meeting relative to agreements that have some bearing on the Columbia river treaty?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the ratifications in respect of this very important treaty are to be exchanged on September 16. It is considered that it would be appropriate to signify this very important and happy conclusion to such a significant international convention in some way which would result in a meeting between the heads of the governments of the two countries. No final decision has yet been taken but I hope, Mr. Speaker, that such a meeting can be arranged; and I assure my hon. friend if it can be arranged it will not result in any intervention, direct or indirect, in any election in our two countries. I expect to be able to make an announcement on this matter within a day or so, but I repeat that the occasion would be strictly the exchange of ratifications on the happy conclusion of a very important treaty.

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): As a supplementary question, does President Johnson wish to celebrate the ratification of this treaty because of its coming benefits to the United States, where arrangements have been made by the Tacoma city light and power company to purchase one eighth of the downstream benefits, provided as the result of storage in Canada, for $65 million? On the basis of this, Canadian downstream benefits from the Columbia will be sold in the United States for a total of $520 million.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, this government is equally happy to celebrate the conclusion of this international treaty which will confer such great benefits on Canada.

CYPRUS—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON PRESENT POSITION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the fact that for the past 10 days there has been little or no word of negotiations relating to the Cyprus crisis, can the minister give us any idea of recent developments there, particularly as the days are numbered as far as the present arrangements are concerned for peace keeping operations?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the secretary general will be making a report to the security council within the course of the next week, following which there will be a meeting of the security council, when future policy will be decided.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

QUEBEC—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON STEPS TO DEAL WITH F.L.Q.

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, last Monday a question was asked of the Minister of Justice as to whether those who participated in the attempted arms theft in Montreal, which resulted in the homicide of the store proprietor, were members of the F.L.Q. At that time the minister declined to give any information. Since then the F.L.Q., in a communication that it sent out to various people, admitted its participation in the robbery and homicide in question. Is the minister now in a position to make a statement regarding the involvement of the F.L.Q. and the degree to which the F.L.Q. in recent weeks has strengthened its numbers?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, in so far as the persons who are alleged to have been connected directly or by way of concert or conspiracy with the matter just referred to by the right hon. gentleman are concerned, since last Monday some development has taken place and there has been the actual laying of charges against them. I believe that until such charges are disposed of, any comment as to the particular activities of any of the individuals concerned or as to the possible motives which may have animated them would be out of order on my part; and I know the right hon. gentleman will agree that so far as I am concerned for the moment, and for the reasons I have just stated, I am barred by both ethics and custom from commenting further.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to argue that. There is a case before the courts and the matter is sub judice, but the minister would not be barred from answering the other important part of the question, which is the material part. What is the potential strength of the F.L.Q. as estimated by the law officers of the crown or the police officers? Can't he make a statement in that connection?

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to give a statement to the house on that particular aspect of the matter.

Mr. Churchill: Why not?

Mr. Favreau: For two reasons, or at least one. There are police groups other than the R.C.M.P. interested in this matter, and second there is not only the interest of the federal government involved but also of other governments. Third, any disclosure of precise information in this respect would be tantamount to laying out information in the open which it would not be in the public interest to disclose.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I am not making very much progress in the answers I am getting. I ask the minister, in view of the threats that have been made by members of this organization respecting the prospective visit of Her Majesty the Queen, is it not of great importance that the country should know the degree to which the F.L.Q. is merely a small minority and not representative of general thinking?

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, I have my own personal opinion as to this and it would not

be proper for me to state it, but in so far as the actual facts gathered and their disclosure are concerned, I must maintain the same stand as I have just taken and I do not believe that it would be in the public interest—

Mr. Churchill: Why not?

Mr. Favreau: —to refer to this matter further, especially in connection with the very solemn occasion which will be soon taking place and about which I believe questions, like the ones which have been put both to the Prime Minister and myself, are certainly not in the best interests of the country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, as leader of Her Majesty's loyal opposition—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: —I want the assurance that Her Majesty is going to be fully protected and that there is no danger to her.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I won't be brushed off by a supercilious statement by the Minister of Justice in that regard, trying to place responsibility over here for his failure to get after the F.L.Q. as he should.

Mr. Favreau: It would have been much easier to have asked at the beginning whether the government was ready or willing to give that assurance, or desirous of doing so. It has already been given, and it is implied in all the acts of this government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since inquiries are being made about the F.L.Q. in the province of Quebec and about its membership, and that, according to press reports, a special bullet-proof armoured car will be used in Quebec city, I ask the Minister of Justice whether it would not be possible to give as much malicious publicity to an incident which happened in Toronto last night? Were the necessary steps taken to prevent young people from causing trouble in that city when the Beatles arrived? Therefore, I ask if the Beatles are also controlled these days, in order to prevent the Queen from coming to Canada?

[*Text*]

CONFERENCE BETWEEN JUSTICE MINISTER AND QUEBEC ATTORNEY GENERAL

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Hon. Léon Balcer (Three Rivers): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice?

Can the minister tell us whether he has been invited by the new solicitor general of the province of Quebec to discuss crime prevention with him?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I did not have that honour.

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Could the minister tell us whether certain judges who come under his jurisdiction such as the judges of the superior court have been called to a meeting by the new solicitor general?

Mr. Favreau: I do not think so, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Rémi Paul (Berthier-Maskinongé-Delanaudière): May I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker?

Has the Minister of Justice discussed with the new solicitor general of the province of Quebec certain future reforms concerning the parole of prisoners now being held at St. Vincent de Paul or in other Quebec penitentiaries?

Mr. Favreau: The answer is no, Mr. Speaker.

[*Text*]

HAL BANKS—SUGGESTED APPOINTMENT OF ROYAL COMMISSION

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Raymond Langlois (Mégantic): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct to the Minister of Justice a question which is likely to clarify a little the situation as regards Mr. Hal Banks and what he has been up to recently. Does the minister intend to establish a royal commission in order to clear up certain questions raised by members of this house as well as by the population?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I must say that up to now that solution has not been considered.

[*Text*]

CANADIAN FLAG

SUGGESTED MEETING OF PARTY LEADERS TO CONSIDER PROCEDURE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): I should like to address a question to the Prime Minister. Last Friday the right hon. gentleman indicated that he would be willing to call, or at least participate in, a meeting of the leaders of all parties in an attempt to find some solution to the disposition of the flag resolution currently before the house. I should like to ask the Prime Minister now whether he has received any indication from the Leader of the Opposition that such a leaders' meeting could be useful.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Has the Prime Minister given any indication that he will depart from his stubborn attitude—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: —respecting the suggestion that a committee be set up of 15 members to decide this matter by a majority, when he would have seven members and no doubt control, by their thinking, the other three members?

Mr. Pearson: I am very glad the hon. member asked me that question. I am also very glad indeed that at the meetings of the leaders which have been held there were four others present. I think it would be accepted by all those present that at these meetings the adjustments of position made by the government were not met in any respect by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Was it not the Leader of the Opposition who suggested in the first place the setting up of a committee to get this matter out of the House of Commons?

Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker. The suggestion that a committee be set up was made by the leader of the New Democratic party. It was accepted by me as leader of the government and rejected by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Diefenbaker: On a question of privilege—not that it really matters, because the record speaks—that is completely false in every particular. What the Prime Minister did say was that he would accept a committee on his terms and on no others.

Mr. Pearson: On a question of privilege, and to keep the record straight, I ask the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam whether I did not accept the proposal on his terms, and whether those terms were not rejected by the Leader of the Opposition.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

I attended the meeting of the five party leaders. The head of the government and the leaders of the three minority parties in the house have even been accused of collusion. At every meeting, and I say it before the whole house, there is only one who raised objections and showed deliberate obstinancy, at every one of those meetings between party leaders, and it is the leader of the official opposition.

So, today, since I rose on a question of privilege, let us stop monkeying with the flag question, and if the Leader of the Opposition is capable of showing good will and good faith, let us agree to take a majority vote in the house on the flag issue.

[*Text*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: The grand alliance between the Créditistes and the Liberals.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): On the question of privilege which has been raised, I do not wish to get into a discussion of this matter because I intend to speak in the flag debate and may be anticipating what I have to say. But I should like to point out, in order to keep the record clear, that the party leaders, as demonstrated by the statements they made in this house on August 21, were divided. Four party leaders were agreeable to the setting up of a committee with the proviso that the report of such a committee should be debated for a limited period of time. The Leader of the Opposition took the position that he could not agree to any such limitation. This was the only point of difference.

Mr. Olson: Now that we have had a long week end and many members have had an opportunity to visit their constituencies, I wonder whether the Prime Minister would consider calling a leaders' meeting immediately after the caucuses tomorrow, when perhaps some of the sentiments of those attending will have been passed on to their leaders.

Mr. Diefenbaker: You speak with authority.

Mr. Pearson: I would be glad to consider that. But I hope if we have another meeting we can make some progress and that we shall not reach a deadlock or impasse, reference to which has been made this afternoon, thanks to the attitude taken by the Leader of the Opposition toward this question.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Would the Prime Minister be willing to have a committee set up, the proviso being that in order to bring about a recommendation for a flag, 80 per cent to 90 per cent agreement should be arrived at?

Some hon. Members: Veto.

Mr. Diefenbaker: You see? They know in advance how the committee will go. That is why they are opposed to it.

Would the right hon. gentleman agree to that? If he would agree to that we would be only too pleased to have the matter sent to a committee, as has been made perfectly clear. But we are not going to have a committee in which you start with the majority against us and sit—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I do not believe in 90 per cent democracy.

Hon. George C. Nowlan (Digby-Annapolis-Kings): In view of the fact that the Leader of the Opposition has suggested, and the Prime Minister has opposed, the holding of a plebiscite, that is to say the consulting of the people, does the right hon. gentleman believe in democracy, period?

Mr. Pearson: In the words of Sir John A. Macdonald, a plebiscite is not necessarily democracy.

TRADE

STATEMENT BY FINANCE MINISTER RESPECTING IMPORTS FROM JAPAN

On the orders of the day:

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary North): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. What are the well established Canadian industries to which the Minister of Finance referred, as reported from Tokyo, in these words—

> The government will not tolerate damage to well established Canadian industries by unrestrained imports of low-cost Japanese goods.

What are these well established industries to which he refers?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): I think the industries referred to can possibly be found by a consideration of those articles upon which voluntary restraints have been established by the Japanese government.

Mr. Hales: Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Order.

[*Later:*]

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce a question supplemental to the question asked by the hon. member for Calgary North. Arising out of those trade discussions, is there a possibility or any indication that the Japanese will be buying goods produced by Canadian manufacturers?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, during the discussions with the Japanese government we urged very strongly, as reported by my colleague the Secretary of State for External Affairs, that the restrictions which now prevent the sale in Japan of Canadian manufactured goods should be relaxed as rapidly as possible.

[*Later:*]

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. A few moments ago the hon. member for Wellington South rose to ask a question, but he was not speaking from his own seat and therefore sat down. I believe he is the acting whip for the official opposition, and should be given the privilege of speaking from the whip's seat.

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington South): I appreciate the opportunity offered by the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker, but my question has been asked.

GRAIN

ESTABLISHMENT OF PRICES FOR WHEAT AND COARSE GRAINS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. C. O. Cooper (Rosetown-Biggar): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I have received many complaints from prairie farmers delivering new wheat to the elevators that they cannot get payment for it owing to the delay in having the price set. Could the minister tell the house when the price of wheat will be set, so that farmers can get payment for their wheat on delivery?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): May I take this question as notice and give a full answer tomorrow?

HOUSE OF COMMONS

INQUIRY AS TO HOLDING OF BY-ELECTIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): I want to direct a question to the Prime Minister concerning a matter I first raised on August 18. In view of the fact that the constituency of Westmorland has now been unrepresented for 103 days or nearly four months, and the constituency of Waterloo South for 73 days; and in view of the fact that even if dates by the by-election were announced now it would be another 44 days before members could be elected, can the right hon. gentleman inform the house whether a decision has been reached as to the dates of these by-elections and if so, what are such dates?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I apologize to the hon. member, Mr. Speaker. I think he asked me this question last week and I said I hoped to be in a position to answer it at the end of the week. I am almost certain I will be in a position to answer it tomorrow.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

QUEBEC—DELAY IN PAYMENT FOR WINTER WORKS

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. Can the minister tell the house whether the contribution of the federal government under the winter works program in the province of Quebec has been fully paid for 1963-64?

[*Text*]

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, this matter was dealt with in the adjournment period last week. At that time it was my information that all outstanding accounts had been settled, but I will be glad to make inquiries and advise my hon. friend later.

PENSIONS

CANADA PLAN—INQUIRY AS TO INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In view of the fact that on July 6, which is more than three months ago, the Minister of Justice told the house that the government was at that time completing—I emphasize the word "completing"—the drafting of the bill respecting the Canada pension plan, can the minister say whether that drafting has now been completed and whether the resolution preceding the new bill will be on the order paper soon?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I make it two months, not three, since July 6. However, I would like to tell the house that I expect to make a statement regarding the Canada pension plan shortly.

Mr. Knowles: I accept the correction, Mr. Speaker. The minister is right; it is only two months since we were told it was almost completed. May I ask whether the bill will be ready in time for debate by this house in case the flag debate is either completed soon or set aside by the house?

COAL

SUGGESTED ELIMINATION OF TRANSPORTATION SUBSIDY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys, but in his absence may I direct it to the acting minister, or indeed the right hon. Prime Minister may wish to reply. It is prompted by a Canadian Press article emanating from the dominion-provincial coal convention at Lake Louise. My question has reference to subventions, and this is what appeared in the press over the week end:

> William Whittaker, managing director of the coal operators' association of western Canada, Thursday called on coal and transportation industry officials to work to eliminate a federal subvention on coal transportation.

I may say that Mr. Whittaker is a member of the dominion coal board. It could be that he is misquoted or misrepresented, as sometimes happens to members of parliament. However, since Mr. Whittaker is a member of the dominion coal board, is the minister in a position to clarify the statement and assure the house that this is not the view of the federal government?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have not seen the statement, but as my hon. friend reports it, it certainly does not reflect government policy. I will be glad to look into the matter at once.

Inquiries of the Ministry

DRUGS

PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION REPRESENTATION ON BODIES CONSIDERING PROFESSIONAL MATTERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. R. Southam (Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister. My question is based on a resolution contained in a letter from the Canadian pharmaceutical association and directed to the Prime Minister under the date of August 31, 1964. Will the Prime Minister give the Canadian pharmaceutical association the assurance that their profession will be represented on committees, boards and commissions appointed in the future to consider matters directly or indirectly affecting the profession and/or the distribution of drugs to the people of Canada?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I believe I have received that letter, Mr. Speaker, and it is under consideration. I would prefer to look at the letter and see whether a reply has gone forward before answering my hon. friend's question.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

CONSIDERATION OF FEDERAL AID TO NURSING TRAINING

On the orders of the day:

Mr. William Dean Howe (Hamilton South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Is the minister aware of recent United States legislation to provide federal aid to nursing training; and if so, has the government considered the possibility of similar legislation for Canada?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part of the question is no, and the answer to the second part of the question is no.

FISHERIES

REGULATIONS RESPECTING KILLING OF SEALS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries. On May 1 he said that a meeting was being convened by him in Moncton on May 20 at which all parties interested in the question of sealing operations would be represented. I would like to ask the minister now whether there has been any success in the matter of preventing the hunting of seals with airplanes in the gulf of St. Lawrence. A great many organizations are interested in this matter, and I am wondering whether the regulations for 1965 will prohibit such action.

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, the meeting referred to by the hon. member was held in Moncton on May 20 between officials of my department and representatives of the sealing industry. As a result of this meeting amendments to the existing regulations controlling sealing operations are now being drafted. As soon as they are completed another meeting will be held in order to discuss the amendments, and I am hopeful that those amendments will be ready within the next three or four weeks.

Mr. Douglas: Could I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it anticipated that these amendments will prohibit the use of airplanes and some of the other more barbarous practices that were carried on last year with respect to sealing?

Mr. Robichaud: I am not in a position to state at this time that these amendments will entirely prohibit the use of helicopters or airplanes, but I am hopeful that they will control such operations.

SHIPPING

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER—ACTION FOLLOWING RECENT SINKING

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. M. Fisher (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Transport whether he is considering any special steps with regard to the recent sinking in the St. Lawrence, in view of the fact that it is almost a repetition of a similar tragedy that occurred last year at the same location?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, immediately the news of this tragic event was conveyed to the department we undertook what is the first step in these matters, namely we instituted an investigation of the facts. I believe this is now under way. As soon as that information can be gathered consideration will be given to what further steps should be taken. It is a singular and very sad coincidence that there should have been such a similarity between these two tragedies.

Hon. Léon Balcer (Three Rivers): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question to the one asked by the hon. member for Port Arthur. I wonder whether the minister could tell us whether following the inquiry into the tragic sinking of the *Tritonica* any special change in the routing or the various aid to navigation installations on the St. Lawrence was recommended and, if so, whether such recommendation has been followed by the department.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, this is a question the answer to which I have to inform myself about before I would take the risk of giving an answer to the house.

SEARCH AND RESCUE

PORT STANLEY, ONT.—OPERATION OF COASTGUARD VESSEL "SPUME"

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, perhaps while I am on my feet I could be permitted to answer a question asked by the hon. member for Elgin in connection with the coastguard cutter *Spume* stationed in the lake Erie district.

I think the person who wrote the hon. gentleman must have been misinformed, because in fact when captains of rescue cutters receive information directly of any vessel in distress they can and are expected to proceed immediately to give any assistance possible without waiting for instructions from Trenton. All that is required of them is that they report to Trenton on their movements as quickly as possible so the people at Trenton will know at all times where they are situated.

CANADIAN FLAG

OFFICIAL ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW DESIGN

The house resumed, from Thursday, September 3, consideration of the motion of Mr. Pearson:

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 the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Diefenbaker and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Churchill.

Mr. Raymond Langlois (Mégantic): Mr. Speaker, if I may resume from where I left off last Thursday evening when 10.30 was called, I was speaking in this debate for the first time since the flag resolution was brought before the house. I mentioned that the Canadian people are actually wondering now what is going on in the parliament of Canada. They are wondering, as I said last Thursday, whether we are a bunch of school kids who have lost our teacher. They do not seem to get any guidance whatever from this parliament at the moment, either on the flag issue or on government business, because the only business we are considering at the moment is the flag. I am under the impression that today we are further away from a Canadian flag than we ever were before. At least before we started this debate there seemed to me a mutual understanding that Canada wanted a flag, but at the stage we have now reached the people are wondering whether they should have a flag; parliament itself has not decided whether they should have a flag or whether the people should vote on it. The people are wondering whether this flag will unite Canada or divide it. At the moment things are moving in such direction that it is dividing Canada instead of uniting us.

We must ask ourselves, Mr. Speaker: What does this flag stand for. If it is going to stand for the ripping of Canada into parts, either regional, provincial or as a nation itself, we may as well not have a flag at all. We want a flag, as do all Canadians, which will not only stand for one group, one religion, one race or one nation, but for Canada; a flag to represent Canada among the other nations of the world as a united and strong nation. The flag should represent all of our historical background and proclaim our unity. It should stand for the social security which we have in Canada. It should stand for individual freedom and for the freedom of any association which exists within its boundaries.

Everyone is proud to look at a flag which stands for something; but what a disgrace it would be if when we looked at our Canadian flag we had to say it is that flag which has destroyed the nation itself. If we do not want that we must play our part as the responsible elected members of this nation, judge the situation as objectively as possible, and take part in this debate using the greatest wisdom we can deploy. If we do not do that it will be the downfall perhaps not only of the government but of confederation and the nation as it stands.

I might have used some very harsh words, Mr. Speaker, last Thursday night when I spoke of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr.

Diefenbaker) and the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson); but believe me I think they are true. It is up to the Leader of the Opposition and the leader of the government to take their responsibility as the two great leaders in this nation. Remember, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition is regarded as just as important as the Prime Minister himself in the form of government we have. It is up to the Leader of the Opposition to bring forward any constructive objections which he has as to why why we should have or should not have such a flag. But it is not the responsibility of the Leader of the Opposition to create any kind of obstruction in such a situation, whether good or bad. The role of the government as well as the opposition—any opposition—is to judge what is best for the Canadian nation, because we are here to represent Canadian interests, not our own.

We have had all kinds of speeches, Mr. Speaker, and some very good ones. They might not always have related to the subject as we would wish, and I myself sometimes stray in that regard; but we are all trying to have our say. I am wondering however, whether we are all trying to find a solution. It is not only a matter of speaking and then sitting down and saying we have done our job. We should speak in such a way that we might find a solution which will take this parliament out of the mess it is in today, a mess brought on by ourselves and nobody else.

The Canadian people were told in the last election campaign that the Liberal party would take a stand on a Canadian flag. Therefore it is up to us, as the responsible elected representatives of the people, to be their spokesmen. Let us carry out this task wisely and justly, and try to do it in such a way that we will save the nation, not destroy it. The Conservative members have objections to this flag resolution. They have brought in some amendments, but I have seen no reference to the flag on the amendments. It is now or never, Mr. Speaker; we cannot delay any longer. We desire unity but we will not accept unity with uniformity. We do not expect that any member of this house or Canadian citizen would accept unity on that basis. We will accept, however, unity with diversity, because that is the only democratic method to be followed. Every citizen of this country should have the opportunity of expressing an opinion in respect of this flag, and that is the only way we can follow the majority rule principle. Such a selection by majority rule would be acceptable to everyone, provided it did not ignore the basic rights of any minority or individual.

As a young member of parliament looking at the situation which has developed in this house, Mr. Speaker, I am ashamed in public to admit that I am a member of parliament. The situation with which we are now faced is shameful. We have expressed our opinions. We have fought for what we believe is right. We believe that Canada has a history comparable to that of any other country in the world. Canadians can be proud of what has been obtained and attained through sacrifice, valour and hard work. Our ancestors should be commended for what they have accomplished in this regard, and it is up to us in this house to continue the progress of this nation, rather than to destroy it as we are doing through a continuation of this debate. I think everyone now has come to the realization that we have now reached the crossroads and must act quickly. We cannot permit ourselves to continue to be a group of asses listening to ourselves bray. We have done too much of this already. At this time we must find a solution acceptable to all parties in this house. Each member of each party in this House of Commons is an elected representative of the people, and each opinion must be respected.

It is not my intention to raise further objections or points which might rekindle the flame of debate, but we must soon settle on some plausible solution to the problems which now exist. The Liberal government has presented its idea in respect of the flag, that being the three maple leaf design embodied in the main motion. Other suggestions have been made, and we have all seen various proposed designs. I have one before me at the moment, prepared by Jean Dubuc, who is a descendant of the man who wrote the words of "O Canada". I do not know how close a relative he is, but one of his ancestors certainly did write those words.

Whether we accept the design proposed by the government, or another design, we must have a flag which will stand for national unity, and will be looked upon with pride by Canadians. There is nothing which tears my heart more, as well as the heart of anyone else in this house, or any Canadian citizen, than does the suggestion that we will need a special type of vehicle to protect the Queen on her visit to this country. I think we must begin to protect Canadians generally in view

of the situation that is now developing. Many people are beginning to tear out their hair because this flag debate continues without any indication of conclusion, and because all the time it continues it divides this country and whatever unity does exist. As long as we continue to beat around the bush here in this house, without coming to any plausible solution to the problem, we are going to further this division. We have now been debating this flag issue for 22 days, and talked about it as early as last spring, without any good result. As a matter of fact, I am now under the impression that we are further away from a solution than we have ever been, and if we continue to follow the course we have followed we will divide this House of Commons into groups, and this country into ethnic associations.

The United Nations, made up of representatives of almost every country in this world, was able to adopt a flag within a very short period of time. Why cannot we decide upon a flag in a similar fashion which will represent the two founding races of this country and those Canadians of other ethnic origin who have come to this country adopting its customs and rules, and who, I am sure, will adopt its flag when and if the Canadian government presents one that is acceptable and representative of unity? Let us put our political feelings aside while dealing with this issue. It is useless to attempt to save our own skins at the expense of national unity because our skins would not be worth much without a country.

A day or two ago I heard an hon. member state that debate is the living right of parliament. I admit that fact, but on this occasion it might well prove to be the death of our Canadian nation. We do desire a Canadian flag, but let us have one that will stand for unity. I am sure the Canadian economy has suffered and will suffer more because of the time lost by this parliament during the debate on this flag issue. This parliament is now behind in its normal work. We did not have a budget presented to the house for several years. We are now losing a great deal of time by discussing the type of flag Canada should adopt, and by the time we do come to some conclusion this nation will be divided and the flag will then be useless because it will stand for little or nothing.

I should like at this time, Mr. Speaker, to present possible solution to our problems, and outline my understanding of the situation. I think it is much easier for a small group of members, perhaps 15, to come to some agreement in respect of a flag design than it would be for the 265 members in this house. Each of the 265 members, in expressing individual and representative points of view, will tend to keep us apart just long enough to destroy whatever unity we now have. I think a small committee could work together discussing the situation objectively, and arrive at some plausible and acceptable solution upon which we could vote to accept or reject.

I do not intend to speak any longer on this flag issue because I feel that the sooner I conclude my remarks the sooner we will find an acceptable solution to our problems. I suggest that this house should adjourn this debate today for a period of 60 days, referring this resolution to a committee comprised of 15 members; seven from the Liberal party, five from the Conservative party, one from the New Democratic party, one from the Social Credit party and one from the Ralliement Creditiste. This 15 member committee could discuss the matter for 60 days starting from today. Then the resolution could be brought back to this house and debated for a period, let us say of six days, somewhat like the throne speech debate or the budget debate. There could be a limit of six days. Then there could be a vote. If it did not pass, nothing would be destroyed; we could go back on the flag debate. However in the meantime the house would have an opportunity of dealing with something else and taking care of the Canadian people. I believe the committee would have a better opportunity of finding a solution to this matter than we would have in this house.

I move therefore, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier), that this debate do now adjourn.

The house divided on the motion (Mr. Langlois) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Balcer	Douglas
Baldwin	Fisher
Bigg	Forbes
Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)	Gauthier
Caouette	Gundlock
Chatterton	Hales
Churchill	Hamilton
Clancy	Harkness
Cowan	Herridge
Crouse	Horner (Acadia)
Danforth	Howe (Hamilton South)
Diefenbaker	Howe (Wellington-Huron)
Dinsdale	Irvine

Division

Jones, Mrs.	Olson
Jorgenson	Orlikow
Knowles	Paul
Lambert	Peters
Langlois	Plourde
Laprise	Prittie
Loney	Rapp
MacEwan	Ricard
McBain	Rynard
Madill	Scott
Martineau	Southam
Millar	Starr
Monteith	Stefanson
More	Thomas
Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria)	Thompson
Nasserden	Vincent
Noble	Webb
Nowlan	Willoughby
Nugent	Winch—64.

NAYS

Messrs:

Asselin (Notre Dame de Grâce)	Leduc
Badanai	Legault
Batten	Lessard (St. Henry)
Béchard	Lloyd
Benson	Macaluso
Berger	Macdonald
Blouin	MacEachen
Boulanger	MacNaught
Brown	McIlraith
Byrne	McMillan
Cadieux (Terrebonne)	McNulty
Caron	McWilliam
Carter	Martin (Essex East)
Cashin	Matheson
Chrétien	Matte
Côté (Chicoutimi)	Moreau
Côté (Longueuil)	Morison
Crossman	O'Keefe
Cyr	Pearson
Davis	Pennell
Drouin	Pepin
Drury	Pickersgill
Dubé	Pilon
Dupuis	Prud'homme
Ethier	Regan
Eudes	Richard
Favreau	Rinfret
Francis	Robichaud
Gendron	Rouleau
Godin	Roxburgh
Granger	Ryan
Guay	Sharp
Habel	Stewart
Hahn	Tardif
Haidasz	Teillet
Harley	Tremblay
Honey	Tucker
Jewett, Miss	Turner
LaMarsh, Miss	Wahn
Lamontagne	Walker
Laniel	Watson (Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie)
Laverdière	Whelan—85.
Leblanc	

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege, to register the strongest possible protest against the contempt shown to this house by keeping members waiting for 85 minutes—

[Mr. Langlois.]

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Diefenbaker: —to suit the convenience of the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) and the government. This is the most contemptuous disregard of the rights of parliament that I have witnessed—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Diefenbaker: —and I protest against this arrogance, that was apparent the other night and has been intensified today. This is totally inexcusable conduct on the part of a prime minister and a government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I can understand the right hon. gentleman's feeling of frustration, when only 44 members of his party were here; but I am at a loss to understand his irritation at being delayed from attending what he himself used to refer to ironically as an egghead conference. As a result, Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to give a ruling whether there is any question of privilege whatever involved in the point the right hon. gentleman has raised.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I answer the Prime Minister's—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Diefenbaker: —arrogance by saying I was very glad to stay here to see a government that so contemptibly interferes with the rights of parliament.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I think the vote which has taken place indicates quite clearly the concern of the house regarding prolonging the debate on the flag issue and the imperative need for our trying to find some solution to the stalemate in which parliament finds itself. This debate started on June 15 and it has continued since that time, with an interruption for several pieces of legislation. But it has gone on continuously for the past five weeks, with the exception of the one day each week which is set aside for the discussion of estimates. Now we are embarking on the sixth week of debating this matter.

An hon. Member: Tell us something we don't know.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Speaker, I hear someone from the Conservative party asking me to tell them something they don't know. I do not

know that I can tell them something they don't know, but I can tell them what I think an increasing number of people in this country know, namely that the reason for this prolonged debate is the fact that the Conservative party in this house seems to be determined to keep parliament from reaching a decision.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): We don't accept that at all.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Speaker, this is rather significant. For five weeks we have been debating this question, and the major part of the time has been taken up by the Conservative party. They have constantly appealed to other people to participate in the debate, and the moment those other members do so they are heckled and interrupted by the hon. gentlemen who sit on my right.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas: It seems to me it is a sign of weakness in one's defence when constantly he has to keep someone else from presenting his point of view. I had hoped, sitting through these five weeks of debate without taking any part, that after members had expressed their point of view we would be allowed to reach a decision; but last week it became increasingly apparent that the official opposition were going to keep moving innocuous subamendments in order to prevent not only the house reaching a decision on their amendment but to prevent other parties in this house moving amendments upon which the house could make a decision. I suggest that this is a negation of democratic government.

A great deal has been said by some speakers about the government seeking to ram a flag down their throats. I would point out in the first place that the present government is a minority government. The government has not a clear majority in the house and the French Canadian members have not a clear majority in the house. Therefore no flag can be rammed down people's throats unless the majority of the members are prepared to vote for it. I think the members should be given an opportunity to vote for it at a fairly early stage.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, I have listened patiently for five weeks to the opinions expressed by the members of the official opposition against the maple leaf flag design, either that proposed by the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) or the single maple leaf design which we have indicated it is our intention to place before the house. I respect the views of those who have put up arguments, and I should like to take the three main lines of argument which have been used as to why some hon. members are against a maple leaf design.

The first is that they say this maple leaf design is a concession to Quebec.

Mr. Monteith: No.

Mr. Douglas: They have either said that themselves or have quoted other people who have said it, and said it in most intemperate and immoderate terms. Someone says no; well I am not going to weary the house, unless I am pressed to, by going over the speeches of hon. members. I have gone over them carefully each day and I can quote for hon. members chapter and verse the speeches which have been made saying specifically that this flag is a concession to Quebec; that this is something which the government is using to get votes in Quebec. The record is clear for anyone who wants to examine it, and if necessary I am prepared to take time, either now or later in the debate, to put all these quotes on *Hansard*; there are pages of them. Suffice it to say for the moment that I think this kind of argument is hurting national unity and if it is persisted in it will wreck confederation. And, may I say, it will wreck the Conservative party.

I would point out that there are no French symbols on the flag which has been proposed. There are no French symbols in the maple leaf design. French Canada has not asked for them because they are sufficiently mature to recognize that in this situation Canada must be concerned about the present and the future rather than being obsessed with the divisions of the past.

The second line of argument which has been presented is that by not having the union jack on the flag we are removing the Christian symbols. I should like to point out that the crosses in the union jack are not Christian symbols in the true sense of the word.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Oh yes, they are.

Mr. Douglas: They represent battle banners which were used: St. George's cross was first used in the crusade when the kings, barons and knights of Christendom perpetrated murder, rapine and plunder in the name of Christianity; the flag of St. Andrew was first used by the Picts and the Scots in their wars against the Saxons; the cross of St. Patrick was on the banner of the Fitzpatricks when

they conquered Ireland, and very few Irishmen will be crying for the cross of St. Patrick. Certainly it has never been adopted as Ireland's flag.

Let us remember first of all that Christianity is not the only faith in Canada. There are people of Jewish faith, the Mohammedan faith and the Buddhist faith.

Mr. Bigg: And the communist faith.

Mr. Douglas: Well, I will leave that to my hon. friend.

Mr. Bigg: Is that not true?

Mr. Douglas: He can speak for some of his friends; I am speaking for mine at the moment. But I submit that in the flags which have been proposed—either the three maple leaf design, the single maple leaf design which we have been advancing, or the design proposed by A. Y. Jackson more than 50 years ago—you have blue bands which do have a religious significance because they are a constant reminder that our motto "From sea to sea" was based on the eighth verse of the 72nd psalm:

> He shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth.

This design has a religious significance not peculiarly Christian but of general application to the Christian-Judean faiths—that the things of God should have priority in the lives of our people from one coast of Canada to another.

The third objection which has been taken to the maple leaf design is that it is removing the symbols of our British connections. All of us are proud of the fact, especially those of us of British origin, that Britain has played such an important role in Canadian history. We are convinced that this influence will live on in our democratic institutions. It will live most meaningfully if we make those institutions work, and work effectively. I submit that it is a sign of political immaturity to refuse to cut the apron strings and walk out on our own feet. It is still true to say:

> Daughter am I in my mother's house;
> But mistress in my own.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that those who keep talking about the union jack, the battle of Hastings and British history should forget that we cannot go back into the womb of the past. There comes a time when any independent nation must cut the umbilical cord and step out on its own. This debate, which has been going on now for all these weeks, reminds me of the discussions we heard 20 to 25 years ago, when a former member for North Battleford, a man called Cameron R. McIntosh, used to bring in a resolution each year for a national flag for Canada. He proposed the red ensign, and I remember all the speeches which were made in favour of the union jack. In 1946, when the government of Mackenzie King passed an order in council saying that the red ensign should be flown on public buildings—

Mr. Hales: It was 1945.

Mr. Douglas: Yes, that is correct; September 1945—at that time I was associated with a provincial administration, and every year for many years delegations came to wait on the government to protest over the flag we were flying, the red ensign, and saying that by refusing to fly the union jack we were denying our connection with the motherland; that we were being false to the blood in our veins. All of the arguments that were used then against the red ensign are now being used for the red ensign.

I have no disrespect, Mr. Speaker, for the union jack. I would be the last person to be disrespectful to it because I was born under it. It is a great flag with a great tradition. But I did not come to Canada to build another little Britain, or little Scotland, or another little England. I came to this country to help build Canada, in which the British traditions of which I am so proud, along with the contributions and the cultures of other ethnic groups and races, could come together to enrich this new country. Therefore, if we are to have that kind of country, this flag must be a symbol of our hopes and aspirations for the future—namely, a united people who are seeking to establish a Canadian identity on this North American continent. I think I have made it clear that as far as I am concerned I have not been convinced by the arguments against the maple leaf design.

Let me turn now to the other side of the question. The government has manoeuvred itself into a political and parliamentary impasse. When I spoke during this debate on June 16 I made the statement that I thought the government had chosen the wrong time and the wrong method to introduce the flag question. We felt that, with all the legislative program before us, a matter like a flag ought not to be introduced at a time when it was almost certain to block the passage of that legislative program. We also felt there should have been some other method by which we could obtain a consensus about a flag, rather than putting a specific design to the House of Commons

where it was almost certain to become a bone of contention.

We in this party, or at least, the great majority of us, are prepared to support a maple leaf design, but I think it is equally apparent that the English speaking section of one of the major political parties is in apparent disagreement and has now embarked upon a policy of obstruction. I think we have to face that fact and have to deal with it. I think we have to begin by remembering that dealing with a flag issue is not the same as dealing with a legislative matter. If this were a matter of some important legislative significance, there are parliamentary means of bringing the matter to a decision. In respect of this question, even if we could force a decision, it would be a Pyrrhic decision. A flag adopted by Canada should represent the consensus, and should be launched with the general support of the vast majority of the Canadian people. It should be an instrument for forging unity rather than creating division, and no flag will accomplish that if it is conceived in controversy and born in bitterness. This would be equally true, in my opinion, if we were trying to force the red ensign through this house. I think therefore that in this situation the government has three courses left open to it. The first course is, it can dissolve this parliament and call an election. I hope members will believe me when I say I am not opposed to an election on this issue because I have any fear from the standpoint of this political party. I think we could do rather well in an election where the bankruptcy of statesmanship on the part of the two old line parties has become so apparent. I am not concerned about an election, I am concerned about Canada. I believe that this country would suffer irreparable damage, irrespective of the outcome of the election. I think any election on the flag issue would divide the country on racial grounds, which would split confederation, and even if confederation survived it would take a quarter of a century to heal the scars that would result.

Therefore, I say I think members in all parts of the house, or some of them at least, will agree that there should be no irresponsible action taken by either side of this house by any political party which would result in such a catastrophe.

The government has a second choice. It could force a decision by closure, or by a war of attrition. To my mind the former is unthinkable, particularly in respect of so emotionally charged a question as the flag issue. To launch a new flag for Canada by means of a closure motion would mean launching a new flag with resentment and bitterness in the hearts of a very considerable section of the Canadian people. The latter course, a war of attrition, would mean that we would neglect a legislative program which ought to be dealt with, and dealt with speedily.

The hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Nugent) made a statement on Thursday evening to the effect that no legislation should be passed, no estimates passed and no money voted to this government until this question was settled by referring it to the people. I do not know whether he was speaking for his party or only for himself, but if that is the course to be followed, then prolonging the debate by a war of attrition will mean that we will do little or nothing by way of constructive legislation at this session. If that attitude is going to be taken, and I have made it clear that I do not condone it, I think we must reconcile ourselves to the fact that we are either going to have no flag at all, or a flag at the price of bitterness and hard feelings, which is not in my opinion a good way to launch an emblem that is to fly proudly over this nation.

Therefore, the third solution, which is the only choice the government has left, is that the government must find some type of compromise out of this difficulty. I readily acknowledge to the Prime Minister that the government has made the major concessions, and almost the only concessions that have been made on this issue. The government has agreed to a free vote, so that an election is not hanging on the outcome.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Douglas: There is no point to the laughter of my friends in the Conservative ranks, because they continually asked for a free vote, and if they were doing so seriously they ought to be serious in appreciating the fact that this concession has been made.

The government has agreed that it was not wedded to any one design, and that it is up to this house in the final analysis to choose a design, providing it is a distinctive national flag which cannot be mistaken for the flag of any other country.

The Prime Minister agreed to the establishment of a committee, as did every other political leader except the leader of the official opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker), and to send this matter to that committee subject to the proviso that there be a time limit on the debate on the committee's report. The government has made some concessions, and I am suggesting now that in the present situation we must

be prepared to explore the situation further. I realize some will argue that if we do this we are knuckling under to blackmail from the official opposition. In the kind of stalemate in which we find ourselves we have to be prepared to make concessions in an attempt to find some common ground. After all, the government must accept responsibility for the fact that this matter is before us. They are the ones who introduced it, and they must have known when they introduced it that it would be a controversial matter, and would not go through the house easily. We really are in the position of trench warfare, in which both sides have dug in and every day which passes during this debate, they are digging in a little deeper. We are faced with a hopeless stalemate. The only hope lies in a major breakthrough so that the house can get some freedom of movement from which some positive decision can be made.

I want to suggest we try a compromise proposal. I suggest that we pick up where we left off in the statements that were made by the leaders of all the political parties in the house on Friday, August 21. I am not speaking of the suggestions that were made by the party leaders in their conferences. I am talking about statements that were made by the party leaders in this house on the order for motions on August 21. I suggest we pick up from there and see where we disagree, see if there is some loophole by which we can find common ground.

I am proposing briefly three things. One is, as was suggested, that a parliamentary committee composed of 15 members be established, seven from the government, five from the official opposition and one from each of the other political parties. I think such a committee ought to have the help of heraldic experts. This is my first suggestion.

The second suggestion is that the committee should report back to the house within 60 days. This time limit could be negotiated. If the Prime Minister would like it shorter or the Leader of the Opposition would like it longer, I think that matter could be negotiated and could be discussed in the party leaders' meeting. I think that in a matter as important as this, 15 days one way or the other is not going to make any difference. We have been able to get along for 100 years without a flag, so if by waiting 20 days more we can find an answer, let us not bother about that. I am suggesting, for negotiating purposes, 60 days.

The third suggestion is that when the committee's report is ready there should be another meeting of the party leaders to determine the length of time that should be devoted in the house to a discussion of the committee's report. While I personally believe that there should be a time limit agreed upon in advance, I would be willing to defer this decision until after the committee's report is ready in order to reach agreement and set up the committee.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know all the advantages and disadvantages of the proposal. I know it would be much better if we could agree in advance as to how long this debate would take when the committee reported back. It has been suggested that if there were a certain percentage, it would be so long; for other percentages, it would be longer. I do not believe you are going to get agreement on that in advance. It seems to me there is much to be said for sending this matter to the committee, having the committee report back in 60 days and just before they report the party leaders could meet. If there were 12 members out of 15 in agreement on the report, then we should be able to arrange for a very short debate. If there were a severe difference of opinion, then it might not be so easy to get agreement about a time limit. Why not let us leave that question until we see how the committee gets along?

Now, let me try to anticipate the reactions to this proposal. I think the Leader of the Opposition should be willing to endorse the suggestion I am making because it falls in line, to some extent, with the proposals which he made in the house on August 21 as recorded at page 7112 of *Hansard*. Now, the Prime Minister would be more justified in having some reservations about accepting this proposal because he, like myself and the leader of the other political parties, has argued for a time limit to be set in advance, that is a time limit on the debate on the committee's report. Those of us who took that position on August 21 did so because we felt that if we did not have a time limit on the debate on the committee's report we could find ourselves, 60 days from now, just where we are today. This is the argument I put up in the house on August 21.

I want to argue now that by deferring the decision as to limiting the time of the debate, we would still be making some gains. We would not be as badly off as we are today. First of all, in the meantime, we would have been able to spend eight weeks on legislative work in the house. We would have been able to get some legislation passed. We would have been able to get on with the country's

business. I hear somebody say, "We might get holidays". I think the holiday time has gone; we are here to work. I thank my friends to the right for the only holidays we are likely to get. I think now we should get on with the country's business; that is what the people of Canada are demanding, get on with the business. Eight weeks from now, therefore, we would at least be this far ahead. We would have some legislation on the statute books. If this included the Canada pension plan, we would be very happy.

The second thing is that my proposals have this advantage. We have at least a reasonable prospect—I think a 50-50 prospect—that the committee might come up with a solution. The Leader of the Opposition has said publicly that he would be prepared to co-operate by selecting representatives from his party who have not taken an inflexible position on the flag issue. If he follows that course and the other parties follow a similar course of action, we might get a committee that would work out a solution. It would be worth a try. I know this, there is a better chance of 15 members trying to find a solution behind closed doors than there is for 265 members trying to find it in the glare of publicity. It might not work, but it is worth a chance. We have nothing to lose.

The third advantage of this proposal is that it would have demonstrated to the Canadian people that parliament is sufficiently flexible to meet a situation that calls for statesmanship. Make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker, the real casualty in a cold war of attrition will be parliament itself. The responsibility for this lies with the two major political parties. It is often said, a little contemptuously sometimes, that the smaller parties are the reason we cannot get on with the business of this parliament; the smaller parties are the reason there is no efficiency in parliament. You cannot blame the three smaller parties in this instance. We did not initiate this issue and we have not prolonged this issue. We have been ready at all times to take a vote and bring this matter to a decision. It has been the two old line parties who have been like two old bulls in a pasture butting their heads together. They must accept the responsibility for the stalemate in which we find ourselves. We think that the time has come to end this cold war of attrition and seek a solution before we do irreparable damage to parliament and to confederation.

If I may just in closing, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that the Prime Minister may feel he will be accused of beating a retreat if he accepts this proposal. I can understand that fear because of some of the jibes that have been hurled at him from time to time. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that it takes a man of stature to make a concession in the interests of national unity; any pipsqueak can stubbornly cling to a position long after it is untenable. I think the Prime Minister of this country can, and I think he will demonstrate the kind of stature that is necessary to give this country the leadership it needs in this difficult time.

If a compromise is reached by all parties along the lines I have suggested, it will not be a decision taken solely by the Prime Minister. On August 21 I, and the leaders of other groups, except the Leader of the Opposition, argued for having a time limit on the debate of the committee's report. I am prepared to defer the decision about a time limit until after the committee's report is ready. If anyone wants to say I am retreating, he may do so. I am not afraid of being accused of backing down. I am concerned not so much with chalking up debating points as I am concerned with finding a solution without sacrifice of principle, and I do not believe it is beyond the ingenuity of this house to work out a compromise and an accommodation.

Therefore I am urging the Prime Minister to consider calling a meeting of the party leaders if there is any indication that the proposal I have outlined is acceptable to the other parties as a starting point for negotiations. The reason I did not get up the other day when the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) urged the Prime Minister to call another meeting is that unless there is some change of attitude, unless there is some new proposal to be considered I do not see any value in such a meeting. But if the various leaders feel the suggestion I have made about a committee, with a 60 day limitation, with the question of the limit of debate on its report to be left until the report is ready—if they feel this offers some basis for discussion, then I would urge the Prime Minister to call such a meeting.

After all, Mr. Speaker, the leaders of this house are the Prime Minister of Canada and a former prime minister of Canada. In the final analysis the solution depends on their willingness to co-operate. When we are selecting a national symbol, a flag that is to be the emblem of Canada, it must have the support of at least the major part of the two largest parties in the house, and it seems to me that the answer lies in finding some

common ground between these two gentlemen.

One hundred years ago Sir John A. Macdonald and George Brown laid aside their differences in order to bring Canadian confederation into birth. I am appealing to the two leaders of this house to follow the same course now in order to strengthen the bonds of confederation at a time when they are sorely strained. If they fail to respond then Canada will be the poorer, but if they succeed future generations will applaud them.

I say to both the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition, and indeed to every member of parliament, we have a great opportunity to put posterity in our debt and to so conduct ourselves that future generations will be able to say we matched the challenge of the troubled times in which we lived.

Mr. Thompson: May I ask the hon. member a question. In the event that substantial agreement could be reached in less time than 60 days, say in one week, two weeks or three weeks, does he mean that the committee could bring in its report prior to the time limit placed on it, in order that agreement be brought about more quickly?

Mr. Douglas: I think the term I used was within 60 days. Maybe I should have used the term not later than 60 days. If the committee could reach a decision within two or three weeks, then certainly let it bring in its report, but if it cannot reach a decision within 60 days any further discussion by the committee would serve no useful purpose.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to prolong the debate unduly because I think that the sorry spectacle the house is now giving to the Canadian people is not to the credit of our parliamentary system, far from it.

I support wholeheartedly what the leader of the New Democratic party (Mr. Douglas) has just said. That does not mean that I support all his political ideas, because I am at the very opposite of state socialism, and will be for a long time. However, I think it should be said that the spirit which permeates the speech the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam has just made is truly Canadian. The hon. member was not speaking as an English speaking or a French speaking Canadian but as a Canadian. We hope that the day will come when each member of parliament will speak as a Canadian instead of trying, as the Conservatives have been doing for two months, to create division, a division which increases day after day throughout Canada.

We saw the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) go to Winnipeg two months ago, to meet the Canadian Legion and face, I would not say animosity, but feelings which were really difficult and hard for a government and for a Prime Minister who had stated at that time that we ought to have a distinctive national flag.

I said then that the Prime Minister had acted like a head of state by meeting those people who, on a particular point, were strongly hostile. But when the Prime Minister came back to the house, he acted not like a head of state but like a diplomat. There is a difference between a diplomat and a head of state. I see that the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Martin) is paying attention to what I am saying, because he does know the difference. A head of state must make decisions, while the diplomat endeavours to smooth things over and acts as a conciliator between the various groups.

The Prime Minister acted or tried to act like a diplomat by moving a resolution including two flags. That is the reason for the debate which has been going on.

If the Prime Minister had put before the house a resolution involving only one Canadian flag—not a French flag, or an English flag or the flag of the province of Quebec or the flag of British Columbia, but one flag for all Canada, with a Canadian symbol—I am positive that the flag would have been passed within five or six days. But the resolution gave rise to this debate which, at the very outset, led us to splitting the resolution. You made a ruling yourself, Mr. Speaker, saying that the resolution would be divided into A and B, that part A would concern the distinctive national flag, while part B would concern the union jack.

Here again, that is the point on which the Conservatives take their stand to boycott and filibuster from the beginning of the debate on this matter of a distinctive national flag. That is the basis of the Conservative arguments, which is unfortunate.

As I said before, and as the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam just stated, the impression has been created in Canada that the distinctive national flag is intended to please Quebec whereas the union jack is intented to please English speaking Canadians. Now, there is no question of a distinctive national flag being only designed to

please the province of Quebec because, if that was the case, I would ask the Prime Minister not to introduce it, because we already have one and we do not need a second one. One is enough. But we Quebeckers are ready, not as French Canadians but as Canadians, to approve any distinctive flag project for Canada, something which would belong to the ten Canadian provinces and not to one alone.

The Conservative filibuster has been reported in the press and been abundantly used on television and all mass media.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) is still accusing us today of hatching a plot with the Liberal party in order to ram a flag down the throat of the Canadian people.

At the time the leaders of the five parties met and the fact was mentioned that the Prime Minister was accepting a free vote in the house—and at this stage I may say that the Prime Minister made concession upon concession so as to reach an understanding and to give Canadians a distinctive national flag—the Leader of the Opposition stuck to his guns and refused to accept the concession and to agree to a settlement. We had gathered together and the free vote question was mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, nobody can make me believe that I am a member of the Liberal party. I am not; neither is the leader of the Social Credit party (Mr. Thompson) nor the leader of the New Democratic party. However, in the interest of national unity and for the good of Canadians in general, we were ready to end those fights which serve no purpose and to stop calling forth phantoms to scare the people or to divide even further the various groups which constitute the Canadian nation. We felt that a free vote would enable a majority of hon. members to express their opinion, that such a majority would naturally represent the majority of Canadian electors who have sent us to parliament to take decisions not to talk through our hats or filibuster as the Conservatives have been doing for the past two or three weeks.

At the time, we spoke of a majority decision but the Leader of the Opposition objected on the grounds that a majority of members would be imposing a distinctive national flag on a minority. On the other hand, the Leader of the Opposition was proposing the red ensign with a fleur-de-lis in the bottom and a union jack at the top; he was ready to force his design on six million French Canadians in the province of Quebec. That was democracy, but a majority vote in the house is not democracy according to the Leader of the Opposition, who is an experienced lawyer.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether he was honest and sincere when he proposed that compromise or that procedure on the flag issue.

Mr. Speaker, the leader of the official opposition was persistent in his ideas and refused to accept the proposals made by the Prime Minister or the other party leaders during these meetings. Mention was made of the establishment of a committee. The principle of such a committee has been recognized. However, a stipulation was immediately laid down: 15 members were to constitute this committee and an absolute majority was a requisite. The question was raised then as to what was considered an absolute majority. The reply was that 13 of the 15 members would have to have voted in favour of the distinctive national flag to be presented to the house, and then the debate could be limited to a few days only.

As my colleague from Mégantic (Mr. Langlois) pointed out this afternoon, the 15 member committee was to include seven Liberals, five Conservatives one New Democrat, one Social Crediter and one member of the Ralliement Créditistes.

If the Leader of the Opposition decided to designate five members who were opposed to the distinctive national flag, without any tie with other nations or other countries, we would start again an endless debate.

That is why the right hon. Prime Minister could not accept such an offer and we could not accept it ourselves. It meant that there had to be unanimity or else the flag would not be accepted.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition will bear the responsibility for this attitude and he will suffer the consequences, not only in one province, but throughout Canada.

As a matter of fact, we can see how the Canadian people react. I receive letters not only from the province of Quebec, but also from English speaking provinces such as Ontario and British Columbia. I have here a letter from 57 Milton street, Toronto:

> Canadians are surely entitled to the best possible design, a simple, majestic, beautiful, striking and original flag, which will proudly take its place with other fine flags of the world, those of Switzerland, Norway, Hungary, France, England and other countries.

This person, Mr. Hughes, suggests—

[*Text*]

> One large, simple maple leaf on white with blue borders; one leaf—outlined in white—on a

light blue field; these are excellent. Or consider the enclosed—it won an honourable mention in the *Weekend* magazine national contest for professional artists. It is majestic: bleu, blanc, rouge.

[*Translation*]

—"Blue, white, red." This comes from an English person who wants a distinctive national flag.

[*Text*]

South West Salvage Co. Ltd.
Lethbridge, Alberta.

I am writing you about your proposal for a Canadian flag, other than the red ensign. I am in agreement with the flag your party is in favour of.

[*Translation*]

It concerns the little flags we had been talking about in this house. He is in favour of a distinctive national flag. It is not only the French Canadians of the province of Quebec who are in favour of a distinctive national flag.

Mr. Speaker, may I call it six o'clock?

[*Text*]

At six o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, before the dinner recess, I spoke of the reaction of people everywhere in Canada, not only in one area or in one province, but everywhere in the country.

Before the dinner recess, I quoted letters sent to me from western Canada, that is from Lethbridge and Vancouver.

Tonight I would like to read into the record some other letters sent to me from the province of Ontario; one is dated August 26, 1964, and it comes from Kingston, in the province of Ontario:

[*Text*]

Dear Mr. Caouette:

I wish to commend your remarks in the House of Commons with reference to the flag vote issue and I quote: "Whether it carries three maple leaves or one maple leaf, a beaver or a sheaf of wheat, as long as it is a distinctive Canadian flag, we shall support the government...we want Canadian symbols on our national emblem—not the symbols of France or the symbols of England..."

The statements made by other representatives that the proposed flag was nothing more than an attempt to please Quebec is far from the truth. Many of us in Ontario have been forced to live underground, so to speak, because Canada has no national flag and no national symbols. It would be interesting indeed to breathe the air of Canadian freedom, if that is possible, under the protection of a Canadian national flag.

Yours sincerely,
Edna A. Kemp, B.A.

For my Conservative friends, if they want the address it is 162 Mack street, Kingston, Ontario.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: That lady even had the courtesy of sending me a copy, in good French, of her letter written in English.

Mr. Dupuis: Did she also enclose her picture?

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I have another letter here, from Bolton, Ontario.

[*Text*]

This letter is from Cedar Mills side road, rural route No. 4, Bolton, Ontario:

Dear Sir:

I gather from newspaper reports that you have introduced the above design for our new flag. I wholeheartedly support your efforts in this direction. While I think Mr. Pearson's design is very pretty, it has no historical significance for Canadians. I believe there would be much less outcry about replacing the red ensign if the flag that was to replace it had some tradition of its own. The above design has three centuries of Canadian history in its design.

The white half, next the pole, indicates the first century, when the French ruled Canada. The red half, on top, indicates that the British took over from the French and ruled Canada for the second century. The large maple leaf, superimposed on the two halves, indicates the last century, when Canada took control of its own territory. It is green, because green is the colour of growth, the growth we owe to all the other peoples, both original inhabitants and immigrants, that have helped to build this great country. It straddles the white and red halves because our hope is that it will weld the two language groups together into one truly united whole.

While the design has been put forward, I have not heard anyone explain the heraldic significance of it, and I think you would be doing a great service for your country if you could put this point across to the house. Even Mr. Diefenbaker could hardly fight with this flag.

In any event, I wish you luck and success in your efforts to replace the British flags that have been flown in the past. Incidentally, I am British born, respect and admire them, but am Canadian all the way.

Sincerely,
Leslie J. Baird

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, others appreciate it.

Here is another letter from Scarborough, Ontario.

[*Text*]

Dear Mr. Caouette:

It is indeed a pleasure to read with much interest your views regarding the present situation concerning one distinctive flag for all Canada. While the design as chosen by Mr. Pearson is not my preference I do feel that it should contain only one maple leaf and also that there should only be one official national flag as there is no other symbol of unity than one.

I have on many previous occasions intended writing to you but somehow did not take the time to do so. Although I live in another area of Canada than you do and though my official representative to the House of Commons is a member of the N.D.P. I have always been able to agree with your views on the multitude of problems that have confronted our country in the past few years, and therefore look upon you as my personal representative in the government of our great land.

That letter is from L. Harris, 21 Silvio avenue, Scarborough, Ontario.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I do not know this Mr. L. Harris, living at 21 Sylvio avenue, Scarborough, Ontario.

Here is another letter, and this is the last one from which I will quote tonight. It comes from Toronto.

[*Text*]

The three leaf design has a 90 year history in Canada. The maple leaf is now regarded as a Canadian symbol, so other nations would have no difficulty in recognizing the emblem as distinctively Canadian and "O Canada" as our official national anthem.

Yours faithfully,
George Bals.

He is from Toronto.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, those are testimonies received not from the province of Quebec, but from other areas of the country and which undoubtedly prove that there are unity, understanding and agreement among the Canadian people, that there are ties which unite us. There is disunity only among people who attempt to play petty politics, instead of putting their country above their political party.

I hear Conservatives such as the hon. member for Nicolet-Yamaska (Mr. Vincent), the hon. member for Berthier-Maskinongé-Delanaudière (Mr. Paul), the hon. member for Joliette-l'Assomption-Montcalm (Mr. Pigeon), the hon. member for Pontiac-Témiscamingue (Mr. Martineau), the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Balcer) especially, who keep on saying: "Why does such a member not rise, why does such a minister not rise? Why does not so-and-so rise to answer the questions we ask him?" Well, tonight I will ask those Conservative members a question. Why is not the hon. member for Three Rivers on his feet to say exactly what is happening, not only in his riding of Three Rivers, in the province of Quebec, but also to tell us about the action of his own leader, the Leader of the Opposition in the house (Mr. Diefenbaker)?

Mr. Speaker, we tried and we are still trying to rise above political partisanship on the choice of a distinctive national flag. As I said this afternoon, the Prime Minister made some concessions, and I am convinced that he is ready to make some more, not on behalf of the Liberal party, but on behalf of Canada, of national unity and understanding between Canadians of all ethnic origins.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the Leader of the Opposition is not interested in widening the gap between English and French Canadians and whether he is not trying to do so. When I hear him asking questions on orders of the day to know whether the Queen will be welcome or whether members of the F.L.Q. will be jailed, I wonder whether he is not interested in promoting bad publicity against the province of Quebec.

Yet last night, as I mentioned before the dinner recess, I saw a monstrous spectacle in Toronto, which was the arrival of the Beatles. For the information of the Leader of the Opposition, the Beatles are from England and they were none the less not well received in Toronto, or probably too well received. There, we saw things which should not happen anywhere in Canada.

We too regret what takes place in the province of Quebec from time to time, when some fanatic or hot-head raises an outcry against the coming visit of Her Majesty the Queen to Quebec or to Canada. But when the leader of the official opposition spends his time adding insult to injury, then he is hurting the cause of Canadian unity.

Mr. Speaker, you and I are both from the province of Quebec. You are not a French Canadian and I am one. But you have noticed how well, in the province of Quebec, English and French Canadians get along together and how much they respect each other, much more than the leader of the official opposition has ever respected the province of Quebec since the day he was born and since he has been a member of our nation's parliament.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that the Conservative members disagree with what I am now saying. Nevertheless, I must add that during the past two months the leader of the official

opposition has been undermining Canadian unity and mutual understanding between the two ethnic groups in Canada.

An hon. Member: He is a liberal, now.

Mr. Caouette: I hear the Conservatives accusing me of being a Liberal, of supporting the Liberals. It is well known that nobody in the province of Quebec has fought the Liberals as I did and that nobody in Quebec has fought the Conservatives as well as the Liberals as I did. No Conservative members will prevent me in this house from saying to the leader of the official opposition that his attitude has been prejudicial to Canadian unity and mutual understanding between French and English Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, I am not the only one to deplore that lamentable attitude and the unfortunate situation which is entirely due to the obstinacy of the Conservatives, who are trying to force an election because they think they would be returned to office thanks to the existing dissensions between French speaking and English speaking Canadians which they created themselves.

They come to the house to boast that English Canadians who were in favour of a distinctive flag are now changing their minds and would accept the red ensign, because they maintain that the distinctive national flag is only a way to please French Canadians of the province of Quebec. When Conservative members, wherever they come from, create such a state of mind, I say that they are playing their last trump card, because judging from what we hear throughout Canada, the Conservatives will lose many seats.

Mr. Speaker, this is what I read in *Le Devoir* of September 4, 1964—three days ago, in an item by Paul Sauriol:

> The amendment to the government resolution calls for a referendum on the flag issue; and this is unacceptable to French Canadians, because such a method implies that the decision of the majority would prevail without consideration of French Canadians' views.
>
> The second subamendment is still more openly directed against our group. It proposes—

It is to be noted that Paul Sauriol is neither a Creditiste nor a Liberal; he is an independent newspaperman, with objective views.

> It proposes that in the referendum which is still the object of the amendment the results be compiled on a national basis and not by areas or provinces. This is undemocratic and contrary to our federal system and, in addition, this subamendment would have the effect of swamping the Quebec vote in the total vote.
>
> At the 1942 plebiscite, the King government paid no attention to the opinion of our group, to which the promise in question had been made, but at least it was known that Quebec had solidly answered "no", even if the majority of Canadians had voted "yes".
>
> This time, not only does Mr. Diefenbaker want to see the Quebec vote cancelled out in a referendum, he wants it made invisible. Then that is a real insult to Quebec. Now, last Tuesday, Mr. Diefenbaker asserted that, never in his life, had he uttered a single word which could be interpreted as against Quebec and that he had always worked for the French Canadians. Yet, that statement and the next day's subamendment are not easily reconciled. The explanation lies in one of two things: cynicism or irresponsibility. That is something which French Canadian members of the House of Commons will find hard to swallow.

Mr. Speaker, there we see the little understanding that exists between the leader of the official opposition and his Conservative colleagues from the province of Quebec.

A few minutes ago I asked why the hon. member for Three Rivers was not present in the house to voice accurately the views of Quebec.

Why does the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Bagot (Mr. Ricard) not do the same thing? Why does the hon. member for Berthier-Maskinongé-Delanaudière (Mr. Paul) not do the same thing also?

I just heard a member of the Conservative party say—

Mr. Paul: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege—

Mr. Caouette: The Conservative members cannot do anything else but confuse the Canadian people as much as possible and confuse the issue of national unity in Canada. That is all we can expect from them.

Mr. Paul: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege to protest against the spurious remarks which the hon. member for Villeneuve just made about me. If he had not stayed away from the house for 12 days, he would have noticed that I did not hesitate in taking position on the flag issue. I shall not allow myself to be labelled a sluggard or a coward in this matter.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I never said that the hon. member for Berthier-Maskinongé-Delanaudière was a sluggard or a coward. But I maintain that, even if he voted against the subamendment of his leader the other day, he is now a follower of his leader in the house.

Mr. Paul: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. I want to protest those spurious remarks coming from a rather lame brain,

and I would ask the hon. member for Villeneuve to read the speech I made in the house on Monday, August 24, 1964.

An hon. Member: It was hardly worth reading.

Mr. Caouette: I read his speech, Mr. Speaker, and, as one of my fellow members just said, it was hardly worth reading. I shall not say that he is a lame brain, because I have more consideration for the hon. member than he has for me. However, if he wants to measure his brain or his intellectual power against mine, I am ready to meet him anywhere—not in my riding, but in his own, for this is important—and we shall have a public joust on what is happening in the Conservative corner of the house, because in the hon. member's riding, like in other ridings of Quebec members, everybody has had enough of those nonsensical and endless discussions on a distinctive national flag.

When we visit our respective ridings people ask us: "When will you be through discussing this stupid issue that you have been debating for two months?"

Mr. Speaker, the issue has become serious. The more we discuss it here, in the house, the more the electorate is dissatisfied with our conduct. In fact, we have reached the point where youngsters of 10, 12 or 15 and older people of 40, 50 and 60 accuse us of behaving like school children in the house.

Who are the school children? They are the Conservatives who, under the leader of the official opposition, have imposed this interminable debate on hon. members and the whole of Canada.

Before I conclude, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that every serious consideration be given to the proposals made by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam and an end be put to the speeches and repetitions we have been hearing here for the past two months, more precisely for 22 days, on the flag issue. Let us stop acting like irresponsible people in the eyes of the Canadian electorate.

Mr. Speaker, I feel the government should take appropriate steps to bring this trivial debate to an end. We have heard over 100 Conservative speeches, endless repetitions by people who are trying to build up a political capital which is getting smaller all the time. Such an attitude will just bring about their own extermination.

I ask the Prime Minister, the government, not as a Liberal, because I am not one and never will be, but as a Canadian, that the government take steps to introduce in the house an amendment, some conciliatory measure or other concessions so that this debate may end and that, at last we may come back to our senses before we lose our intellect, and that we go on with the adoption of real legislation, progressive legislation to give the people the security and liberty they expect from us, under a flag which would be Canada's own.

[*Text*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Do I understand the hon. member for Brantford wishes to ask a question?

Mr. Brown: Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to ask a further question of the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam in respect of the speech he made this afternoon?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Brown: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask that hon. member whether he will make it clear to the house that it is his desire that the committee to deal with the flag issue, and to which he referred, would sit in camera on this matter?

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to reply, I would like to state that this would be entirely a matter for the committee itself to decide. My own feeling is that the committee would do much better by sitting in camera, if not all the time, then most of the time. However, that is a matter for the committee itself to decide.

Mr. J. H. Horner (Acadia): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate this evening I cannot help but comment on the fact that today has been very interesting. Unfortunately the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) is apparently leaving the house, because I should like to make reference to his speech, and state that it was a speech which lends itself more than any other to the creation of disunity in Canada. He has accused the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) of acting in a manner which will create great disunity in this country, but nothing is further from the truth. There has never been a speech made in this House of Commons which has created more disunity than that made by the hon. member for Villeneuve.

I am surprised that hon. members of that party speak in such terms about the leader of any group, in view of the fact that not one of them rose in defence of this country in its time of need. Today they are all prepared to defend Canada and say they are doing so for righteous causes. These are the same individ-

uals, and particularly the hon. member for Villeneuve, who refer to the work done by that right hon. gentleman as comparable to the efforts of Hitler and Mussolini. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to every member of this house, that we in the Conservative party are not creating anything like the disunity in this house and in this country that has been created by the words uttered by the hon. member for Villeneuve, and I say that only after listening to the remarks—

Some hon. Members: Order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): I say that, Mr. Speaker, only after listening to the remarks made by that hon. member.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak to a question of privilege. I should like to say to that hon. member, who suggests that I used Hitler and Mussolini to make a comparison, that I have never known of a man in Canada who acts more like Hitler and Mussolini than his own leader, who is today acting against the national unity of Canada.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Mr. Speaker, where is the question of privilege in that statement? I ask you to rule on that question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): There is no question of privilege in that remark, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. I do not think the question of privilege referred to by the hon. member for Villeneuve is well taken. I do suggest that it would be better for hon. members to refrain from entering into personalities and confine their remarks to the debate before us.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Those remarks are nothing more than character assassination.

Mr. Langlois: Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak on a point of order.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): That assassination is made by an individual who is afraid to stand up and risk being charged with—

Mr. Langlois: Mr. Speaker, I hate to disagree with the hon. member for Acadia, but he said there was no one in this group who had stood up to defend Canada. It is true I am not of an age which would have permitted me to fight in the last world war, Mr. Speaker. However I have a question of privilege, and I think I should have the opportunity of completing it. I can only defend what I believe. At the moment, I can compare my military experience with that of the hon. member for Acadia. Although he might have had an opportunity of defending his country in the last world war, today we are defending much more: We are defending the unity of Canada. I think he should put up his arms in that way.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): We have had two hypothetical questions of privilege. The first one was no question of privilege whatever, and the second might have contained some element of privilege because the hon. member was not of age. However, the statement I made still stands unchallenged, because I looked up the facts in the parliamentary guide. Remember, I am talking about the facts and they are on record. The hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) is on record as stating in 1940 and 1945 that Canada was not worth defending, was not worth fighting for. Now this hon. member stands as the conscience of the Canadian public. He reads letters from Lethbridge, from Ontario, from Vancouver and all across Canada. He has become the conscience of this parliament and the conscience of Canada, although in 1940 and 1945 he thought Canada was not worth fighting for. Are we supposed to take this man seriously, Mr. Speaker? I think not. This man said he admired Hitler and Mussolini and stated that Canada was not worth fighting for.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Are we supposed to take him seriously? I think not.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order; the hon. member for Villeneuve, on a point of order.

Mr. Caouette: I think there is a subamendment before this house and the hon. member should discuss it. Now he is discussing whether or not I was in the armed forces, and that is none of his business.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Caouette: I will go a little further. In the province of Quebec, when the plebiscite took place in 1942 I was one of the many thousands that were fighting the Liberal government at that time. I am just as respectful as the hon. member for Acadia and I have no lesson to take from him. Mr. Speaker, I should like you to ask the hon. member to stay in order and discuss the subamendment that has been presented by his own party.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): I think the hon. member has made a personal explanation. Perhaps we can hear the hon. member for Acadia now.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): I have listened to the hon. member very carefully. I only stated what I did because—

Mr. Caouette: You said nothing.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): If I said nothing, why did it hurt so much? Why did the hon. member rise twice—thrice? He did so because it hurt; because I said something. The hon. member said in 1940 and 1945 Canada was not worth fighting for. He has said quite a bit about Canada. I am proud he does not come from western Canada. If I have offended any of my fellow members from eastern Canada, I can only say that I am proud that he is not a member of this party. The hon. member is talking a lot and I am sorry I cannot hear him because I am sure those are pearls of wisdom which it would be better if you and I heard, Mr. Speaker.

I only stated what I did because the leader of the social credit rally party referred to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) and charged him with creating disunity in Canada by continuing this debate. It pleases me a great deal to rise and speak on this amendment, and in particular on the subamendment before us. The subamendment contains provisions for the taking of a plebiscite, and, in the interests of national unity, indicates that the results of the plebiscite be published on a national basis only rather than a regional or provincial basis. The whole purpose behind this subamendment is to show the government a way out of the present flag crisis in which they find themselves. We are suggesting, by means of the amendment, that a plebiscite or referendum be carried out in a certain way and that the facts be published in such a way that unity will be maintained in this country of ours.

I am pleased to speak at this time to this subamendment. I suggested at the commencement of my remarks that this had been a very interesting day. We sat for 90 minutes, Mr. Speaker, while a party which has continually asked for a vote, which had been sitting over there for 20 days shouting "Question, question", and "Vote, vote"—

An hon. Member: And 50 Tories were away.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): —waited to collect its members. The vote came as no surprise. There was a vote last Thursday and after that vote an hon. member stated he would bring this up from time to time. Another vote came today and we waited 90 minutes for the government to produce its members. We were told later on the delay was caused by the fact there were two or three flights from Newfoundland, Toronto and other points in Canada bringing in members so that the Liberals could substantiate their belief that this flag debate should continue. This is their belief, that this flag debate should continue. We wanted this debate to end, but they voted for this flag debate to continue. I repeat that, so that there will be no doubt about it. The response of the government was that this debate shall continue.

It was interesting, Mr. Speaker, to watch the voting of the party of the hon. member who moved the motion. On Thursday night some hon. members of that party voted for the continuance of this debate. Now, we have only had two speakers since Thursday night and yet all members of that party who were present voted to have the debate cease.

Mr. Langlois: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): It is odd they could not realize this on Thursday night. It is interesting to note this particular change—

Some hon. Members: Order, order.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): —in so far as the various parties in this house are concerned.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): The hon. member for Mégantic on a question of privilege.

Mr. Langlois: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I do not believe it is the privilege of the hon. member for Acadia to discuss or comment in any way upon how a member of this house voted. After all, if I voted one way on Thursday and presented a motion today, I took the time to explain why I presented such a motion. It is not up to the hon. member for Acadia to decide whether I should have voted one way or the other. I think he should stick to the matter under discussion.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): I think there is some merit in the point of order raised by the hon. member for Mégantic. I say to the hon. member for Acadia that I do not believe he is quite in order in making reference to a vote that has already been taken in this house.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Well, Mr. Speaker, this is a debate on the flag. As I mentioned in

my opening remarks, we have had a very interesting day. I could not help but refer back to Thursday night when a vote was taken to sustain this debate. If the hon. member had a change of heart from Thursday to Tuesday that is fine. I have no objection. I am just pointing out the fact that he had.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): If hon. members are objecting to this being pointed out, if they are ashamed of the way they voted on Thursday, let them stand up and say so.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. I must point out to the hon. member that he is out of order when he reflects on the way in which a member voted in a vote that has already been taken. I believe the hon. member should continue with his speech on the subamendment.

Mr. Langlois: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege because the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Horner) seemed to point to me specifically and say I had a change of heart since last Thursday. That is true. I explained my position today, and this is one proof that we have no stupid-headed fools in this party at least.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the hon. member meant by that last remark—stupid fools.

An hon. Member: Everybody else does.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): He apparently is ashamed of his Thursday night vote.

Mr. Langlois: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. The hon. member does not have the right to comment on a vote taken in the house, either on my vote or on anybody else's vote.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. I am sure the hon. member for Acadia does not want me to continue to remind him that he is out of order when he persists in reflecting on a vote already taken in the house.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Mr. Speaker, I intended to get right along with my speech, but the slightest reference really seems to dig deep. While I know most members of the house are quite proud of the way they voted, particularly those in this party, many of those on the other side wished they could have voted otherwise, but because they were not allowed a free vote three months ago—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order.

[Mr. Horner (Acadia).]

Mr. Horner (Acadia): —they could not vote the way they wished.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. I would remind the hon. member he is out of order by making reference to any vote taken in the house. Maybe the hon. member would consider the incident finished and go on with his speech.

Mr. MacInnis: On that point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. MacInnis: —where nobody can refer to votes which have taken place in the house, is there some quotation with which the Chair can guide the house, because this takes place here day in and day out. Parties are continually referring to the way other parties voted on certain issues in days gone by.

Mr. Knowles: It is standing order 35.

Mr. McIlraith: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, we have had a persistent breach of the rules, and this has been drawn to the attention of the hon. member three times. The applicable rule is standing order 35, the last sentence of which is:

> No member may reflect upon any vote of the house, except for the purpose of moving that such vote be rescinded.

Beauchesne's fourth edition, at page 113, paragraph 125, goes on to elaborate on this standing order, and subparagraph 3 of the citation reads:

> A member may not speak against or reflect upon any determination of the house, unless he intends to conclude with a motion for rescinding it.

Mr. Bigg: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, no later than this afternoon the Prime Minister himself took it upon himself to count the number of Conservatives present and made a very pointed reference to the number present.

Mr. Pickersgill: He only referred to those who did not vote.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): No, he did not.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. I think I have advised the hon. member for Acadia two or three times that he is out of order in reflecting on a vote taken by the house. Perhaps I should read for him that section of standing order 35 which has reference thereto:

> No member may reflect upon any vote of the house, except for the purpose of moving that such vote be rescinded.

I am sure the hon. member for Acadia recognizes that in continuing with the remarks he is now making he is not obeying the standing orders of the house. Maybe he will continue with his remarks on the subamendment.

Mr. Nugent: May I make a comment on that point of order?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): I do not think there is any need to have any further comment on this matter. The point of order has been raised and I have given the ruling that the hon. member is out of order. Maybe we can now allow the hon. member for Acadia to continue.

Mr. Nugent: If I might, on that point of order there is a point that has not been mentioned. The hon. member was talking about the situation at the time that existed before another situation arose in which the question developed as to how the hon. member should vote.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. This is not the matter upon which I am ruling. I am ruling upon the fact that according to standing order 35 the hon. member for Acadia does not have the right to reflect upon a vote already taken.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Mr. Speaker, at the outset I want to say I regret I may have caused you any inconvenience in ruling on my behalf. I had no intention when I rose to speak of causing you any difficulty in ruling whether I was in order or out of order. I was only rising to the debate offered to me by previous speakers, and I shall refrain from commenting on that party's remarks during the rest of my speech. I might say that they were ashamed of their past actions—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): —and I would now like to refer to the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas) and his speech—

Mr. Langlois: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege—

Mr. Horner (Acadia): —in which he said a flag must be a symbol of the hopes and aspirations—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. Is the hon. member for Mégantic rising to ask a question?

Mr. Langlois: No, I rise on a question of privilege on the statement made by the hon. member for Acadia. I would like the hon. member for Acadia to withdraw his statement that we were ashamed of our past role, our past vote—

Mr. Bigg: He did not say that.

Mr. Langlois: If that was his intention I can assure the hon. member for Acadia I have never regretted any action or vote I have taken, whether on Thursday night or today, and if the situation pops up again I shall do the same thing.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. The hon. member for Mégantic has made his explanation but I doubt that the words used by the hon. member for Acadia are unparliamentary.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Mr. Speaker, I was referring to the speech of the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas) in which he stated that a flag once adopted by a country—I jotted these notes down—must be a symbol of the hopes and aspirations for the future of that country. I wholeheartedly agree with these remarks. He also went on to say it must have the support of the vast majority of the people who will accept and worship that flag in the future. Perhaps this is interpreting the words of the hon. member, and if he disagrees with my interpretation maybe he will rise and say so. He went on to say that the flag now before the house has been brought in the wrong way, has been brought in at the wrong time and has been handled very poorly by the government. I wholeheartedly agree with him in that respect.

Mr. Bigg: The understatement of the year.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): And the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam suggested a way out. His whole speech was as if he were acting as a mediator between the devil and the deep blue sea, or between the two sides.

An hon. Member: Which is which?

Mr. Horner (Acadia): I leave it to you to interpret. I know which is the devil. The hon. member suggested a committee of 15 members, a suggestion which has been floating around and which I think was first offered by the Leader of the Opposition.

An hon. Member: Are you sure?

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Yes I am sure, if you want to know. This whole suggestion of a committee of 15 members was presented by the official opposition. The whole tenor of the hon. member's remarks was that you cannot bring in a flag unless it is accepted by the vast majority, that you cannot bring in a flag or you cannot expect the people to accept a flag unless it meets the wishes of the majority. Then he went on to say we should have

this committee of 15 members and limit its sittings to two months. What happens if after two months the committee has not reached a majority decision? The hon. member did not mention that possibility. He did not say its findings would be backed by a majority, or a vast majority, or an overwhelming majority. He simply said that in two months the committee should end its sittings. It does not matter whether it has called in the Legion or other interested parties; in two months its work is to end. Then we should decide how long the debate is to last in this house.

What will happen if the committee having sat for two months and a decision having been made to the effect that there should be a ten days debate in this house there is still strong opposition in the country to the flag proposed by the government or by the committee? The hon. member did not deal with that situation at all.

The hon. member went on to say emphatically that the government should not expect to impose upon the people of Canada a flag they did not want. I am sure that if he disagrees with me he will rise and say so. He said this emphatically. Yet he did not propose any means of dealing with a situation such as I have described—the committee having sat for two months and the House of Commons being at a stalemate after a debate of ten days, or one week, or two weeks on this issue. The hon. member did not suggest any means of dealing with a situation like that. As one hon. member opposite has said, he was just hoping.

Mr. Douglas: Would the hon. member permit a question? I suggested that when the committee had prepared its report the party leaders would then meet to discuss whether or not any limitation on the length of debate would be established in connection with the committee's report. I take it that if the committee was virtually unanimous in its conclusion the leaders would decide that only a short time was necessary. But if the committee was nowhere close to being unanimous it would be a much longer time. The decision would be one entirely for the party leaders themselves. It seems to me that is fairly conclusive.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Fairly conclusive if a conclusion is reached by the committee in two months. But where are we left if a conclusion has not been reached at the end of that time? We would be left exactly where we are today. Does the hon. member agree with me? He agrees with that. He agrees with my interpretation of his remarks. So I say there is no need to put a time limit on the deliberations of the committee. Even though members over there say "oh" and "aye" and whatever else they are told, they too are in favour of a committee. So why put on a time limit? I ask this question: Why do we need a flag this winter, this fall, or next spring? We have gone on for years—

Mr. Douglas: Would the hon. member permit a further question? If he would look at the statement of his leader on August 21 he would be aware of the fact that his leader has already agreed to the suggestion that the committee should report in 60 days.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): I realize that my leader is a compromising gentleman and prepared to go more than half way in settling this issue.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): The hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam suggests in that all-inclusive manner of his that the issue can be resolved quite simply in a matter of two months. I am pointing out that it may not be as simple as he imagines, even though my leader has said he is prepared to accept a two months limit on the sittings of the committee.

I myself wholeheartedly support the idea of a committee of 15 members, seven from the government side, five from this party and one from each of the others. I am in wholehearted support of there being a time limit on the debate when the issue comes back to this house—

An hon. Member: If.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): You are right: If—if the committee has unlimited time and reaches a virtually unanimous decision. Is it impossible that this should happen? The committee of 1945 reached a virtually unanimous decision, 21 to 1, I believe.

An hon. Member: You were not on the committee.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Twenty three to one was the exact figure. Now, we have the same question, the same country, the same people. Why cannot it be resolved in a similar way in this committee? There is no reason whatsoever. I come back to this. Why does the government insist there must be a time limit on the sittings of the committee? We got along from 1945 to 1964, nearly 20 years, without this proposed design. We went along right

through the period between 1867 and 1945 without, or with, a flag, depending on the way you want to interpret the situation. What is the hurrry? Where are we rushing to? I say to the leader of the house, whom I see shaking his head: Is this flag now proposed by the government likely to create greater unity? Is it likely to be a uniting force around which all Canadians will gather? Now let him shake his head. No, sir. This proposed new flag, especially having regard to the manner in which it was placed before us, is not a uniting force; it is not a symbol behind which all Canada will unite.

The leader of the New Democratic party pointed this out clearly. He said the government had brought this issue before us at the wrong time, in the wrong way. They had handled it badly, he said. He stated the proposed flag was not a uniting force. Many members have expressed the opinion that this debate has divided the country and will continue to do so. I do not accept that. Perhaps as a young member of the House of Commons I look to the future with greater interest than do some who are here. I see one problem confronting Canada—one which will loom large in the years ahead. It is the problem of unity. Will we stay united, or will we divide? We hear talk of two nations and of a separate state. I wonder whether we will stay united. I know the Prime Minister is concerned about this problem, too. It took him 90 minutes to decide how to vote this afternoon—whether to end this debate or have it continued. It took him 90 minutes to make that decision. I do not begrude him the time, though at the time I might have done so, since I was anxious to make this speech. But it showed me he was concerned about unity in Canada. I hope that when the next similar vote comes up he will have reached the decision which is requisite from the leader of a government responsible for the position confronting parliament today. I hope he will reach a decision to end this debate until such time as the subject will create unity in Canada, not divide the country as it is doing at the present time.

The hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam said many Conservatives have stated that this proposal by the government is a concession to Quebec. I do not believe it is, but it is understood and accepted by Canadians across this country as being a concession to Quebec.

An hon. Member: Repeat that.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Someone says: "Repeat that". I do not think this a concession to Quebec. But I do say—and I have seen evidence for this in editorial pages across Canada—that a good many Canadians in various parts of the country believe this is a concession to Quebec.

Mr. Cashin: Does the hon. member not feel, then, that he is under an obligation to go across the country telling the people what he thinks—telling those who believe this to be a concession to Quebec that it is not so? Would he perhaps start on this crusade within the next 24 hours.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Mr. Speaker, that question really did not make much sense. If the hon. member is prepared to organize the meetings, I am prepared to speak at them. As we look around the world today—and I say this in all seriousness to the government of Canada—we see countries divided. We see Cyprus, for example. Canada is playing a great role in trying to bring unity and peace to that country. We look at the Middle East; we look at the country to the south of us. You can look at any part of the world today and see disunity caused by racial problems. Surely, Mr. Speaker, we should not join with other countries in the world and promote or create greater disunity in this country of ours, a country which until the past year had been united. Let us remain united, above all. This is the whole purpose of the subamendment, namely to keep us united and to foster unity in our country. As I have said, as a young member of parliament I look perhaps to the future and see that the biggest problem facing Canada in the next 10 or 20 years is unity. We must stay united if we expect to grow and if we expect to maintain our stature throughout the world.

The press has written up this debate as a terrible fiasco, as a terrible thing. Some hon. members have emphasized the fact that 20 days have been spent on this debate. These 20 days may go down as the best 20 days this parliament has ever spent. If because of this debate unity is maintained and promoted, the time could not have been better occupied. We hear a great deal of talk about confederation; we hear a great deal of talk today about opting out, about dominion-provincial rights and dominion-provincial cost sharing programs and the splitting up of tax sharing arrangements between the provinces and the federal government. We hear a great deal of talk about maintaining a strong central government, and also about maintaining a strong

separate province, a province to which more and more rights should be doled out.

I say again, Mr. Speaker, that if we can maintain and promote unity in this country, these 20 days will have been well spent and may well be the best days this parliament or any other parliament has spent since confederation. The press may write any reports they like. I know that the people across Canada are tired of this debate; I know they think parliament should get on to more pressing business. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the government is responsible for this debate and it is their responsibility to bring forth legislation that is so necessary.

Mr. Sharp: We have.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Someone over there says "We have"; I think it was the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp). I wonder whether he supports what the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) said today to the press, namely that we have to shut out all Japanese trade. I wonder how the western farmers like that. I know they did not like it a few years ago when we made similar statements, although they were not nearly as strong as the statement of the Minister of Finance today.

They talk about legislation. We have said from time to time, "Bring forward your pension legislation; bring forward your agricultural machinery legislation that will revamp and revolutionize agriculture", as stated by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Hays) in Lethbridge back in March. He said the opposition was holding up this legislation. The Minister of Trade and Commerce nods his head as if to agree that we are holding up this legislation. It is not even on the order paper; neither is the pension legislation. Bring it forward; put it on the order paper. It is the government's responsibility to bring it forward.

This afternoon, Mr. Speaker, we voted in favour of the motion so that the government could bring forward this necessary legislation. How did the minister and the rest of the cabinet vote? They voted to continue this debate; they wanted to hear more as to why their flag should or should not be approved by this House of Commons.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. The hon. member is again reflecting on a vote which has already been taken by the house.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Trade and Commerce led me astray by nodding his head. He led me to cast reflections upon his action this afternoon, which was contrary to the impression he created when shaking his head while I was speaking earlier.

An hon. Member: Deceitful people.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): It is a sorry state in which we find ourselves in this Canadian parliament, stalemated and blocked from proceeding with necessary legislation. The farmers all across Canada are waiting for this legislation to be passed. I do not know whether they want to be called grocery growers or not; I do not think they do. I am a farmer, and I want to be called a farmer and not a grocery grower. If the Minister of Agriculture can dream up any term to apply to me and the farmers of Canada, let him do so; but we are proud to be farmers. It is a sad commentary on this parliament when we find ourselves stalemated by the government. They realize this debate has reached an impasse but they will not, because of their stubborn arrogance, bring in necessary legislation. This is a proud, arrogant government which has presented a flag that has been termed a political flag and which, as the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas) quite properly said, is a flag that will cause Canada to remain divided in the years ahead. This proud, arrogant and dictatorial government is trying to ram down the throats of Canadians a flag of one man's choosing. It is not a flag of two or three men; it is not a flag the cabinet has decided upon; it is not a party or backbenchers' flag, but is a flag of one man's choosing. We have as evidence in this regard the speech of the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan).

An hon. Member: Was it good?

Mr. Horner (Acadia): It was very good, because the hon. member who has interjected did not challenge it, and neither has any other backbencher or cabinet minister challenged it. I think the hon. member's word is good, because nobody on that side of the house, neither backbencher nor cabinet minister, had the guts to stand up and challenge what was said. Hon. members opposite know whether this design was presented or even talked about in their caucus; they know better than I do. I ask them to stand up and say it was not. They can throw out these red herrings, if they like, but they will not lead me astray this evening.

We have the word of the hon. member for York-Humber, and no one in his party has challenged what he said. It has not been

challenged by any backbencher who might have attended the caucuses of that party. No cabinet minister, and not even the leader of that party, has challenged it. This is a one-man flag which will be portrayed as Pearson's pennant as long as Canada exists.

Mr. Dupuis: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Bigg: No, not from a sticker-licker.

Mr. Dupuis: Does my hon. friend remember having said in this house in 1961:

I think that any attempt to include the union jack or red ensign in the flag would merely degrade two well known and honourable flags.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): I am sure that if my hon. friend reads my whole speech which I made in 1961, rather than picking out a sentence from it, I would be pleased if he would rise in his place and ask me about it. But I have the floor and have only five or six minutes left.

Mr. Dupuis: Answer my question.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): I said, read my whole speech. Mr. Speaker, I hope you are deducting the appropriate amount of time to allow for these people who are interrupting me in the course of my remarks. While I have not too much time left there are a few things I want to say, and I trust the Chair will give me 40 minutes, which is what all hon. members ask for.

Some hon. Members: Answer.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): I will answer the question, do not worry. Give me time this evening and I will answer it.

We are suggesting that this government has no mandate. In presenting this flag the government has contributed to and is aiding the division of Canada. We have suggested that they made no real promise before the 1963 election that they would present a flag to parliament, and I say that they have not stood on their feet and substantiated any of the points I have just made.

I should like to refer to an interview which took place on November 9, 1961 in which the present Prime Minister, who was then leader of the opposition, was interviewed by Mr. John Andrews of CJCH news bureau. It starts in this way:

Mr. Andrews: Mr. Pearson, how do you feel about a distinctive Canadian flag?

Mr. Pearson: I feel very friendly toward a distinctive Canadian flag. In fact, it's been on our program now for some years...a distinctive Canadian flag...

Mr. Andrews: What particular design do you have in mind?

Mr. Pearson: Well, I haven't any particular design in mind...

So in 1961 he did not have any particular design in mind, yet the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate (Mr. Pickersgill) said on a T.V. program in 1960 that he told Canadians that if he was elected prime minister he would bring in a particular design for a Canadian flag. The interview continues:

Mr. Pearson: I would have a distinctive Canadian flag which could not be mistaken for the flag of any other country....that's as far as I've got.

Mr. Andrews: Then you wouldn't have the union jack in it.

Then the Prime Minister replied that he could not make a statement on this at that time. Then Mr. Andrews asked, in deciding what design we should have:

How would you poll the people on this?

Mr. Pearson: We would poll the people when we have a general election. And if they don't like the idea of a distinctive Canadian flag which can't be mistaken for that of any other country, they'll let us know in no uncertain terms.

Hon. members opposite got 42 per cent of the vote. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is that in no uncertain terms? Is that a majority government? As the hon. member for York-Humber quite explicitly pointed out in his speech, they did not even present the flag to the electorate in the 1963 election. They did not even point out—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. I must advise the hon. member that the time allotted to him has expired.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Mr. Speaker, I beg to differ with you. I was continually interrupted from the commencement of my remarks, and I certainly have not taken 40 minutes.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): The Clerk at the table has given me the time when the hon. member began his speech and I have made an appropriate allowance for the interruptions the hon. member has had. I must advise him that his time has expired.

Mr. Dupuis: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Mr. Speaker—well, if the hon. member is going to ask me a question I will answer it.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Yvon Dupuis (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, it was not at all my intention to take part in this debate, but as my hon. friend did not answer my question

and suggested that I speak after him, may I take a few minutes of the time of the house to recall briefly what took place in the House of Commons on the question of a national plebiscite as the one requested now by our friends in their subamendment.

First of all, as I intend to be brief, I would like to say that I am proud of having been here this afternoon when the leader of the New Democratic party (Mr. Douglas) made a speech which, in my opinion—

[*Text*]

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. When the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Dupuis) rose to his feet the members on this side of the house were under the impression that he was rising for the purpose of asking a question. According to the ruling made last week in the house, all that was necessary, in effect, was for a speaker to yield the floor in order to give an hon. member permission to ask a question. However, it now appears that the hon. minister is making a speech, and in doing so he needs the necessary recognition from the Chair, which was not forthcoming. The hon. member on this side accepted a question from the minister, who is now proceeding to make a speech.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. The hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Horner) could not accept a question without the unanimous consent of the house, his time, plus a very generous allowance given by the Chair, having expired. The Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Dupuis).

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Is this a speech or a question?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dupuis: Mr. Speaker, I said at the outset that since the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Horner) stated that he did not have time to answer my question, I would make a speech.

I said I was glad to be in the House of Commons this afternoon when the leader of the New Democratic party made what I consider as a historical speech, above all partisanship, and I take this opportunity to congratulate him sincerely for his contribution to the debate.

Mr. Speaker, I have no intention to give the debate a political slant, but I would merely like to remind—

[*Text*]

Mr. Nugent: Would the minister permit a question? He has just said that the leader of the New Democratic party had made a speech well above partisan politics and he wanted to congratulate him for that. Would he care to explain to the house how he can equate that with his position as chief huckster for the government of the three maple leaf flag?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dupuis: Mr. Speaker, evidently, if the hon. member who has just put a question were intelligent, his question would be intelligent, but, one cannot give what one has not got.

Mr. Speaker, a while ago, I asked a question of the hon. member for Acadia. The hon. member should certainly have been most careful before making his speech, for in January 1961, when the Tory government, headed by the man who is today the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker), was making no decisions, a Conservative member, Mr. Régnier, saw fit to submit to the house, because of his chief's irresolution, a motion for a national referendum or plebiscite.

On this occasion, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who just resumed his seat, had something to say.

Evidently, I cannot take all the time I am allowed to read the hon. member's speech, but I wish to quote a few excerpts, which may lead my Conservative friends to do some thinking.

Listen to this. On January 23, 1961, in the House of Commons, when the present Leader of the Opposition was prime minister and reigning supreme, with an overwhelming majority in the house, the hon. member for Acadia said this:

[*Text*]

> I think that any attempt to include the union jack or red ensign in the flag would merely degrade two well known and honourable flags. Between now and 1967, when Canada will celebrate its centennial, we hope that Canada will continue to grow in stature and as a nation. Right now the provinces are meeting with the federal government in order to work out ways by which Canada can amend the British North America Act without having to go to the British government for final approval of amendments. When this day arrives I think we will have passed another milestone in becoming a truly independent nation, and surely when we pass that milestone and celebrate our centennial we should feel entitled to have a truly distinctive flag.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, the man who said that is the Conservative member for Acadia, who just resumed his seat, when he was sitting with the Diefenbaker government. I commend him, I agree with him and it is to congratulate him that I rose to my feet.

The hon. member for Acadia said, as recorded on page 1318 of *Hansard* for January 23, 1961, year of the reign of "his gracious majesty" the hon. member for Prince Albert:

[*Text*]

Surely an artist in designing a flag should adhere to simplicity and present a design that is well known and recognizably representative of Canada, one that would be recognized and accepted the world over. I think a flag must be emblematic of the country it represents so that it will not be mistaken for the flag of another country.

I should like to congratulate the hon. member and state that I agree with him. I note that he left the house before I mentioned what he had said, because he realizes what he did say and he is ashamed now.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak on a point of order.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nugent: Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak to a question of privilege. I am sure that the minister, if he reflects upon the reason the hon. member left the house, will realize that even for that hon. minister, this is getting to be pretty low.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nugent: I know why the hon. member for Acadia left the house, and it is certainly not because he is afraid of anything that huckster might say. The minister referred to the statement, that only after we have passed that milestone and repatriated the constitution could that be done.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Nugent: I think if the hon. minister reflects further he will conclude that he should qualify at least his remarks in respect of that statement.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dupuis: Mr. Speaker, I hope you keep track of the interruptions because, I too, have many things to say.

[*Text*]

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister without Portfolio should withdraw the remark he made about the hon. member for Acadia.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nugent: He is not man enough to withdraw.

Mr. MacInnis: I think the Minister without Portfolio should definitely withdraw the statement he made in respect of the reason the hon. member for Acadia left his seat. While the hon. member for Acadia was making his speech a page informed me that there was a long distance call for him. I personally went to the phone for the hon. member who had asked me to find out who was calling and what the individual wanted, and advise them that the hon. member would call them back as soon as he had concluded his remarks. I base this statement on a message I received from one of the page boys. I think the minister should withdraw his statement.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dupuis: Mr. Speaker, I presume—and I speak slowly in order that the translators may interpret my speech correctly—that when I began to quote him, the hon. member for Acadia must have been embarrassed because he left his seat, but I think that he was especially embarrassed over his party's stand and not over his, because he frankly said what he had to say in 1961. And I continue the quotation—

[*Text*]

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

An hon. Member: There is no point of order.

Mr. MacInnis: I have explained to the Chair that the hon. member for Acadia left his seat having received a message from the page that there was a long distance call for him. I would not stand here and repeat this explanation if it was not the actual fact. The minister has indicated that the hon. member for Acadia left his seat for an entirely different reason. He must accept my explanation, or call me to order.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. Perhaps the members of this house will allow me to say that the hon. member for Cape Breton South has explained why the hon. member for Acadia left this chamber, and I am sure the Minister without Portfolio will accept that explanation.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dupuis: Mr. Speaker, I am willing to accept the explanation of the phone call, but that does not change the facts.

I resume quoting what the hon. member for Acadia said when the Conservatives were in office, on January 23, 1961.

[*Text*]

Mr. Nugent: Quit trying to change the facts.

Canadian Flag

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dupuis: I do not understand why my Conservative friends take exception to remarks made by their own colleague. I do not understand it at all. They filibustered long enough, they can at least let me speak. They asked us to speak and when we rise to do so, they try to interrupt us. Are they sincere?

Here is what the hon. member for Acadia said under a Conservative government on January 23, 1961 about the resolution of the Conservative member for St. Boniface who at that time asked for a referendum. Remember that when in office the then leader did not want one, but now that he is in opposition, he does.

Listen to this:

[*Text*]

The resolution suggests that we should have a referendum. I do not think it is necessary to go to the trouble and expense of doing so when we will be taking a census this year.

An hon. Member: Who said that?

Mr. Dupuis: The hon. member for Acadia, and he then continued as follows:

I agree with the hon. member who proposed an amendment to the resolution.

[*Translation*]

Now that he is through with is phone call, I wish to tell the hon. member for Acadia, who is now returning to the house, that I congratulate him.

[*Text*]

In the census I believe the only question that should be asked is: Are you in favour of a truly distinctive flag? That is the first question that should be answered. If the answer is overwhelmingly in the affirmative then the government in power should have the courage to decide on a truly distinctive flag.

An hon. Member: Who said that?

Mr. Dupuis: I want to congratulate the hon. member for Acadia in respect of the statements he put on record in 1961. I could not agree more with him. He was a real Canadian in those days.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to a question of privilege. The hon. minister referred to my leaving the house, and I should like to say that I left the house to answer a call which was—

An hon. Member: We heard all this.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): I left the house to answer a call that—

An hon. Member: This is the same old story.

[Mr. Nugent.]

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Mr. Speaker, there is so much shouting going on that I cannot hear.

Mr. Nugent: You cannot hear the minister's withdrawal?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. Order please. It would appear that the hon. member for Acadia wishes to make an explanation, and I suggest there are two avenues open to him. He may ask the Minister without Portfolio, who is now making a speech, to yield the floor and allow him to make his explanation, or he can wait until the minister has completed his remarks, and then, under certain conditions, make an explanation. I suggest to him, however, that the explanation which he feels he should make does not constitute a question of privilege.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. The Minister without Portfolio has cast aspersions on my conduct as a member of this house. It is on that point that I wish to raise this question of privilege. I left the house because I was called away, and while I was away I looked at what remarks I had made in 1961.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Just to make it clear, I should like to read this one sentence.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): In 1961, I said this:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): I personally am satisfied with the flag we have.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Will the hon. member resume his seat, please?

Mr. Horner (Acadia): What I said in 1961, I stand by.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Will the member has given an explanation as to why he left the house. However, he has already made his speech and he cannot now refute any argument that is being made by the Minister without Portfolio.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): I will refute anything he says, and give him proof.

An hon. Member: You had a telephone call?

Mr. MacInnis: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I would appreciate it very much if the hon. member who just made the remark from your right would stand up

and identify himself as having made that remark which casts a reflection on the explanation I gave to this house. I wonder if he has the guts to stand up and identify himself? As I said before, the message I received on behalf of the hon. member for Acadia was delivered here during his speech by a page boy.

Mr. Tardif: Since we are talking about "guts", Mr. Speaker, no doubt we are talking about intestinal fortitude, and there is no shortage of that on this side.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Tardif: Furthermore, it was stated to this house that the hon. member had been called to receive a telephone call. The hon. member came into the house and said he had gone to get his notes or a copy of the speech he made before.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): On a point of privilege—

Mr. Tardif: Which one is true?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order, the hon. member—

Mr. Knowles: Are we charging admission to the galleries tonight?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): The hon. member for Cape Breton South has given an explanation as to why the hon. member for Acadia left the chamber. Under the rules of this house hon. members in this chamber must accept that explanation. Now, perhaps we can get on with the remarks of the Minister without Portfolio.

Mr. Nugent: If I may, I should like to speak to this question of privilege. We cannot allow the statement of the hon. member for Russell to stand. He questions the explanation given. The hon. member for Acadia said that he went out to take a phone call and while he was out there took advantage of the opportunity to look at his notes. The hon. member for Russell just twisted that explanation, and I hope he will withdraw that scurrilous remark.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order; the Chair has already ruled that the explanation given by the hon. member for Cape Breton South must be accepted by the members in this chamber. There can be no debate on that matter.

Mr. Nugent: I am asking the Chair to rule on the remarks of the hon. member for Russell.

Mr. Tardif: If the hon. member will give me a chance I am very happy to say now that I accept the statements made by both members.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order, I should like to read to the house citation 145, page 126 of Beauchesne's fourth edition. Perhaps if I read part of it that would be sufficient:

> 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.

I would expect that the members of this chamber would abide by that rule.

Mr. MacInnis: I have a further question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. Your ruling has indicated that my explanation as to why the hon. member for Acadia left the house must be accepted. On the basis of that ruling, I ask the hon. member for Russell to withdraw the insinuation he cast upon my explanation.

Mr. Tardif: It is not necessary for me to withdraw. All I need say is that I accept your explanation, and I do so with great difficulty.

Mr. Nugent: Now, Mr. Speaker, that remark must be withdrawn. The hon. member has abandoned the twist he put on before and is trying to weasel out of it. He made a plain imputation, and this weaseling cannot be allowed in a house of honourable gentlemen. If we are a house of honourable gentlemen, I would ask the hon. member for Russell to prove whether or not we are.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order, may I read again the last part of citation 145:

> 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.

I suggest to the hon. member for Russell that he accept the explanation given.

Mr. Tardif: I rise in my place, Mr. Speaker, and I do so with pleasure.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dupuis: Mr. Speaker, those points of order have given our hon. friends opposite a breathing spell.

It is obvious that they are not happy tonight; however, for the last ten days they have been urging the ministers to take part in the debate, but when one of them rises, they are very unhappy because they would have preferred that he had remained silent, as they are not over anxious to listen to us.

Canadian Flag

I quoted the words of the hon. member for Acadia; no need for him to be vexed, because I have great esteem for him and I consider that what he said in this house in January 1961 was nothing but the truth. So much so that at that time, when the hon. member for Acadia stated:

[*Text*]

I do not think it is necessary to go to the trouble and expense of doing so when we will be taking a census this year.

[*Translation*]

I was so convinced that he was right on January 23, 1961, that on the day after, January 24 of that same year, I was in this house and I thought I would give the then prime minister the opportunity to support his member for Acadia. The day after the great discovery of the hon. member for Acadia, I moved in the House of Commons, in order to facilitate his task, Bill No. C-60, of which I have a copy here; and in order to comply with the hon. member's wish I entitled the bill: an act to amend the Statistics Act.

Here are the explanations I gave on that occasion:

[*Text*]

Here is the explanation that was given to the house, in support of the hon. member, who is my greatest friend. I quote:

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to authorize the governor in council to conduct a public opinion survey on the occasion of the next decennial census in Canada, concerning an entirely distinctive national flag and national anthem.

Mr. Nugent: Have you changed your mind?

Mr. Dupuis: No, I will explain that. We never change our minds, but occasionally the history of our country changes with the government. I will explain everything you want. You want us to tell you the truth, and you will get the truth tonight.

I continue:

Since the census—

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Mr. Speaker—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dupuis: Will you allow me to speak or do you prefer to carry out your own filibuster?

And I go on:

[*Text*]

Mr. Horner (Acadia): You interrupted me often enough.

Mr. Dupuis: I quote:

Since the census forms have to go back to press shortly—

[Mr. Dupuis.]

This is in support of the hon. member.

—it would be a fine opportunity—

—for that great man, Mr. Diefenbaker—

—to include those two questions in order to learn the wishes of the Canadian people on this matter of great current interest.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Are you prepared to do that now?

Mr. Dupuis: This was what the hon. member said in 1961.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Are you prepared to do that now?

Mr. Dupuis: He is asking me a question, and I will answer the question.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Are you prepared to do that now? The hon. member wishes me to put a question to him. Are you prepared to do that now?

Mr. Dupuis: Let me answer you. I will answer you.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): He does not say yes or no.

Mr. Dupuis: I will say yes.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): The Minister without Portfolio has the floor.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): You say yes.

Mr. Dupuis: I want to answer and he does not want me to answer. This is a real Tory tactic.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): I am sitting here listening to you.

Mr. Dupuis: I will answer you.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, when does a government call for a referendum to answer the hon. member for Acadia's question?

He asks me: "Are you or are you not in favour of a referendum?" I answer immediately: No, today, I am not in favour, and here are my reasons.

When should a government call for a referendum? Everybody knows that there are two main reasons for a government to call for a referendum.

First, a government may want to ask the people to be released from a commitment, and that was the case of the 1952 referendum—

An hon. Member: 1942.

Mr. Dupuis: Yes, 1942.

Second the opposition or the government may ask for a referendum when it is clear,

obvious and unquestionable that the government in power cannot take its responsibilities and wants to leave it to the electors.

Now, today, we have a government that wants to assume its responsibilities and that does assume them. We do not want to be released from any commitment. We want to carry out the pledge we made to the people of Canada.

[*Text*]

Mr. Horner (Acadia): When and where did you make that promise you are talking about?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dupuis: Mr. Speaker—

[*Text*]

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Is it a promise like that clearly set out by the Postmaster General (Mr. Nicholson)?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): I am sure the house would want to accord the ordinary courtesies of the chamber to the Minister without Portfolio who is now making a speech and who has the right to continue without being interrupted.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): I rise on a question of privilege. When I was making my speech I was interrupted continually by members opposite and on this side of the floor. I would only ask the minister if he would explain when and where such a promise was made, and was it a promise in accord with the definition of a promise set out more clearly by the Postmaster General?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dupuis: Mr. Speaker, I can see that my friend from Acadia is nervous tonight. I see it as plainly as if I were in his shoes, but I would advise him to consult his immediate neighbour who is a doctor and who perhaps could feel his pulse, give him some advice and help him to contain himself during my speech.

I have here the text of a promise made by the Liberal party. Do not forget this: the present Leader of the Opposition, who has been prime minister of Canada—I see that my friend the hon. member for Acadia is again going to the telephone. There is no doubt about it, those people use the telephone a lot. They use it quite a lot. I know that if he is leaving the house, it is not because he is ashamed, but because he is wanted on the telephone.

I know now that it was not because he was ashamed, but because he had to answer a telephone call.

Mr. Speaker, I see the former minister of veterans affairs (Mr. Churchill) looking at me. He moved the subamendment. He was a member of the government then. He is one of the old die-hards. Those are the men who were in office for six years, and who had the greatest majority of all times in the House of Commons. Those are the men who, when they were in office, were asked by their own Conservative members to hold a referendum. At that time, they did not choose to do so, they even refused the request of their own members.

When they are at the helm, when they are all powerful, there is no referendum. But today, when they are in the official opposition, they suddenly become the defenders of the people, and ask for one.

Well, Mr. Speaker, at this time, the Canadian people are looking at the official opposition; and they will be strict in their judgment.

It is hardly possible that only the team on the official opposition benches could be right in this country.

I might quote many texts at this point, and I shall quote a few. I did not want to quote so many, but I see that they have a considerable impact on my friends opposite.

This is what another Conservative member said on January 23, 1961, when the Leader of the Opposition was the all-powerful prime minister of Canada:

> Yet, I think that a referendum would not be necessary, and that it is up to the government to give the Canadian people that distinctive national flag they want so much.

That was what a Conservative member told his government.

Mr. Macaluso: Who said that?

Mr. Dupuis: The Conservative member for Richmond-Wolfe, Florent Dubois. When people realized that he had no influence on the prime minister they did not re-elect him, saying: It is useless to send him to the House of Commons because the prime minister will not listen to him.

We have some gems. Of course, up to now, they were ignored by our hon. friends opposite.

Another Conservative member said this when his party was in power in 1961:

> It would certainly not be surprising to see Canada provided shortly with a national flag.

That one still trusted his leader. And he added:

> Our government will then have the opportunity to choose an essentially distinctive emblem in accordance with the legitimate aspirations of the majority of Canadians.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is exactly what we are saying. This hon. member was surely defeated because his constituents realized he had no influence on his leader.

That was the hon. member for Matapédia-Matane, Mr. Alfred Belzile, our lamented colleague.

Mr. Speaker, we can of course give other examples. Mr. Nasserden, member for Rosthern, said for instance:

I think it can be said that there is no matter that is of more interest and importance to Canadians than the matter of a distinctive Canadian flag.

I have it in English, I could read the English text but it is good to read the translation once in a while to show them the advantage of being able to speak both languages.

In a few more years we shall be celebrating our centennial here in Canada and at that time it would be well if all Canadians could share that measure of unity that may be enhanced by a distinctive Canadian flag.

Yes it would be a good thing.

The man who said those words is a member who sits on the other side but who will not be there long when his electors find out how he has changed his mind.

[*Text*]

Mr. Fane: How funny can you get?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dupuis: You find that funny? There is nothing funnier than seeing the Conservatives caught in the very trap in which they wanted to catch others.

Mr. Speaker, we have many more historic quotations. For instance, our friends opposite ask: How is it that the Liberals, who are in power, want to decide upon a flag?

We did not change our minds. Our Canadian high commissioner in England, Hon. Lionel Chevrier, had this to say in 1961, and it is exactly what the Liberals who are in office, are saying today, although they were in opposition then:

—in closing I say that, under the existing law of parliament, by virtue of the powers of this government, if we are to have a distinctive national flag, it is up to the government either by the establishment of a committee or by some other means, to give it to us. I believe that those who spent much of their time criticizing the former administration instead of giving us a distinctive natonal flag, had better address their claims and their representations to the government—

—Conservative, at that time.

—that sits to the right of Mr. Speaker.

And Mr. Chevrier added:

If they did that—

[Mr. Dupuis.]

The Conservatives—

—we soon might have a distinctive national flag which, I think, the great majority of the Canadian people wants.

So you see, Mr. Speaker, that we have not changed. But they have. When we were in the opposition, as the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate (Mr. Pickersgill) said a week ago, the then leader of the opposition in 1960-61 and 1962 said in the house, in press conferences, on television, in his electoral program which I have now: If you elect the Liberal party, if you give the country a Liberal government, they will give Canada a national distinctive flag which will not be mistaken for the emblem of any other country.

That was the promise made by the leader of the Liberal party when he was sitting on the other side of the house, and during the last election campaign, that if he was elected to office, as prime minister, and as an honest and sincere man, he would submit to the house a distinctive national flag for the Canadian people.

[*Text*]

Mr. Hales: What about the second flag?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dupuis: You should begin by settling the first problem. You are so mixed up with the first—we will speak about the second later.

What do we see today? The right hon. Leader of the Opposition, the former prime minister, asks us for a referendum, a plebiscite; he is seconded by his lieutenant, his brave lieutenant of the old guard, the former minister of veterans affairs (Mr. Churchill).

[*Text*]

An hon. Member: We believe in democracy.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dupuis: You believe in democracy but you are attempting, as a small opposition group, to thwart all the other parties, to thwart public opinion and you even contradict the statements you made here yourselves when you sat on this side of the house. You pay lipservice to democracy but by your actions you show that you are anti-democratic.

At present, as I said, the Leader of the Opposition is asking for a plebiscite. Why? Because he does not want this government to take its responsibilities.

When he was prime minister he did not want any plebiscite and that was established at the time of the introduction of Bill C-60 on January 24, 1961. We have recalled, after the

hon. member for Acadia, that the only opportunity—and this is very important—the only opportunity for the government to hold a referendum without any cost to the country, was on the occasion of the decennial census which happens every decade. Now, the last time we had a decennial census was in 1961 and if the present Leader of the Opposition had been sincere, he would then have called for a plebiscite at the same time as the decennial census. That would not have cost the country anything.

An hon. Member: He is not sincere.

Mr. Dupuis: He could have added to the questions asked from door to door one or two additional questions to ask the Canadian people: Are you for or against a national distinctive flag? Are you for a distinctive national anthem?

But when he was prime minister, while he could have taken that opportunity—which happens only once every ten years—to hold a referendum at no cost to the taxpayers, the Leader of the Opposition said "no" to his supporters, he said "no" to the Canadian people and, today, as an irresponsible man, he is asking other people to do what he was not man enough to do himself when he was prime minister of Canada.

At this time I am not playing politics. I am merely quoting facts as they were put on the record. I am only discussing things that we have seen, that our hon. Conservative friends can check up in *Hansard* because they have a short memory.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding I wish to tell you this.

Today we have the pleasure of realizing that the majority of members of this house are in favour of a distinctive national flag. We have the satisfaction of seeing that, for once in the history of Canada, a man, having become Prime Minister, has kept his promise to propose a distinctive national flag, the one he has proposed to this house before the whole nation, to which he had made that promise.

And today it is our privilege to see, rising above party politics, members of the New Democratic party, Social Credit members and those from the Ralliement Creditiste, and for once I agree with my hon. friend the member for Villeneuve: We are all Canadians above political partisanship.

We want a distinctive national flag which would not hurt anybody. And, as my hon. friend from Acadia said—and I want to remind him of what he said, because he was on the telephone:

[*Text*]

Surely an artist in designing a flag should adhere to simplicity and present a design that is well known and recognizably representative of Canada, one that would be recognized and accepted the world over. I think a flag must be emblematic of the country it represents so that it will not be mistaken for the flag of another country.

That was said by the hon. member for Acadia who was on the phone a few moments ago.

I think a flag must be emblematic of the country it represents so that it will not be mistaken for the flag of another country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Dupuis: I have new things to tell you.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): I said one flag, not two, and that is what you are attempting to present to Canada today.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dupuis: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Acadia says: "One flag for Canada". We too want a distinctive national flag. That is what you now have before you, but you refuse to adopt the resolution.

[*Text*]

Mr. Horner (Acadia): You present one distinctive flag. Your suggestion is two flags.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dupuis: And the hon. member continues as follows:

[*Text*]

As I mentioned before, the flag should be of simple design. We would not want anything bizarre or complicated which would detract from the flag and create confusion as to what it represents. I think a truly distinctive flag would bring greater unity in Canada and that all Canadians would pay their allegiance to it—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): One flag; not two flags.

Mr. Dupuis: I think that instead of shouting "One flag" the hon. member should see his leader and ask for one group in his own party.

[*Translation*]

And the hon. member continues as follows:

[*Text*]

I think a truly distinctive flag would bring greater unity in Canada and that all Canadians would pay allegiance to it if a design were brought in and presented by the government—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

An hon. Member: Who said that?

Mr. Horner (Acadia): One design, one flag.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dupuis: I notice that the doctor sitting next to the hon. member for Acadia has lost heart and has left the house. He left the hon. member for Acadia to his disease.

And I continue—besides, I do not see why the hon. member for Acadia should be so angry, because I totally agree with him; he was right in 1961.

I continue—

[*Text*]

Do you understand English?

The idea of a distinctive flag for Canada has been suggested over the years—

Indeed.

—and the question has had the continuing support of the armed forces.

Indeed. I think he should repeat that to his hon. friend from Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill).

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Read the next two sentences.

Mr. Dupuis: You want me to continue? I will speak, then. Listen.

The union jack has been suggested as our flag. A long time ago I learned in school how the union jack originated—

An hon. Member: Don't criticize it. Your friends burned it the other night.

Mr. Dupuis:

Some people accuse Canadians, this government and politicians on both sides of the house of becoming too nationalistic. I think that is an exaggerated accusation. I believe that Canadians should be able to speak their piece without being accused of being anti-American, anti-British, and so on.

Some hon. Members: Who said that?

Mr. Dupuis: The hon. member for Acadia, who was answering the phone a few minutes ago.

Some hon. Members: Oh.

Mr. Dupuis: I agree with the hon. member. I like him and support him. He was speaking in this debate as a real Canadian, not as a Tory, and he said this:

We are Canadians, we speak from a Canadian point of view and this fact should be accepted by other countries.

I am certain there would be greater acceptance, particularly in the United States, if we had a truly distinctive flag.

Who said that?

[Mr. Dupuis.]

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member asked, "Who said that?" I would like to say, on a point of order, that I said it. I said that Canada and Canadians generally wanted a truly distinctive flag.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): But they want one flag—not two, not three flags, as was suggested by the Prime Minister in *Hansard* when speaking earlier on this question. I say, and I said then, that Canadians and Canada want one flag, not two and not three.

Mr. Pickersgill: Little Jack Horner is in the corner.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. I think we should allow the Minister without Portfolio to continue.

Mr. Dupuis: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the house, the country and the press gallery—

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would draw Your Honour's attention to the clock. The minister has now been speaking—

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Pickersgill: I thought you wanted us on this side to speak.

Mr. MacEwan: You would all do well in the barnyard, anyway.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. The hon. member for Cape Breton South is rising on a point of order.

Mr. MacInnis: I am not too sure that the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) would be in order, even if he rose to his feet. He has a lot to say from that particular seat and I would call his attention to the fact that he is out of order speaking from that seat. We all realize it is a seat he would like to occupy. Mr. Speaker, I believe the Clerk of the House will confirm the fact that the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Dupuis) started his remarks at a quarter after nine.

Mr. Habel: Are you keeping the time?

Mr. MacInnis: Yes, I am watching the clock. If I am wrong in the premise I am putting forward, Mr. Speaker, the Chair is at liberty to correct me.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): It is the custom in this chamber for the Clerk to advise the Speaker when a member begins

and to advise him when his time expires. It is the duty of the Chair to allow a few extra minutes, if he considers it proper, to an hon. member who has been interrupted on a number of occasions. I would hope that in this particular case the Chair will be able to be as fair as it was in the previous case.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, I trust that the same privilege will be accorded to other hon. members, although it was denied this evening to the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Horner). The Minister without Portfolio has now gone 10 minutes beyond his time.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. I do not want to enter into any argument with the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. MacInnis); but I should advise him that extra time was not denied the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Horner). I would advise the hon. member that he began his remarks at 8.28, his time expired at 9.08, and he was advised by the Chair that his time had expired at 9.16. In the opinion of the Chair the hon. member was given a very generous allowance of time.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege, as I have been mentioned in this discussion. While I do not in any way wish to curtail the remarks of the Minister without Portfolio, I would point out that I was allowed five minutes extra time. I believe, if I accept the word of my colleague the hon. member for Cape Breton South, the minister has now gone 10 minutes over time. I think the Clerk should rise and report to you, Mr. Speaker, when the Minister without Portfolio started and when his time expired.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dupuis: Mr. Speaker, I understand that my friends may suffer, but what amazes me most is that they suffer from hearing their own words, and that is what is amazing and that the people do not understand.

What does my hon. friend for Acadia think of a truly distinctive national flag? Listen to this:

[*Text*]

I think that any attempt to include the union jack or red ensign in the flag would merely degrade two well known and honourable flags.

Who said that?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Dupuis: That was said by the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Horner) when his party was in power. He did not say that tonight.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): You didn't give me enough time.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. I must advise the Minister without Portfolio that his time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nasserden: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege arising out of the remarks that have been made by the hon. member who has just resumed his seat. I want to make it plain that I do not object to his quoting my remarks of 1961. I still stand by everything I said then. But I do not like to hear those remarks twisted, as they were tonight in the house. I want to read to you—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Nasserden: —just one paragraph to show—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. If the hon. gentleman feels he has been misquoted, he has the right to make an explanation; but I should point out to the hon. member that under the rules of this house he is only permitted to explain that part which he considers to be misunderstood. He is not permitted to introduce any new matter. Perhaps there is no need for me to read the appropriate citation to the hon. member at this time; but if he goes outside these bounds, I shall be obliged to do so.

Mr. Nasserden: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This is what I said:

Whatever the design finally approved by parliament and the Canadian people, it should be a reminder to us of our beginnings as a nation. It should reflect the part that Great Britain played in the development of our institutions. It should also reflect the personality of Canada as it has developed under the enriching influence of French culture. But more than that, it must also reflect the personality of a nation having that third dimension, that of those who chose Canadian citizenship after the destiny of Canada was decided in the articles of confederation.

Mr. Churchill: Withdraw your distortion now.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dupuis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

The hon. member, in spite of your warning, did not say that I had misquoted him. He quoted other excerpts of his speech, and that is out of order.

If you have authorized the hon. member to quote another excerpt of his speech, I do not see why I could not do so myself.

It reads as follows:

—a referendum would only emphasize that division rather than creating unity in the country at the present time.

That is what the hon. member (Mr. Nasserden) said. Do you have enough or do you want more?

[*Text*]

Mr. Speaker: Order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dupuis: May I ask the unanimous consent of the house to go on with my speech?

[*Text*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. I think the procedure we are now following is quite irregular. The hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Nasserden) has made something of an explanation, as he is permitted to do, if one follows citation 142 which is to be found at page 124 of Beauchesne. I shall read that citation:

A member who, during a debate, has spoken to a question may again be heard to offer explanation of some material part of his speech which has been misunderstood; but he must not introduce new matter or endeavour to strengthen by new arguments his former position which he alleges to have been misunderstood, or to reply to other members.

In view of this I would suggest to both hon. members that we let the argument rest there.

Mr. Nasserden: Mr. Speaker, I would like to question your ruling.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Nasserden: The hon. member has raised the question as to what was my stand with regard to a referendum at that particular time. I say I have not changed my mind in that regard. At that time—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. I am in some difficulty with regard to knowing what is the position of the hon. member in this debate, whether he has already spoken on this particular subamendment. If he has, then I can only resort to citation 142, and I have given him sufficient privilege there. If he has not already spoken he can reserve his remarks until he does.

Mr. Nasserden: I have made my position very clear, I think, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. W. H. Jorgenson (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, I was beginning to wonder whether I would ever get the floor tonight. In the remaining moments left to me this evening I should like to begin my remarks with what are my sincere comments on this issue. This evening has been quite interesting and I am sure the gallery must have been regaled with the antics of the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Dupuis). After seeing and listening to him there is no question in my mind why he remains a minister without a portfolio. He began his remarks with very profuse congratulations to the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas) for the very high level of his remarks this afternoon. What a pity he does not follow that rule himself. The speeches he delivers in this house—indeed, the type of speech I have heard him deliver on each occasion he speaks in the house—are anything but on a high level. He chose to quote a number of references from *Hansard* of 1961, which purported to be statements by hon. members in this party in which they had stated that they were in favour of a distinctive national flag. I do not think there is any conflict there, any more than there is now. I am sure that most hon. members in this house are in favour of a distinctive national flag. I say "a distinctive national flag", not two or three flags as proposed by hon. members opposite. It is not a question whether or not we are opposed to or in favour of a distinctive national flag. This is not the point at issue right now. What we are opposed to, and I think what Canadians generally across the country are opposed to, is the anaemic, insipid design which has been proposed by this government. If a flag is to be distinctive and is to be Canadian, then it must be one which meets with the approval of all Canadians.

I was also interested in the new theory of democracy propounded by the Minister without Portfolio when he stated that he thought that because government members and those who support them were in the majority, the opposition should simply quit talking and allow the resolution to come to a vote. What an example of how little he knows about parliamentary government. In my opinion it is a disgrace for a minister of the crown to stand on his feet in this house and put forward such theories and express such thoughts.

This debate, which has gone on for the past few days, has certainly generated a certain amount of heat. Perhaps tonight was the best example of how much heat has been generated. I am not going to make any comments about the light that was shed, but it was at least most entertaining. If the debate has done nothing else I think it is making Canadians

across this country aware of our history. It is making Canadians aware of what a flag means to this country. It is making Canadians think about designs for a flag. As a result of this debate I think there will be a greater participation on the part of the Canadian people in the national affairs of the country. I do not suggest that the people who have spoken in this debate are accurately reflecting the views of all Canadians, but most certainly those who have spoken have made statements and expressed feelings which I am sure are expressed by somebody. Even the comments made by the Minister without Portfolio will be received, I dare say, by somebody in this country. I think it is the responsibility of members of parliament to express these feelings, because if we are to be a true reflection of the attitudes and thoughts of Canadians across the country, then those attitudes and thoughts must be expressed in this house.

It has been suggested that Canadians generally are getting tired of this debate. I am sure most hon. members discussed this issue over the Labour day week end with their constituents. I am sure that most of our constituents feel that the debate has gone on far longer than it needed to go on. But at the same time those of my constituents who have said to me that they think the debate has gone on too long have followed that remark up very quickly by saying: "But you simply must not allow this insipid design to be passed". So what other method is there open to the opposition? What other method is there open to a member of parliament to prevent the government's foisting this folly upon the Canadian people, other than debating the matter in the house, and debating it to the point where the government realize that the people of this country are not going to be happy with this design?

Another thing which has contributed to this feeling among Canadians is the fact that from the time the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) made his first statement to the Canadian Legion convention in Winnipeg, this issue has been played up by the newspapers across the country. Every question asked in the house about this matter, even a simple question which perhaps took up two minutes of the time of the house, received front page headlines day after day after day. I do not criticize the newspapers for this because their job is to sell newspapers and they do that the best way they can. But none the less the feeling has got abroad that nothing has been done in this house since early April, when the Prime Minister spoke to the Legion convention in Winnipeg. That is not the case. The flag resolution was introduced considerably later than that, and I find it rather strange, now that the resolution is before the house and is being debated, that all of a sudden the newspapers find there is no copy in it; that it sells no newspapers and they do not want to discuss it at all. These sensational headlines with which we have been greeted day after day since before the resolution was introduced have certainly created in the minds of the people across the country the impression that this issue was on the floor of the House of Commons long before it was in fact presented to the house.

I think that if Canadians are tired of the debate on this issue they are even more tired of this government—this dismal, abject failure of a government. To quote the words of Peter Newman it is a quiet, grey failure of a government which has fumbled and failed to bring to a conclusion every policy it has introduced in this house. It has failed to come to grips with the economic problems of this country, and it is really the economic problems which are paramount. In fact, the government is trying to cover up the real difficulties with this issue. I remember, when we were the government, how they ridiculed almost every measure we brought forward, but it is strange today that those measures which we introduced have now become law in this country without change. Indeed, they have been carried on very proudly by some members of the present government.

When the present government's minister of finance presented the three budgets, which met with some considerable agitation, certainly the image of decisiveness disappeared and, I might add, never returned. I am sure members will recall how the present government boasted that it would improve our relations with the United States. I recall reading a comment in a New York newspaper to the effect that if the Pearson government is a friend of the United States, who needs enemies. I recall how the government said it would improve relations with the provinces. We only have to think back to the measures that have been introduced respecting dominion-provincial relations to realize that—

Mr. Moreau: Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak to a point of order. I wonder whether you would ask the hon. member to relate his remarks to the resolution now before us.

Mr. Jorgenson: Of course I am happy to do so. The subamendment deals with the question of national unity, and all the things

I have mentioned are part and parcel of that subject. Can you deny that relations with provinces, including the province of Quebec, constitute a question of national unity?

I am sure that the majority of hon. members in this house are aware of the so-called quiet revolution taking place in Quebec. I do not think we need fear it. I think perhaps it is a good thing for this country, because these people are attempting to find their place in confederation and do the things necessary for them to be a part and remain a part of this country. The problems that beset the province of Quebec are largely economical and must be dealt with by economic measures. This government has failed miserably to introduce anything that could possibly be of benefit to the province of Quebec, other than by continuing the policies initiated by the former government, particularly as they relate to ARDA.

I wonder what happened to the policy in respect to two ministers of agriculture. I suggest everything that this government has done has tended to create division, including the establishment of the bilingualism and biculturalism probe. This government seems bound to aggravate and destroy the unity that existed when it came into office, and in order to cover up its failure to deal with these problems it has attempted to divert attention by proposing the two flag resolution. This government has attempted to confuse the issue, and to convince the citizens of the province of Quebec that it is doing great things for them, when in reality it is doing nothing to solve the economic problems that beset that province.

Very frequently during this debate we have heard hon. members opposite ask for cessation of the debate. They have often said, bring this to a vote and let us end it all; let the members of the House of Commons decide this issue. They make these statements as though such a decision would really solve anything. surely those members are not so naïve as to think that if a vote was taken in this house it would end the problem. Certainly they should know, and would know if they had gone home over the last week end, that a vote would not solve the problem or end the debate. It would end the debate in the House of Commons, but not the debate that is taking place across this country.

Mr. Speaker, one of the best editorials I have read on this particular subject appeared in the Ottawa *Journal* of August 31, 1964, and I should like to put it on record. The editorial, headed "Not Speed but a Flag", reads as follows:

> The Commons is confusing the challenge the flag debate presents.
>
> The real task is to produce a flag that will unite a nation.
>
> Whether that takes a month or four months is relatively unimportant.
>
> An error is not less so if it is done quickly.
>
> Mr. Pearson speaks of a month's debate over-all; Mr. Diefenbaker speaks of three months in committee plus a final Commons debate on approval.
>
> We must be wary now lest we think the goal is simply to narrow that time gap. The goal is a flag that will please most Canadians.
>
> Mr. Diefenbaker is not resisting a short limited debate just to keep the Liberal government from doing the country's business. Last Thursday (*Hansard*, page 7343) he promptly supported Mr. Knowles' urging that the government devote two days a week to other business while the flag debate lasts. Mr. Favreau, for Mr. Pearson, would not accept this.
>
> Mr. Diefenbaker refuses to limit debate for it is the one weapon that might oblige Mr. Pearson to produce a more acceptable flag. (We've met mighty few people of any political persuasion who really like the present suggestion.)
>
> If Mr. Pearson came forward with a design more adequately representing the nation's wishes the opposition would vote it through to happy fulfilment in weeks, not months.
>
> The obstacle to peaceful solution is the present design, not the debate schedule.
>
> Whatever flag parliament eventually passes should be honoured by us all. The country's impatience is not for any new flag but a new flag it wants. Reasonable debate and the devotion of compromise can produce such a flag.
>
> We've had enough of Liberals saying Tories are anti-French, and Tories saying Liberals are selling out to the French.
>
> Let's go on with the business of the country, and finding an acceptable flag, at one and the same time—for the two can't be separated now.

Mr. Speaker, may I call it 10.30?

At 10.30 p.m. the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to special order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, September 9, 1964

The house met at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

ANNOUNCEMENT OF BY-ELECTIONS ON NOVEMBER 9

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I should like to inform the house that by order in council P.C. 1964-1409 of September 9, by-elections will be held to fill the vacancies in the two federal constituencies of Waterloo South, Ontario, and Westmorland, New Brunswick, on November 9, 1964.

JUVENILE DELINQUENTS ACT

AMENDMENT RESPECTING APPLICATION TO MENTALLY RETARDED PERSONS

Mr. William Dean Howe (Hamilton South) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-118, to amend the Juvenile Delinquents Act (application to mentally retarded).

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Howe (Hamilton South): The passage of the Juvenile Delinquents Act marked our recognition that a juvenile charged with an offence against our criminal laws should not, as well for the good of the community as for his own good, be exposed to the usual public and trial process of the criminal courts; and, if adjudged an offender, cannot comprehend and benefit by, and therefore should not undergo, the penal punishment of an adult offender.

Since the passage of the act, scientific technologies enable us to define the mental age of a person in terms of an equivalent chronological age. The purpose of this bill is simply to update the law in accord with these scientific advances and so apply the act to those mentally retarded persons who have a mental age within the age limits protected by the act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

BORDEAUX JAIL, MONTREAL—PERSONS DETAINED UNDER IMMIGRATION ACT

Question No. 1,425—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Are people detained by the immigration department under provisions of the Immigration Act in the Bordeaux jail photographed and fingerprinted?

2. Are people who visit those detained under the Immigration Act at the Bordeaux jail required to sign a declaration that they would submit to search procedures and, if so, is this done at the request of the immigration department, or at the request of the officials of Bordeaux jail?

3. Is the department giving consideration to making arrangements to detain people in Montreal in a place other than Bordeaux jail?

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): 1. Yes. All inmates of the Bordeaux jail are photographed and fingerprinted and no exceptions are made on behalf of persons detained under the provisions of the Immigration Act.

2. Yes. All visitors to inmates of Bordeaux jail are required to sign a visitor's pass which incorporates, among other things, an agreement to submit to a search if the jail authorities deem such action necessary. No exception is made on behalf of visitors to persons detained under the provisions of the Immigration Act. This is part of normal procedures at Bordeaux jail and is not done at the request of the immigration department.

3. No. Although the facilities of Bordeaux jail are used by the department to a greater extent than any other in Montreal, use is also made of the reformatory school, Mont St. Antoine, 8147 Sherbrooke street E., the Montreal city police headquarters and the women's division of the Montreal gaol, 1730 Fullum street.

* INQUIRY INTO ECONOMIC INTERDEPENDENCE OF CANADA

Question No. 1,429—**Mr. Martineau:**

1. Does the government intend to launch an inquiry concerning the interdependence of the various areas of Canada?

2. If so, would this inquiry deal especially with the possible economic effects which might result from Quebec's separating from the rest of Canada?

3. Has the government initiated a pre-inquiry into the interdependence of the various areas of Canada and, if so (a) who decided to have it held (b) under what authority is this inquiry being conducted (c) what are the names of those officials

conducting it (d) will this inquiry require spending of public funds, and (e) does the government intend to have its decision in this matter ratified by parliament?

4. Has the Prime Minister informed the officials responsible for conducting this inquiry or pre-inquiry of his views on the subject of the inquiry or on the conclusions which such an inquiry will lead to?

5. Does the government intend to appoint a royal commission to inquire into the interdependence of the various areas of Canada?

6. Will the royal commission on bilingualism and biculturalism be called upon to contribute to this inquiry and will it be required to consider the work which will be undertaken by a similar commission?

7. Does the Prime Minister intend to appear before all organizations, commissions or other bodies inquiring into the interdependence of the various areas of Canada?

8. Did the government consult the provinces before launching its pre-inquiry into this subject and does it intend to consult them or does it intend to invite them to take part in all such inquiries?

Mr. Jack Davis (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): 1. Yes.

2. No. This will be a general inquiry into the economic and social forces affecting the unity of Canada.

3. No. Ministers have consulted with officials as to the appropriate form of the inquiry.

4. No.

5. No. The inquiry will be conducted by an interdepartmental committee of government officials. It will be related to the federal government's work in connection with the federal-provincial tax structure committee. The intention will also be that the general findings of the inquiry should be published in a white paper.

6. No.

7. No.

8. There has been no pre-inquiry. In conducting the inquiry, federal officials will seek the assistance and views of the governments of the provinces, as well as of private persons and organizations. The inquiry will be conducted on an informal basis.

COMMUNITIES NOT RECEIVING C.B.C. TELEVISION

Question No. 1,589—**Mr. Byrne:**

1. How many communities of 2,000 population or more are not now receiving C.B.C. television extension service or direct live C.B.C. television?

2. What would be the approximate annual cost of providing television extension service to such communities?

3. What is the annual cost of providing existing C.B.C. extension service?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows:

1. The present television planning list contains 60 locations of 2,000 or more population which do not receive adequate C.B.C. television service.

2. This is estimated at approximately $3,500,000.

3. Assuming "extension service" to mean net-work relay and rebroadcasting stations, the annual operating costs total approximately $1,600,000.

SEISMIC OIL PROSPECTING, VANCOUVER ISLAND

Question No. 1,696—**Mr. Groos:**

1. Does the government permit seismic operations by prospecting oil companies off the coast of the lower areas of Vancouver island, B.C., and, if so, is there any cut-off date each year?

2. Are there any limitations to the extent or magnitude of these operations?

3. Is there any indication that these operations may have an adverse effect upon west coast fishing?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): In so far as the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources is concerned:

1. Yes. The government permits seismic operations by prospecting oil companies off the coast of Vancouver island, B.C.

In so far as the Department of Fisheries is concerned:

1. To the second part of the question, the answer is yes.

2. Yes; as a result of experience and studies a set of conditions has been established.

3. Experienced fisheries observers have accompanied seismic operations on the west coast during the past two years. Their observations indicate only relatively minor fish kills. They have authority to postpone or relocate the release of shots should large schools of fish be detected at the proposed position of shooting.

COMPLAINTS RESPECTING CARE OF VETERANS, HAMILTON, ONT.

Question No. 1,697—**Mr. Groos:**

1. Has the Minister of Veterans Affairs received a letter dated August 5 from the president of the federation of British Canadian veterans of Canada, from Hamilton, Ontario, expressing concern at the alleged poor treatment received by some older veterans under D.V.A. care, and living in private nursing homes?

2. Will the minister have these allegations looked into, and will he advise the house of the results of the investigations and of any action he feels should be taken to protect the health and welfare of the veterans concerned?

Hon. Roger Teillet (Minister of Veterans Affairs): 1. Yes; on 10 August, 1964.

2. The allegations have been looked into by officials of the city of Hamilton and the

Department of Veterans Affairs in Hamilton. They have not been substantiated.

C.N.R. AGENCY AT AUDEN, ONT.

Question No. 1,701—**Mr. Fisher:**

Is Canadian National Railways planning to close its agency at Auden, Ontario and, if so, what has been the annual revenue for this agency in each of the past five years?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): The management of Canadian National Railways advise as follows:

Information which is currently available is contained in application to remove the agent at Auden, which was filed on May 19, 1964, with the Board of Transport Commissioners for Canada and is as follows: January to December 1962, $34,614; January to December 1963, $25,127. Information for other years is not immediately available.

*PROSECUTIONS FOR WATER POLLUTION

Question No. 1,702—**Mr. Fisher:**

1. What is the chronology and what are the details, in so far as D.O.T. knows them, regarding the water pollution charge laid against captain Kurt Steinick, of a Norwegian freighter which was apparently settled when he forfeited bail by failing to appear in a Port Arthur court?
2. What authority, if any, under the Criminal Code, or under any other statutes of the federal government can be used to prosecute those who pollute navigable waters and harbours?
3. Has the lakehead harbour commission authority to police and to charge offenders in such matters?
4. Has the lakehead harbour commission authority to establish facilities or a depot for disposal of waste oil and other detritus of ships using the harbour and, if so, has it done anything about it?
5. Has the department any intention of tightening its policy on pollution by shipping in navigable waters?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): 1. On June 26, 1964, at 11:45 a.m. the M.S. *Katia Banck*, of Helsingborg, Norway, was reported by the lakehead harbour police to have discharged oil into the waters of Port Arthur harbour. Following an investigation by a steamship inspector, an information was laid against the master, Kurt Steinick. The case came to court on June 29 but the vessel having sailed meantime, bail of $50 was forfeited.

2. Section 4 of the oil pollution prevention regulations, P.C. 1960-166, made under authority of section 495 of the Canada Shipping Act, makes it an offence for any person to discharge or allow to escape from a ship into the inland, minor or other waters of Canada any oil or oily mixture which fouls the surface of the water.

3. Yes.

4. The commissioners have the authority to establish the necessary facilities. Establishment of such facilities would however be a substantial financial undertaking. The commissioners have not yet reached the point where such expenditures are considered justifiable and within their means.

5. A number of convictions for offences have been registered under the present regulations. A proposal is now before parliament to raise the maximum fine from $500 to $5,000.

TELEVISION STATION PROGRAMS, QUEBEC CITY

Question No. 1,717—**Mr. Choquette:**

With reference to the television station shortly to be opened by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in Quebec city (a) what will be the proportion of programs originating in Quebec city, and (b) what will be the proportion of programs originating elsewhere?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation that the new television station in the beginning will originate an average of approximately eight hours a week of programs in Quebec city. This is approximately 9 per cent of its program schedule. When it moves to its permanent studios in Ste Foy it is expected that CBTV will increase its program originations to an average of approximately 12 hours a week. Further development will depend on resources.

[*Text*]

PERSONNEL OF TELEVISION STATION, QUEBEC CITY

Question No. 1,718—**Mr. Choquette:**

With reference to the television station shortly to be opened by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in Quebec city (a) who is the manager or administrator (b) who is the director of programs, and (c) what are the names of the station's personnel?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows:

(a) Mr. René Dussault, manager, Quebec city; Mr. Roger Morin, director T.V. services.

(b) Mr. Louis Leclerc, program director T.V.

(c) The combined Quebec city staff for radio and television is 133 with 66 in television, 28 in radio and 39 common to both services. About 90 per cent of the employees are from Quebec city.

Questions

[*Text*]

CANADIAN TELEVISION STATIONS

Question No. 1,719—**Mr. Choquette:**

1. What is the total number of television stations in Canada and what are the call letters of each?
2. What is the total number of French language television stations in Canada, what are the call letters and location of each?
3. How many of the stations have bilingual programming?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): 1. (a) The total number of television broadcasting stations in Canada as of August 1, 1964 was 195. (b) The list of broadcasting stations in Canada which includes the call letters of all stations is a publication available from the queen's printer.

2. Television stations in Canada are not licensed to broadcast in either English or French specifically. The licence does not designate the language to be broadcast. It is not possible, therefore, to specify the total number of French television stations in Canada.

3. Seventeen television stations have bilingual programming.

CANADIAN RADIO STATIONS

Question No. 1,720—**Mr. Choquette:**

1. What is the total number of radio stations in Canada and what are the call letters of each?
2. What is the total number of French language radio stations in Canada, what are the call letters and location of each?
3. How many of the stations have bilingual programming?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): 1. (a) The total number of broadcasting stations in Canada as of August 1, 1964 was 541. The number of stations in each of the following classes is as follows: Sound-standard band (AM), 258; Sound-FM, 49; AM short wave, 39; Television, 195. (b) The list of broadcasting stations in Canada which includes the call letters of all stations is a publication available from the queen's printer.

2. Radio stations in Canada are not licensed to broadcast in either English or French specifically. The licence does not designate the language to be broadcast. It is not possible, therefore, to specify the total number of French radio stations in Canada.

3. Thirty two radio stations have bilingual programming.

NATIONAL FRENCH RADIO NETWORK

Question No. 1,721—**Mr. Choquette:**

Is the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in the process of establishing a national French language radio network and, if so, on what date is it expected that the network will commence operation?

[Mr. Lamontagne.]

[*Translation*]

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation that the national French language radio network at present extends through eight of the 10 provinces of Canada from Nova Scotia to Alberta, making its programs available to 94 per cent of Canadians whose mother tongue is French. Each year new stations are being added to the French network in unserved areas and the C.B.C will continue to increase its coverage in so far as its financial resources allow.

[*Text*]

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BENEFITS TO CANADIAN WORKERS IN U.S.

Question No. 1,731—**Mr. Dionne:**

1. What reasons were given by the representatives of the employment security commissions of Maine and New Hampshire, which prevent an agreement being reached whereby Canadian workers in the United States might be considered eligible for benefits under the Unemployment Insurance Act?
2. In the years 1962 and 1963, how many Canadians were employed on American soil in the states of Maine, New Hampshire, New York and Vermont?
3. On what basis were agreements reached with the other American states and on what dates were the various agreements signed?
4. What proposals were submitted by the Canadian government to American authorities with a view to reaching an understanding?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): 1. The reasons given by the employment security commission of Maine for being unwilling to enter the reciprocal arrangement were the present condition of their reserve fund, the present economy of the state, and the unevenly balanced flow of workers across the border As almost all the traffic is one way, i.e. persons returning to Canada after working in Maine, the employment security commission thought that there would be too great an increase in the cost to their unemployment insurance fund. The New Hampshire department of employment security stated that New Hampshire was not prepared to make the amendment in its law required to provide for participation in an agreement with Canada.

2. The national employment service does not have information concerning the number of Canadians that were employed on American soil in the states of Maine, New Hampshire, New York and Vermont.

3. Agreements with the other American states were reached on the basis that, so far as possible, the provisions of the reciprocal

arrangement already in effect among the states themselves should be extended and applied to Canada provided, however, that it should be optional for each state whether or not to participate in the arrangement with Canada. In the United States each state operates its own unemployment insurance plan. In 1942 the government of Canada and the government of the United States entered into a master agreement in substantially the same terms as that existing among the states. The government of the United States agreed to recommend to each of the states that it carry out the provisions of that agreement with respect to Canada, but no state can be compelled to participate in the agreement if it prefers not to do so. Under this arrangement a person who is working in one of the subscribing states and who subsequently becomes unemployed in Canada may claim benefit from the state in question, through an office of the unemployment insurance commission in Canada. If he is entitled to benefit under the law of that state, the benefit payments are made to him by that state. The local office of the unemployment insurance commission in Canada where he has filed his claim certifies the facts regarding his being unemployed and available for work and forwards such certification to the liable state.

Decision of a state to participate in the agreement is notified by letter to the unemployment insurance commission of Canada either through the bureau of employment security at Washington or directly to the commission. Notices of participation by the states were received as follows: In 1943 from 29 states; between 1943 and 1952 from 14 states; and between 1952 and 1958 from 3 states; leaving four non-participating states, namely Alabama, Iowa, Maine and New Hampshire.

4. The proposals submitted to the American authorities were that the non-participating states should enter the reciprocal arrangement under the same conditions as the other 46 states which are participating in the arrangement. Such proposals were submitted for consideration on several occasions by letter, by informal discussions between Canadian and American officials, and by discussions at several formal conferences, including meetings in 1959, in 1962 and in 1963.

ESTABLISHMENT OF AIRPORT, NORTH QUEENS COUNTY, N.S.

Question No. 1,732—**Mr. Crouse:**

Is the government giving any consideration to establishing an airport in North Queens county, Nova Scotia, adequate to service the Annapolis valley and south shore area of the province?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Not at the present time.

RUNWAY IMPROVEMENT, TRENTON, N.S. AIRPORT

Question No. 1,733—**Mr. MacEwan:**

Has the Minister of Transport received a resolution from local 1231, United Steelworkers of America, Trenton, Nova Scotia, urging an extension to the runways and the provision of runway lighting at the Trenton airport, Trenton, Nova Scotia, and, if so, will the minister give immediate consideration to these important matters?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): A resolution from local 1231, United Steelworkers of America, Trenton, Nova Scotia, has been received by the Department of Transport. The contents of the resolution have been studied by the department but this study failed to establish a clear operational requirement for the improvements included. While no immediate action is contemplated the matter will be kept under review.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND CAUSEWAY

Question No. 1,737—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. Is the present feasibility study of the Prince Edward Island causeway now proceeding on the assumption that such a structure will not contain railway tracks?

2. Has the government received an offer from an individual or individuals to erect such a structure, and, if so, what is the response to such a suggestion?

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): 1. No decision has been made as to whether the crossing will not contain railway tracks.

2. The government has received a proposal, but is not in a position, at the present time, to make any reply to the suggestion.

APPLICATIONS FOR RADIO AND TELEVISION LICENCES

Question No. 1,749—**Mr. Irvine:**

1. What applications are presently before the Department of Transport for radio A.M. and/or F.M. and T.V. station licences, throughout the Dominion of Canada?

2. Who are the applicants, and on what frequencies do they propose to operate, and with what power?

3. What is the location of each of the proposed radio stations and what is the proposed area of coverage of each?

4. What other stations do the applicants have an interest in?

5. What stations are the proposed stations to be affiliated with?

Questions

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): 1, 2 and 3.

When would-be licencees first approach the Department of Transport, either informally or formally, it is not always possible to determine to what extent technical requirements can be satisfied so that a formal application can be passed on for consideration by the board of broadcast governors. Considerable technical examination and study is often necessary at this preliminary stage. For this reason it has been customary to release information on applications only at the stage when these are passed to the board of broadcast governors for consideration.

At the present time the following applications for new radio and television licences have been transmitted by the department to the board of broadcast governors but have not yet been the subject of a recommendation from that board.

Applicant	Proposed station location	Type of station	Power	Frequency or channel
Newfoundland Broadcasting Co. Ltd.	Cornerbrook, Nfld....	Television.....	effective radiated power 410 W. (video) 205 W. (audio)	10
Vantel Broadcasting Co. Ltd...	Chilliwack, B.C. (Vedder Mountain)	Television rebroadcasting	5 W.	11
Twin Cities Television Ltd.....	Blue River, B.C.....	Television rebroadcasting	5 W.	3
Northern Radio—Radio Nord Inc.	Metagami, Que.....	Television rebroadcasting	5 W.	6
Northern Radio—Radio Nord Inc.	Val d'Or, Que.....	Television rebroadcasting	5 W.	8
Northern Radio—Radio Nord Inc.	Ville Marie, Que.....	Television rebroadcasting	5 W.	6
Inland Broadcasters Ltd.....	Savona, B.C.....	Sound FM.....	effective radiated power 8.1 W.	101.9 Mc/s
Inland Broadcasters Ltd.....	Clearwater, B.C.....	Sound FM.....	effective radiated power 22 W.	92.7 Mc/s
A Company to be Incorporated Represented by Roy E. Bonisteel	St Catharines, Ont....	Sound standard band	2500 W. (day-time only)	1500 kc/s
A Company to be Incorporated Represented by Rober E. Redmond	St. Catharines, Ont...	Sound standard band	1000 W. (day-time only)	1500 k/s
Department of National Defence	Lowther, Ont.....	Sound standard band	20 W.	1490 kc/s
Newfoundland Broadcasting Co. Ltd.	St. John's Nfld.....	Sound FM.....	effective radiated power 1600 W.	93.7 Mc/s
Inland Broadcasters Ltd.....	Merritt, B.C.....	Sound FM.....	12 W.	103.9 Mc/s
Canadian Broadcasting Corporation	Beauce, P.Q.....	Television rebroadcasting	effective radiated power 4500 W. (video) 2250 W. (audio)	6
Twin Cities Television Ltd.	Bralorne, B.C.....	Television rebroadcasting	5 W.	3
Sunwapta Broadcasting Co. Ltd.	Whitecourt, Alta.	Television rebroadcasting	5 W.	7

Applicant	Proposed station location	Type of Station	Power	Frequency or Channel
Twin Cities Television Ltd.	Canoe Mountain, (near Valemont) B.C.	Television rebroadcasting	5 W.	8
C.K.R.T.—TV Ltee	Riviere du Loup, P.Q.	Television rebroadcasting	5 W.	2
La Cie de Radiodiffusion de Matane Ltee	Grande Vallee, P.Q...	Television rebroadcasting	5 W.	11
Twin Cities Television Ltd.	Promontory Mountain, B.C.	Television rebroadcasting	5 W.	5
A Company to be Incorporated Represented by J. H. Jefferies	Prince Rupert, B.C....	Sound standard band	1000 watts day & night	560 kc/s

The board has reserved its decision on a recommendation with respect to the following applications:—

Applicant	Proposed station location	Type of station	Power	Frequency or Channel
Canadian Broadcasting Corporation	Cold Lake, Alta.....	Television rebroadcasting	Effective radiated power 560 W. (Video) 280 W. (audio)	12
Canadian Broadcasting Corporation	St. Paul, Alta.....	Television rebroadcasting	20,300 W. (video) 10,100 W. (audio)	9
A Company to be Incorporated Represented by J. Fred Weber	Prince Rupert B.C....	Sound standard band	1,000 watts day 250 watts night	560 kc/s
Canadian Broadcasting Corporation	Rochebaucourt, P.Q...	Low power Relay transmitter	40 W.	990 kc/s

4 and 5. Details relating to ownership and affiliation are matters for board of broadcast governors consideration and to the extent relevant, may be made known through the proceedings of that board.

REPRESENTATIONS RESPECTING DUCK AND GEESE CONSERVATION

Question No. 1,761—**Mr. Fisher:**

Has the Canadian wildlife service received a copy of the representation of Thomas O. Nelson of Fergus Falls, Minn. dated August 1, 1964 in which a plea is made for a new or extended policy on ducks and geese conservation and, if so, what analysis does the service make of Mr. Nelson's arguments and what is its judgment on their value?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): Yes, on August 10, 1964. Mr. Nelson's statement of the components of a migratory bird conservation policy is essentially the same as that which has been prepared by the Canadian wildlife service. Studies which are under way at the present time are expected to point to the means of putting such a policy into effect.

INSTALLATION OF PIPE ORGAN, PERFORMING ARTS CENTRE, OTTAWA

Question No. 1,765—**Mr. MacEwan:**

Has a brief been received by G. H. Southam, co-ordinator of the advisory committees for the proposed national centre for the performing arts from the Royal Canadian College of Organists asking that a pipe organ be installed in the new centre and, if so, has a decision been reached on the matter and, if not, when can a decision be expected?

Questions

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): A brief from the Royal Canadian College of Organists asking that a pipe organ be installed in the proposed Canadian centre for the performing arts was received by the co-ordinator for the centre on June 10. The complicated artistic and technical aspects of the matter are being studied, in co-operation with R.C.C.O. representatives, by the co-ordinator's advisory committee on music, opera and ballet, by his advisory committee on the theatre, and by the consulting architects. A decision is expected within the next two months.

CANADA-U.S. CO-OPERATION IN WILDLIFE PROTECTION

Question No. 1,778—**Mr. Scott:**

1. Has the Canadian government received a communication from Mr. Thomas O. Nelson, 406 South Cascade street, Fergus Falls, Minnesota relating to the need for joint action between the various Canadian governments in the fields of conservation and protection for the continent's wild fowl and, if so, what action has the government taken to deal with the particular problems raised in the said communication?

2. What action has the government taken to promote joint co-operation among the various provincial and government agencies to the end that is set out in the said letter?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): 1. Yes, on August 10, 1964. The first step in the dealing with the particular problems raised in Mr. Nelson's letter had already been taken in 1961 when an international migratory bird committee was formed to examine these problems. The committee's first recommendations, tabled in the House of Commons on March 7, 1962, are being implemented. The work on a more comprehensive program for maintenance of waterfowl habitat management, based on further studies by this committee and the Canadian wildlife service is making a good progress.

2. There has been continuing and close co-operation between the Canadian wildlife service and the provincial game agencies with a view to solving the basic problems set out in Mr. Nelson's letter.

TRANQUILIZER "AMPHEMIDONE"

Question No. 1,787—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

1. Has a tranquilizer of the generic name of "amphemidone" ever been available in Canada and, if so, under what trade names has it been sold and by what companies?

2. If it is no longer available in Canada, for what reason was it removed from the market?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. No.

2. See answer to 1 above.

COST OF HISTORICAL SITES, N.S. AND N.B.

Question No. 1,793—**Mr. Fairweather:**

What are the comparative figures for the past five years for which figures are available for moneys spent or approved for restoration, rebuilding or acquisition of historical works or sites in the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): Expenditures for restoration, rebuilding or acquisition of historic sites in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick for the fiscal years 1959-60 to 1963-64 inclusive:

Questions

Historic sites	Fiscal years					
	1959–60	1960–61	1961–62	1962–63	1963–64	Total
NOVA SCOTIA	$	$	$	$	$	$
Halifax citadel	121,632	225,877	325,255	314,250	180,987	1,168,001
Martello tower Halifax	12,794	23,496	—	19,950	—	56,240
George island	—	35,162	—	113,919	62,969	212,050
Champlain habitation	—	13,312	—	—	—	13,312
Bell museum, Baddeck	29,125	33,103	29,383	8,616	30,220	130,447
Grand Pré	37,415	22,385	29,647	89,197	29,688	208,332
Port Royal	28	71,190	55,154	24,863	14,214	165,449
Fort Anne	1,155	7,466	5,000	487	2,708	16,816
General projects	—	—	—	—	665	665
Fortress of Louisbourg	6,750	9,201	859,736	1,455,964	1,563,008	3,894,659
Nova Scotia sub totals	208,899	441,192	1,304,175	2,027,246	1,884,459	5,865,971
NEW BRUNSWICK						
Fort Beausejour	1,409	24,963	—	1,959	5,170	33,501
Martello tower, St. John	—	38,818	—	—	—	38,818
Martello tower, Lancaster	—	—	—	9,997	15,655	25,652
St. Andrews	—	—	—	—	13,329	13,329
New Brunswick sub totals	1,409	63,781	—	11,956	34,154	111,300
Totals for each year	210,308	504,973	1,304,175	2,039,202	1,918,613	
Grand total for the five year period						5,977,271

OLD AGE PENSION RECIPIENTS

Question No. 1,804—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

Of Canadians in receipt of the old age pension, what proportion has (a) no additional income (b) additional income not exceeding (i) $100 (ii) $500 (iii) $1,000 (iv) $5,000 (v) $10,000.

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): The old age security program provides for the payment of a flat rate pension of $75 per month, without a means or needs test, to all persons aged 70 or over who can meet certain residence requirements.

For this reason the department has no knowledge of other income of any recipient of old age security.

FOOD TESTS FOR CHEMICAL CONTAMINANTS

Question No. 1,806—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

1. Does the government maintain checks on the presence of herbicidal, pesticidal, or other chemical contaminants in (a) milk and dairy products (b) meat (c) poultry and eggs (d) fruit and vegetables (e) fresh water fish (f) marine fish?
2. For which chemicals are tests conducted?
3. For each of these chemicals, what is the permissible level of contamination?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. Yes. The food and drug directorate of the Department of National Health and Welfare conducts continuing surveys for all types of pesticide residues in milk and dairy products, meat, poultry and eggs, fruit and vegetables, fresh water fish and marine fish.

2. Tests are conducted for all chemicals likely to be of concern due to known toxicity or because of suspected abuse or misuse.

3. Under the food and drug regulations, there have been established permitted residue levels for 73 pesticide chemicals. Any chemical not so listed cannot be used or, if used, must not result in a residue in food.

RELATIONS OF QUEBEC CAISSES POPULAIRES WITH BANK OF CANADA

Question No. 1,808—**Mr. Côté (Chicoutimi):**

1. Do the caisses populaires of Quebec deal directly with the Bank of Canada through their federation and, if not, for what reason?
2. What conditions would be required to enable them to deal directly with the Bank of Canada?

[*Translation*]

Mr. L. T. Pennell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): 1. The caisses populaires of Quebec have not maintained deposit accounts with the Bank of Canada or obtained advances from the bank, nor has their federation, but there have been dealings in connection with new issues of Canada savings bonds.

2. There is no legislative requirement for the caisses populaires of Quebec or their federation to maintain cash reserves in the form of Bank of Canada notes and deposits with the bank, and there is no legislative provision for the bank to receive deposits from, or to make advances to, the caisses populaires of Quebec or their federation.

[*Text*]

SERVICES OF MARINE INDUSTRIES LTD. RESPECTING "NEW GRAND HAVEN"

Question No. 1,809—**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria):**

1. What payments were made to Marine Industries Limited, Sorel, Quebec, as appraisers of the *New Grand Haven*?
2. What payments were made to Marine Industries Limited, Sorel, Quebec, for purchasing and holding the *New Grand Haven* for the federal government until treasury board approval could be obtained?
3. If no payments were made for either of the above, what commitments were given the above firm for services rendered?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): 1. None.

2. None.

3. None.

*RESTRICTIONS ON SEAL HUNTING, GULF OF ST. LAWRENCE

Question No. 1,824—**Mr. Mather:**

Will steps be taken prior to the opening of the 1965 sealing season to prohibit seal chases by airplanes and helicopters in the gulf of St. Lawrence?

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): There is no intention of prohibiting the use of aircraft entirely, but their use will be subject to stricter regulation.

GREAT LAKES FISHERY CATCH

Question No. 1,832—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

In each of the last ten years, what has been the total catch of the great lakes commercial fishery?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce):

Commercial Catch of Fish of the Great Lakes, 1954-63

	Canada 000 lb.	U.S.A. 000 lb.	Total 000 lb.
1954	40,888	79,747	120,635
1955	39,391	75,198	114,589
1956	53,239	78,948	132,187
1957	44,852	74,039	118,891
1958	39,317	68,897	108,214
1959	40,937	63,463	104,400
1960	38,781	65,936	104,717
1961	46,238	67,140	113,378
1962	54,566	61,850	116,416
1963	45,038	N.A.	N.A.

Source: Canada, fisheries statistics, Ontario, published by the dominion bureau of statistics.

U.S.A., fishery statistics of the United States.

DEATHS FROM BOATING ACCIDENTS

Question No. 1,834—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

In each province, how many deaths have there been from recreational boating accidents in each of the last five years?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Fatal accidents due to submersion of occupant of small boat, (international list No. E850—a small boat being defined as any watercraft propelled by paddle, oars or small motor, with a passenger capacity of less than ten), for Canada and provinces, 1959-1963:

	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963
Canada	269	291	283	248	271
Newfoundland	14	11	17	12	15
Prince Edward Island	2	2	—	3	2
Nova Scotia	17	24	31	24	25
New Brunswick	49	18	20	14	13
Quebec	43	38	44	38	55
Ontario	77	94	97	95	90
Manitoba	20	23	20	12	19
Saskatchewan	12	19	14	12	10
Alberta	18	11	9	4	13
British Columbia	16	43	28	30	24
Yukon	—	—	—	1	2
Northwest Territories	1	8	3	3	3

DEATHS FROM ALCOHOLISM, ETC.

Question No. 1,840—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

In each province, in each of the last ten years, what has been the death rate per thousand attributable to (a) alcoholism (b) drug addiction (c) suicide?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): (a)

Questions

Death rates (per 100,000 population) for alcoholism*, Canada and provinces, 1954-1963

Province	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963
Canada	1.7	1.7	1.8	2.0	2.4	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.3	2.6
Newfoundland	0.8	0.7	0.2	0.5	0.5	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	—
Prince Edward Island	5.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	2.0	4.0	2.9	3.8	1.9	2.8
Nova Scotia	1.0	0.6	0.1	0.9	0.7	0.1	0.4	1.6	1.2	0.4
New Brunswick	1.1	0.4	0.5	1.2	1.2	0.7	0.5	0.7	0.7	2.3
Quebec	2.2	2.5	2.4	2.8	2.8	2.6	2.6	2.3	2.7	3.0
Ontario	1.6	1.7	2.0	2.1	2.8	2.5	2.5	2.8	2.9	3.0
Manitoba	1.0	0.6	0.7	0.7	1.5	1.3	2.5	2.0	1.7	2.1
Saskatchewan	0.6	0.5	0.8	1.4	1.5	0.9	0.8	0.6	1.6	0.9
Alberta	1.3	1.4	1.0	1.3	1.8	1.0	1.3	2.0	1.8	1.9
British Columbia	2.5	2.0	2.3	2.6	2.4	2.4	2.9	3.1	1.9	3.2
Yukon	10.0	—	16.4	—	—	—	—	—	6.7	6.7
Northwest Territories	—	—	—	—	10.0	4.8	4.5	—	—	4.2

*Includes alcoholism (category 322); alcoholic psychosis (category 307); cirrhosis of liver with alcoholism (category 581.1).

[Mr. Sharp.]

(*b*)

DEATHS DUE TO DRUG ADDICTION (OTHER THAN ALCOHOL)

(Rate per 100,000 population)

CANADA AND PROVINCES, 1954–1963

(Category 323)

Province	1954		1955		1956		1957		1958		1959		1960		1961		1962		1963	
	No.	Rate	No.	Rate	No.	Rate	No.	Rate	No.	Rate	No.	Rate	No.	Rate	No.	Rate	No.	Rate	No.	Rate
Canada	—	—	5	(1)	6	(1)	5	(1)	3	(1)	1	(1)	2	(1)	3	(1)	2	(1)	5	(1)
Newfoundland	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	0.2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Prince Edward Island	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Nova Scotia	—	—	—	—	1	0.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
New Brunswick	—	—	1	0.2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Quebec	—	—	2	(1)	3	0.1	1	(1)	1	(1)	1	(1)	2	(1)	—	—	2	(1)	2	(1)
Ontario	—	—	2	(1)	2	(1)	2	(1)	1	(1)	—	—	—	—	3	(1)	—	—	3	(1)
Manitoba	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Saskatchewan	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Alberta	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
British Columbia	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	0.1	1	0.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Yukon	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Northwest Territories	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

(1) Less than 0.1 per 100,000 population

(c)

(International list No. AE 148)

SUICIDE RATES PER 100,000 POPULATION CANADA AND PROVINCES, 1954-1963

Province	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963
Canada	7.2	7.0	7.6	7.5	7.4	7.4	7.6	7.5	7.2	7.6
Newfoundland	2.0	1.5	2.2	3.3	2.5	3.2	2.7	3.7	1.9	3.3
Prince Edward Island	7.9	6.0	4.0	6.1	7.0	3.0	7.8	6.7	3.8	5.6
Nova Scotia	4.0	5.3	3.9	7.1	4.8	4.2	8.0	5.2	6.0	6.1
New Brunswick	2.8	4.2	4.3	3.2	5.3	5.5	4.6	5.0	5.9	4.7
Quebec	4.7	4.4	5.3	5.4	4.9	5.1	5.0	4.6	5.0	4.8
Ontario	8.0	7.8	8.6	8.7	8.5	8.7	8.6	8.8	8.2	8.9
Manitoba	7.0	9.2	9.4	8.0	9.7	7.3	11.1	7.6	8.4	8.5
Saskatchewan	9.7	10.4	8.6	8.5	9.3	7.5	8.2	10.2	7.8	9.8
Alberta	10.1	8.8	10.2	9.0	9.2	9.4	9.2	8.9	8.5	7.6
British Columbia	13.7	11.6	12.4	11.0	11.2	11.4	10.1	11.8	10.3	13.0
Yukon	10.0	—	25.0	—	23.1	7.7	14.3	34.2	—	13.3
Northwest Territories	5.9	16.7	26.3	—	—	19.0	9.1	13.0	29.2	4.2

POPULATION INCREASE

Question No. 1,843—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

What is the current rate of population increase in each province and in Canada?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce):

Rate of population increase, Canada and provinces, 1963-1964 and 1961-1964

Province	Rate of increase 1963-64	1961-64
Canada	1.8	5.5
Newfoundland	2.1	7.2
Prince Edward Island	—	1.9
Nova Scotia	0.8	3.4
New Brunswick	0.5	3.2
Quebec	1.7	5.8
Ontario	2.1	5.6
Manitoba	0.8	3.9
Saskatchewan	1.1	1.9
Alberta	1.9	7.5
British Columbia	2.5	6.7
Yukon	6.7	14.3
Northwest Territories	4.2	8.7

SALES TAX EXEMPTION ON WORN OUT PRODUCTION GOODS

Question No. 1,844—**Mr. Irvine:**

1. Has the Department of National Revenue recently received a submission from the Canadian fasteners institute asking that exemptions be made from sales tax on production goods worn out or expended during manufacturing operations and, if so, what is the date and substance of the said submission?

2. Did the brief request relief from certain taxation and, if so, on what grounds did it ask for any such relief?

3. Has the government given consideration to the request outlined in such submission and, if so, what steps does the government intend to take in this regard?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue): 1. Yes, August 11. The substance of the brief is that the tax on production goods increases the cost of production in a market in which foreign competition is present.

2. Yes. See part 1 above.

3. Consideration is being given to this submission; however, any decision in this regard will be a matter of government policy.

REVENUE FROM SALES TAX ON DRUGS

Question No. 1,872—**Mr. Howe (Hamilton South):**

What has been the revenue to the government from the 11 per cent sales tax on drugs, in each year since the imposition of the tax?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue): This information is not available. Statistics relating to sales tax collected according to commodities are not maintained.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

BILINGUAL CHEQUES

Question No. 1,558—**Mr. Pigeon:**

1. Do all government departments issue bilingual cheques in all parts of Canada?

2. If not, which departments do not issue bilingual cheques and for what reasons?

3. Do all crown corporations issue bilingual cheques in all parts of Canada?

4. If not, which crown corporations do not issue bilingual cheques and for what reasons?

Return tabled.

Motions for Papers

PUBLIC SERVANTS RECEIVING $18,000 OR MORE ANNUALLY

Question No. 1,597—**Mr. MacRae:**

1. What are the names of those civil servants who are in receipt of a salary in excess of $18,000 per annum?
2. What is the exact salary of each?
3. What is the position that each fills?

Return tabled.

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. J. B. Stewart (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, motion No. 162 is acceptable to the government. Motions 160 and 161 are acceptable to the government subject to the usual reservations concerning the consent of the government of the province.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed that motion 162 be carried, and that motions 160 and 161 be carried, subject to the reservations stated by the parliamentary secretary?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

ASSISTANCE FOR QUEBEC MAPLE SYRUP PRODUCERS

Motion No. 160—**Mr. Boutin:**

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, telegrams or other documents exchanged between the Minister of Forestry and the minister of agriculture for the province of Quebec, since April, 1964, concerning a request for financial assistance for producers of maple sugar and maple syrup in the province of Quebec.

Motion agreed to.

Motion No. 161—**Mr. Boutin:**

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, telegrams or other documents exchanged between the federal Minister of Agriculture and the minister of agriculture for the province of Quebec, since April, 1964, concerning the request for financial assistance for producers of maple sugar and maple syrup in the province of Quebec.

Motion agreed to.

ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS DETAINED

Motion No. 162—**Mr. Orlikow:**

That an order of the house do issue for a copy of a list of the names of any illegal entrants to Canada since July 1, 1963 who were detained for more than one month before being deported or charged in court and the reason for the length of this detention?

Motion agreed to.

[Mr. Pigeon.]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

MALAYSIA—INQUIRY AS TO COMMONWEALTH ASSISTANCE

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether he will give a report to the house concerning the situation in Malaysia due to the unprovoked attack on that country by Indonesia; whether the minister will let us know what request has been made by the Malaysian government for assistance from Canada and what response Canada has made to that request; and third, what aid is being given to Malaysia by other commonwealth countries.

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the situation in Malaysia has taken a more serious turn within the last few days. The full consequences of the increased intervention by Indonesia are not yet clear. When the prime minister of Malaysia was here the Prime Minister and I conferred with him, with the result that, as the Prime Minister announced on the 29th of July, it was decided that a Canadian military survey group would proceed to Malaysia to determine the kind of assistance which could be provided, bearing in mind particularly the contributions which would be made by other countries. The British government itself is engaged in a similar assessment, and, as my hon. friend knows, the government of Malaysia has recently discussed with the government of the United States what assistance that country might give.

At the present time there is a Malaysian mission in Washington looking over certain possible kinds of purchases, and we anticipate that this group will be in Canada within the course of a very few days. This visit may concern a particular type of aircraft. The decision in that regard will have to be made subject to our own assessment of the situation and the wishes of the government of Malaysia. Consideration will then be given as to the means of financing these operations. The survey group which the Prime Minister announced on July 29 is expected to leave for Malaysia very shortly.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, regard being had to the naked aggression practised by Indonesia against Malaysia, has the government given reconsideration to the question of

terminating once and for all assistance to Indonesia?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, the matter is under consideration. I may say that, in consultation with other countries such as Australia, we have considered the matter, but no country has decided to withdraw such assistance to Indonesia, on the theory that assistance of a non-military kind given by western countries has not traditionally borne any political motivation. However, the matter is being reviewed. In the case of Canada, part of our assistance is in respect of aid to students, some of whom are now on their way.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I am not referring to student exchanges; I am referring to food and other such supplies which can have the effect of indirectly rendering available, as the hon. member for Oxford has said, additional foreign exchange, which seems a form of help to Indonesia not justified regardless of the fact that restrictions are not attached to such assistance.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, I am perfectly aware that the right hon. gentleman was not referring to technical assistance, but I am also aware that other countries have pursued the course I have indicated, and no country has yet cancelled its program. The other form of assistance provided for by Canada in the estimates for 1964-65 is wheat flour in the amount of $350,000. There has been no shipment of flour under this allocation. As I indicated a moment ago, this whole question is under consideration. I would not wish at this time, as external affairs minister, to subscribe summarily to the statement made by the right hon. gentleman a few moments ago.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, this is not a question of summarily subscribing to my suggestion. This matter has been before the minister for several weeks, and the situation has become worse and worse in relation to Malaysia.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, I just want to suggest to the right hon. gentleman that there ought to be occasions on orders of the day when the right hon. gentleman should consider that he has responsibilities, which I do not think he fully discharges.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, if I do not discharge my duties on orders of the day I can say to the minister, having regard to the way he is playing around with this problem, that he follows that course throughout.

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a supplementary question of the Secretary of State for External Affairs with regard to Malaysia. Are the press reports correct which state that the government of Malaysia is understood to have made an urgent request to Canada for military and economic aid in its struggle against Indonesia? The minister seemed to indicate that there was a time lag involved here, with some party coming up from Washington. Has there been an urgent request, and what has been Canada's response?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, there is no time lag. My hon. friend is referring to a story which appeared in one of the leading Canadian newspapers this morning. There has been no request made beyond the request made by the Tunku when he was here three weeks ago. I may say that my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, when he was in Kuala Lumpur the other day at the commonwealth economic conference, had further consultations with the government of Malaysia along the lines which were discussed between the prime minister of that country and the representatives of the government of Canada a few weeks ago.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, may I then direct a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Did he at that conference give as prompt a reply in respect of aid from Canada as was apparently given by other nations of the commonwealth to Malaysia?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I spoke to the ministers of the government of Malaysia along exactly the lines indicated by the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

AGREEMENT WITH SPAIN RESPECTING PEACEFUL USE OF ATOMIC ENERGY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs regarding the agreement which has recently been signed between the governments of Canada and Spain for co-operation in the peaceful use of atomic energy. I should like to ask the minister what precautions and what iron-bound guarantees are there to ensure that the information and materials in-

volved cannot be used for other than peaceful purposes.

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): This agreement, as the other eight or nine, Mr. Speaker, is subject to safeguards similar to those laid down by the international atomic energy agency, with headquarters in Vienna. Canada subscribes to such safeguards which are obligatory on both countries. In the case of this agreement Spain is obliged to maintain certain standards, and subject itself to inspections to guarantee that these safeguards are observed. The result is that such atomic installations and materials are used only for peaceful purposes.

Mr. Douglas: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In addition to the exchange of information, does the agreement provide for the supplying by Canada to Spain of any uranium concentrate, heavy water or other materials?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to give further consideration to that question, and I will take it as notice.

CONGO—REQUEST FOR RECOGNITION OF REBEL REGIME

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, my question is also to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Has the government of Canada received any request for diplomatic recognition from the rebel regime of the eastern Congo?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Not that I am aware of, Mr. Speaker. I will take notice of that question.

COMMONWEALTH RELATIONS

REPORTED REQUEST THAT CANADA ASSUME DEFENCE OF BRITISH CARIBBEAN POSSESSIONS

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, may I put a question to the Prime Minister?

Has the Prime Minister been consulted or is he aware of a report to the effect that Great Britain will ask Canada to undertake the defence of the British possessions in the Caribbean area? If so, what has been the reaction of the Prime Minister or of the government?

[Mr. Douglas.]

[*Text*]

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have not seen the report to which my hon. friend has referred, but to my knowledge there has certainly been no consultation between the two governments on this matter recently.

[*Translation*]

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

Could the Prime Minister tell us whether this matter has been discussed during the commonwealth Prime Ministers' conference in London?

[*Text*]

Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Speaker, it was not discussed then.

FINANCE

REPRESENTATIONS RESPECTING REVALUATION OF CANADIAN DOLLAR

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance but in his absence I will direct it to the Prime Minister. Has the government received either from the United States government or the international monetary fund any representations, or has any pressure been brought to bear, to have the Canadian government revalue the Canadian dollar at a higher rate?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the Acting Minister of Finance will deal with that question.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, may I answer as Acting Minister of Finance. The government sees no reason to change the official par value of the Canadian dollar, which it is committed and well able to maintain.

Mr. Martineau: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I thank the minister for the information, but will he say whether he has received any such representations from the United States government or other sources?

Mr. Sharp: No, Mr. Speaker.

PUBLICATIONS

INTENTION OF GOVERNMENT RESPECTING PENDING LEGISLATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (Queens-Lunenburg): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question

to the Prime Minister. The speech from the throne on February 18 stated:

You will be asked to consider measures to strengthen the position of periodicals published in Canada.

In view of the fact that *Liberty* magazine has been forced to suspend after 32 years of continuous publication in Canada, will the Prime Minister tell the house when he proposes to do something to help Canadian periodicals survive in the battle for the market with United States publications?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I should like to think we would be able to deal with this matter during the current session.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATION OF INSANITY LAW TO CRIMINAL OFFENCES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Justice which is prompted by a speech made by the deputy attorney general of Ontario, as reported in the press. Is the government giving any consideration to introducing the principle of diminishing responsibility in the law on insanity as applied to criminal offences?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, this is one matter which the Department of Justice under my jurisdiction has under study at present.

TRANS-CANADA HIGHWAY

COMPLAINTS RESPECTING PAYMENT FOR PROPERTY PURCHASED OR EXPROPRIATED

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address to the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Public Works a question which has application from the Atlantic to the Pacific. In view of complaints from property owners whose properties are purchased or expropriated in connection with building or rebuilding certain sections of the trans-Canada highway, does the federal government accept any responsibility for making certain that these property holders are treated fairly and justly, by the withholding of federal grants or through any other procedures?

Mr. G. Roy McWilliam (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, the minister will be here later today and I will bring the question to his notice.

Inquiries of the Ministry

CIVIL DEFENCE

OTTAWA—PUBLIC REACTION TO SOUNDING OF SIRENS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. William Dean Howe (Hamilton South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Defence but in his absence possibly I could ask it of the Prime Minister. In view of the generally indifferent reaction to the sounding of air raid sirens in Ottawa on Saturday last, has the Prime Minister considered action to make the public more fully aware of the proper response to such an alarm?

Hon. Lucien Cardin (Associate Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I think I should remind the hon. member that the siren system that is now in effect was authorized by the previous government and was completed and became operational on November 6, 1961. Perhaps it might be useful to explain a little of what this system is and what has been done in the recent episode concerning the siren.

As hon. members know, there are 31 sirens in the Ottawa-Hull metropolitan area, and these are controlled centrally at the federal warning centre at Carp. There is one main circuit from Carp to the Bell Telephone exchange in Ottawa, and from the exchange there are circuits to individual sirens. These circuits are all leased from the Bell Telephone Company, and the federal warning officer is responsible for activating the sirens in an emergency. There are visible and audible means in the warning centre to show when the sirens have been activated.

All sirens in the metropolitan area started sounding at 14.29 hours on Saturday, September 5, 1964. They were not activated by the federal warning officer, and Bell Telephone informed the department that the sirens were activated by a short circuit in the circuit between Carp and the Bell Telephone exchange, which was caused by a cable being damaged by shotgun pellets. There was no time lost in advising the Department of National Defence and the Bell Telephone Company of what happened, and the subsequent delay in deactivating the circuits was caused by the complexity of the circuits within the Bell Telephone system, so it was not until 15.01 hours that the sirens stopped sounding.

I may also inform the house that the directorate of signals is undertaking a comprehensive investigation of the procedures to be adopted in the case of accidental soundings, with a view to reducing the time lag in

deactivating the circuits. Further, I may add that in the pamphlet, "Eleven Steps to Survival" it is set out that if the sirens are sounded the first thing the public should do is turn on their radios, and if the air waves are carrying no special announcement then they can conclude it is a false alarm.

Mr. Howe (Hamilton South): As a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, is the public going to be made fully aware of the steps that should be taken, because obviously last Saturday there were not proper steps taken by people with knowledge of what should be done.

Mr. Cardin: Mr. Speaker, I understand the pamphlet "Eleven Steps to Survival" was very widely circulated throughout the country, and in that particular pamphlet all the information and instructions are included.

Mr. Raymond Langlois (Mégantic): As a supplementary question, in view of the whole uproar caused by one shotgun blast would the minister and the government not consider some new system, as on another occasion it may not be a shotgun blast but another kind of blast that would be more dangerous to everybody and would cause more commotion. Is that going to be repaired and seen to?

Mr. Cardin: In my answer, Mr. Speaker, I stated the department was investigating the procedures to be followed, and was also investigating the whole system.

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): In view of newspaper reports that at the time of the sounding of the warning sirens in Ottawa no answer could be obtained from the three telephones in the E.M.O. office because no one was on shift duty, could the minister give us any authoritative information as to how much warning the government expects to receive in the event of an invasion, in order to have a staff on duty in the emergency measures office?

Mr. Cardin: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of that to which the hon. member refers, but I do know there was no delay from the time the people at the Carp centre became aware that the sirens were sounding until they advised both the Department of National Defence and the Bell Telephone Company. I think the time lag was something like four minutes.

Mr. Winch: There must be some misunderstanding, Mr. Speaker. My question was about the emergency measures organization office. According to the newspapers it has three phones, but no answer could be obtained from the office when the sirens went off, because apparently there was nobody on duty. If it is an emergency measures organization how come there is not 24 hour personnel on duty?

Mr. Cardin: Mr. Speaker, I shall have to look into that.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lucien Plourde (Quebec West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a supplementary question concerning the emergency measures organization. It seems that an attempt was made to contact radio and T.V. stations but that telephone lines were busy during several minutes. Now, if an emergency really occurred, would there not be a line available to inform all radio and television stations since they have to broadcast messages?

Mr. Cardin: Mr. Speaker, I said a while ago that I would look into that and get the information.

[*Text*]

CANADIAN FLAG

SUGGESTED MEETING OF PARTY LEADERS TO CONSIDER PROCEDURE

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Guy Marcoux (Quebec-Montmorency): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister. In view of the fact that the various parties held a caucus this morning, and following the suggestion by the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Olson), is it the intention of the Prime Minister to convene another meeting of the party leaders soon, in order to facilitate the conclusion of the flag debate?

[*Text*]

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker, steps are being taken to invite the party leaders to a meeting without delay.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

INQUIRY AS TO DESTROYER CONVERSION PROGRAM

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Pictou): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Associate Minister of National Defence. I would like to ask the minister whether current reports are correct, to the effect that 11 Royal Canadian Navy destroyers will be modernized. I believe the amount involved was stated as

some $21 million and, if so, will this program commence at an early date? The reports refer to the conversion of 11 ships, four of the Mackenzie class and seven of the Restigouche class. Finally, could the minister inform the house whether this means that the recently initiated program covering the H.S.S. 2 helicopters, at very substantial cost, will not be carried out?

Hon. Lucien Cardin (Associate Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, perhaps it might be useful if I gave the status of the destroyer conversion program. As hon. members know, in the approved program seven St. Laurent class vessels have been approved for conversion, with the installation of variable depth sonar and helicopter facilities. Three of these have been converted, two in 1963 and one in 1964. Two are currently undergoing conversion, the *Saguenay* and the *Skeena*, and two have yet to be converted, the *Margaree* and the *Fraser*. Also two ships, the *Nipigon* and the *Annapolis*, were approved for construction to the standard of the 205 class conversion. The *Nipigon* was completed in May, 1964 and the *Annapolis* is due to be completed by the end of 1964.

There are plans which have not yet been approved—and I think this more directly concerns the hon. member's question—for the remaining 11 D.D.E.'s, four Mackenzie class and seven Restigouche class. It is planned to commence conversion of them in mid-1965, with completion about mid-1969. However, I want to point out to the hon. member that departmental and treasury board approval has not yet been given.

Mr. G. L. Chatterton (Esquimalt-Saanich): As a supplementary question, can the minister say whether the government will continue the policy that ships operating on the Pacific coast will be maintained and converted there?

Mr. Cardin: Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Defence Production is not here I shall be happy to take that question as notice.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION OF FARM LOAN LEGISLATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. A. McBain (Elgin): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Prime Minister. Will the right hon. gentleman give consideration to setting aside Thursday, or Monday at the latest, for government legislation in order to present for debate the resolution to amend the Farm Improvement Loans Act, to increase the maximum amount from $7,500 to $15,000? This resolution has been on the order paper since July 13, and the increase is required by farmers at the present time so they may be able to engage in major improvements and construction works before the cold weather sets in.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the proposals of the government for setting aside certain days in the middle of the week for other legislative measures have already been laid before the house but they did not meet, I gather, with general acceptance.

Mr. McBain: As a supplementary question, is this another piece of legislation that is not ready for debate by parliament?

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. H. Jorgenson (Provencher): I wish to address a question to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the statement the hon. gentleman made in Toronto over the week end I wonder if he is planning to change the regulations under all the statutes pertaining to the Department of Agriculture so that for the word "farmer" there may be substituted the words "grocery grower".

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): Maybe a better title would be "minister of food".

AGRICULTURE

REQUEST FOR INDICATION OF COUNTRIES OF ORIGIN OF LAMB IMPORTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. R. Gundlock (Lethbridge): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Due to the fact that lamb prices have dropped 8 cents in the last few days, coinciding with the suspension of shipments to the United States by normal suppliers, can the minister give us some real assurance that the Canadian market will receive consideration, at least to the extent of listing the countries of origin as set out by the dominion bureau of statistics in its livestock reports?

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): Lamb prices are supported under the stabilization act to the extent of almost 100 per cent and, of course, when a significant decline in lamb prices occurs the government does support this commodity.

Some time ago the hon. member asked about lamb prices and suggested they were

not being quoted in the usual manner. This is not the case. They are quoted as they have always been in the market reports.

Mr. Gundlock: These prices are not quoted in relation to the country of origin, and the chief suppliers to the United States market are listed in that country. If I might quote just a few words—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I wonder if the hon. member would ask his question; then we will dispose of it. What is the question?

Mr. Gundlock: The suppliers to the United States voluntarily reduced their exports in the face of a reluctance on the part of that market. The question I am asking is this. Can we not have these imports listed according to the countries of origin?

Mr. Hays: It is evident that the hon. member is confused. If he will come to my office I will explain the whole thing to him.

Mr. Gundlock: On a question of privilege, may I say I am not confused at all. I should like some answer to my question concerning this lamb problem. This is a facet of the Canadian economy which is being neglected.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member would put his question on the order paper.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

INQUIRY AS TO HOLIDAYS FOR STAFF

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the President of the Privy Council. I wonder whether the minister is in a position to tell the house anything further with respect to the question of holidays for the staff of the House of Commons, in view of the fact that our operation is becoming an all year round proposition.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (President of the Privy Council): No, Mr. Speaker, other than to reiterate that this question is receiving active consideration at the moment, and that I hope there will be some information available shortly.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

ALBERTA—PROVISION OF HOSPITAL FOR DOMICILIARY CARE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): My question is addressed to the Minister of Veterans Affairs. When does the government expect to reach a decision regarding the former Government House and the Wells pavilion property in Edmonton in relation to the centenary project for a provincial museum?

Hon. Roger Teillet (Minister of Veterans Affairs): I was able to announce today that an agreement has been reached with the province of Alberta with respect to Government House. In effect, the federal government is returning Government House to the province, also the Wells pavilion near the university hospital, in exchange for a 150 bed domiciliary care hospital beside the Aberhart sanatorium, the cost to be shared by the federal government. This institution will be leased and operated by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Will admission to this new proposed building be under the jurisdiction of the Department of Veterans Affairs?

Mr. Teillet: Yes. While the province will own the building, it will be leased to the department and we shall operate it in the same way as we now operate Government House and the Wells pavilion.

HALIFAX, N.S.—TRANSFER OF HOSPITAL FROM FEDERAL CONTROL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): May I ask the Minister of Veterans Affairs if he is in a position to advise the house whether any discussions have taken place recently with regard to the possible transfer of the Camp Hill veterans hospital at Halifax to other authorities?

Hon. Roger Teillet (Minister of Veterans Affairs): No, Mr. Speaker.

GRAIN

ESTABLISHMENT OF PRICES FOR WHEAT AND COARSE GRAINS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): I have a question for the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Is the minister prepared to answer the question put to him yesterday by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar respecting payment for deliveries of grain?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Yes, Mr. Speaker. On August 31 a similar question was addressed to the Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce in my absence, and at that time my colleague said the wheat board had released

the information to the elevator agents. I have now confirmed this. On August 27 the wheat board provided information as to prices of wheat and coarse grains to the elevator companies, and by this time all elevator agents have received the information. Accordingly, as far as I am aware, farmers can receive payment for the grain immediately they deliver it.

Mr. C. O. Cooper (Rosetown-Biggar): In the light of that answer may I point out that I have a letter here dated September 3 from a farmer who was unable to obtain payment. In addition I received a telephone call from Rosetown yesterday morning asking why farmers could not get payment for their wheat, and last evening I received another telephone call from a party in my constituency inquiring when he would be paid for wheat in storage in the elevator.

Mr. Sharp: These prices were approved some time ago by the government, and as far as I know the wheat board has been distributing the information as quickly as it can. I hope there will be no further delay.

Mr. Olson: I wonder whether the minister would inquire into these delays, because according to the statement he made the information was given out by the wheat board on August 27. I know that what the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar said is true and that at many delivery points authorization to make out the grain tickets has not been received.

Mr. Sharp: I will do so.

CANADIAN FLAG

OFFICIAL ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW DESIGN

The house resumed from Tuesday, September 8, consideration of the motion of Mr. Pearson:

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 the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Diefenbaker and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Churchill.

Mr. W. H. Jorgenson (Provencher): When the house rose at 10.30 last night we were dealing with the attitude of the government toward this particular legislation, and I was expressing some concern over the fact that from numerous sources we have heard the theory advanced that because they know they are faced with a majority of votes the opposition should simply offer token resistance to the motion which is now before the house and permit the issue to come to a vote. I expressed the view that though this might end the debate here in the House of Commons it would certainly not amount to a satisfactory solution as far as the Canadian people are concerned.

The Minister without Portfolio had some interesting observations to make last night on this aspect. The Prime Minister himself offered a suggestion, and it was contained as well in part of the speech made by the leader of the New Democratic party, the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam.

It seems to me that with an issue of this nature, an issue that contains as much emotion as this does, there is a great deal more involved than simply allowing the question to come to a vote and letting the vote decide. What is involved here in something far deeper, namely the question of producing a flag that will be satisfactory to people all across Canada. In this respect, Mr. Speaker, there appeared on Saturday, July 11 of this year an editorial in the Winnipeg *Tribune* which I think deals very fully with this subject, and I should like to place it on the record. It is entitled "Parliament and people" and says:

How political are Canadians?

A foreigner visiting this country must find this a perplexing question. Although the newspapers and air waves provide political news and views in abundance there is a negative undercurrent.

There is a repetitive theme that another election must be avoided at any cost.

Parliament is constantly hectored as a "do nothing" body by the commentators.

Various issues are regarded as being tiresome because they haven't been resolved.

It is difficult to determine whether such views represent the citizen at large or merely are expressions of frustration by the professional political pundits who weary of their task. One thing is certain.

If parliament approved legislation in slap-dash fashion, it would be thoroughly roasted as having abandoned its fundamental responsibility. And undoubtedly the MP's would be reminded again that their $18,000 stipends required them to be more than rubber stamps.

I wholeheartedly agree with that sentiment. The article continues:

It is one of the assets of our parliamentary system that elections can or must be called once a government has lost control or the confidence of the commons. This places a minority government in a delicate position which can only be maintained by

introducing legislation deemed necessary and desirable by the other factions.

No matter what party a citizen may endorse, his first political allegiance should be given to parliament. The present government's uncertain grasp of this basic political philosophy unfortunately has obscured this for many in the conduct of the flag debates. Pushing the flag bill to an extremity and with indecent haste, the government attempts to cover its own ineptitude by charging its opponents with obstructionism.

This charge appeals to those who like quick uncomplicated decisions. The assumption, however, that parliament is supposed to present only token resistance to a government has no validity in our political system.

Then it goes on to say:

Even though the flag bill couldn't rate any better than priority No. 10,000 in matters that require attention—apart from Mr. Pearson's curious obsession—it certainly has become a stumbling block. The government lost its one chance of having this dealt with in relatively dispassionate terms when it renounced the free vote. Despite this gross error, compounded by the desperate two-flag and two-anthem amendments, we still must hope that parliament somehow will untangle the government without resorting to an election.

The elements of the flag dispute are too vague for articulation on the hustings. If Canadians truly are tired of it as a topic while it is in parliament, it isn't likely to strike a higher or nobler chord on the campaign trail. But despite this, those in parliament who oppose either the proposed new flag or the dragooning tactics employed by the government must, in all conscience, employ whatever restraint they can against arbitrary legislation in the interest of the public.

The people of Canada did not demand that this matter should be resolved at this time. And even most of those who approved Mr. Pearson's design hoped for something more conciliatory than his "stand or fall" ultimatum. At the present stage of this contretemps, the government and not parliament is the obstructionist.

Canadians may get tired of any government but God help us when we get tired of parliament.

I think this sums up very concisely the point of view I was attempting to express last evening. This raises the question of why all this haste has been employed in attempting to ram this legislation through the House of Commons. In the first place the Prime Minister and a number of his colleagues on the other side of the house have stated that this was a solemn commitment made to the Canadian people. I can think of a good many other commitments that were a great deal more solemn than this one. I will not go into detail or try to enumerate them, because hon. members opposite have been reminded of them on several occasions.

It is said that this solemn commitment was given, in effect, in reply to a question asked by a reporter at a press conference in Winnipeg. I rather think it was more of an afterthought, or perhaps the Prime Minister at that time seized upon the opportunity to please somebody. But certainly, Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to imagine that this represents a solemn commitment when it did not even appear in most of the campaign literature distributed by the Liberal party during the last election campaign.

The Minister of Transport the other day attempted to shed some light on this situation when he quoted an excerpt from a television broadcast by the present Prime Minister in 1960. He attempted to use this as an example of a solemn commitment the Prime Minister had made at that time. It might have been the statement that was made, but I wonder how it stands up in the face of the theory advanced in this house the other day by the Postmaster General, since at that time the present Prime Minister was in the opposition.

This whole affair, right from the time it was introduced at the Legion convention early in April until today, has been a story of bumbling and mismanagement on the part of this government. As a result national unity in this country has reached the lowest ebb in our history. At the present time we have this situation. We have one group of people ardently supporting the retention of the red ensign as Canada's national flag, and we have another group that supports the maple leaf flag. But I think within these two extremes we have a large majority of Canadians who are sincerely hoping this parliament can produce a distinctive Canadian flag.

I think it is the responsibility of this parliament to do so. It cannot be done by simply calling for a vote on this issue, because we know what will be the result of a vote. To allow it to come to a vote would in my opinion simply be an abdication of our responsibility as an opposition. The problem of national unity would not be resolved; in fact it is my opinion that it would be complicated even further. We would have dissension from one end of this country to the other if this matter were permitted to come to a vote.

As I see it, the only solution is to follow the suggestion that was made originally by the hon. member for Edmonton West, then yesterday by the leader of the New Democratic party, and by others in this house, and refer this question to a committee for decision. Once the committee had brought in its recommendation in a spirit of compromise, the spirit with which they would begin their hearings in a sincere effort to produce a flag, I believe a flag could be produced that would be acceptable to Canadians across this country. I do not think it is possible to produce a flag that would be acceptable to everybody, but

I do believe that if this procedure were followed we could produce a flag that will not carry with it all the recriminations, bitterness and hatred that has characterized this debate. I sincerely hope that the parties in this house can get together and produce that kind of flag. In my opinion it can be done.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Léon Balcer (Three Rivers): Mr. Speaker, I must confess it is with some hesitation that I rise to take part in this debate which has been going on for quite some time, because most of the points one could dwell on have already been made very successfully by previous speakers. However, since I have been invited to voice my opinion, I shall do so this afternoon in all sincerity and I do hope that, in so doing I shall not offend anybody.

The present debate seems to be causing a great deal of confusion and concern in the minds of people, and I do not think any issue has raised such heated discussions throughout the country in the past several years. One has but to read the editorials in Canadian newspapers to realize just how strong a feeling of frustration seems to have come over public opinion as a result of this parliament's inability to reach a decision and give our country a national emblem, something which the great majority of Canadians have been asking for quite a number of years already.

Personally, when I go back to my riding for the week end, like most hon. members I am asked these questions. What is happening in Ottawa? When will we have a flag? Will you settle that question? How will you get out of that deadlock? As a member from Quebec, I must say that this debate is giving rise to strong apprehensions among the moderate element in my province and what worries our people most is the damage that some stands and some speeches can really do to Canadian unity.

I know that national unity has become a rather trite expression and that a lot of people are tired of that old cliché but just the same, whether we want it or not, national unity remains the backbone of our development and an absolute necessity in a country like ours.

Mr. Speaker, I know that during this debate, in speeches from all sides of the house, appeals have been made for national unity, many professions of faith have been made in favour of national unity, so much so that I wonder if those professions of faith and statements of love are not in fact stifling national unity.

This reminds me of a historical incident which happened in 1862. While Paris was besieged and the city was in dire poverty, famine drove people to eat dogs, cats and other animals of that kind. Now, there was a poor man of Paris named Chavette who had a dog called Médor, his only faithful friend. The time came when Chavette had to eat his friend Médor. While eating his dog, he would place each bone in Médor's plate and when he was finished, looking at the dog's plate, he said: It is too bad that Médor is not here; it would have such a good meal.

The same attitude is taken with respect to national unity. While paying lip service to national unity we let it crumble, and the day may come if the situation deteriorates, when all that will be left will be the skeleton of national unity, and then we shall say: Poor national unity; we would have been so pleased to re-examine it.

Mr. Speaker, where are we going with the situation which prevails now? Are we not running the risk of deepening a division which certainly should not exist in our country? As members of the Canadian parliament, we have a responsibility to this country which extends from sea to sea and it is our duty not to let this difficult situation get any worse.

I will not say the situation is serious because I do not want to be pessimistic. However, I must certainly acknowledge that it is complicated. If, in the province of Quebec, French Canadians are taking a stand which speaks well for the future not only of the province but of the whole of Canada, it must be said that such a reawakening is often spoiled by extremists. In fact, the efforts of the moderate elements in my province are often misunderstood by my friends from the other provinces. There have been heated exchanges between the two groups these past few years, but our politicians, our faculty members, our businessmen, our great newspapermen, etc. have also made fine efforts to bring the two elements closer together.

This debate and, especially, the present stalemate should not be allowed to place parliament and the whole country in an untenable position.

Both parties seem to have taken irreversible stands and the division is becoming more pronounced every day.

I think that both parties delude themselves.

At any rate, the supporters of the three maple leaf flag are deluding themselves with

the thought that their design will be adopted without closure. In my opinion, it is a delusion. It is also a delusion for the supporters of the red ensign to believe that it can be maintained without resorting to an endless filibuster.

For my part I was ready to accept the three maple leaf design, as were thousands of Canadians. However, I must admit that the right hon. Prime Minister could not have acted more clumsily than he did in the circumstances, first of all by requesting a confidence vote on the flag issue and afterwards, in conjunction with his supporters, by making this emblem a party symbol, and, finally, by endeavouring to impose the union jack when nobody had requested it.

The supporters of the red ensign are certainly justified to express their opinion, but I do not think that exaggerated outbursts of emotions will settle anything.

Hon. members have so often used the words "great principle"; they have appealed to principle so much that I wondered whether they were not parodying that sally of Aristide Briand: "Rest on your principles, rest on them the most you can; if you rest on them long enough, they will eventually yield".

Mr. Speaker, there has been undoubtedly excesses of language, but I believe that they have gone beyond the thought of the speaker. However, this has made us realize that such a debate could carry us on delicate grounds.

Both delusions—closure and filibuster—nurtured by both parties must be dispelled in both cases: otherwise parliament as an institution will certainly be affected. A compromise must be reached by all means. Besides, compromise is the whole history of Canada. The very existence of this country is due to a compromise, and its future rests also on compromise, understanding and sacrifices accepted on both sides.

Several compromises have been put forward, but I feel that there is a very simple one which is actually recognized by almost all members. When a measure is at the same time wholeheartedly supported by the Toronto *Star*, Montreal's *Le Devoir*, the Montreal *Gazette* and the former premier of Ontario, Mr. Frost, it can be concluded that it is a compromise acceptable throughout the country.

As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, I am in favour of a flag with only one maple leaf, instead of the flag bearing three maple leaves which is now proposed. In my opinion, a flag with a single maple leaf would be supported by the majority of Canadians.

[Mr. Balcer.]

I do not want to propose any particular design, because I know that my friend the hon. member for Nicolet-Yamaska (Mr. Vincent) has put forward a flag designed, I must admit, by my brother-in-law.

I feel that I would put myself in a somewhat awkward situation if I were to propose the flag designed by my brother-in-law; nevertheless, I wish him good luck.

Personally, I am ready to accept a flag with a single maple leaf as the symbol of Canada.

I should like to point out that if I support the design with a single maple leaf it is not because the symbol is exclusive to Quebec but because it is a symbol of Canada as a whole. I would even go so far as saying that it is more a symbol of English Canada than it is of French Canada.

As a second flag, signifying our membership in the commonwealth, I suggest that the red ensign be substituted for the union jack. I appreciate that to suddenly abandon the red ensign would be a much too quick transition for some hon. members and that the shock would perhaps be too sudden. But why could we not adopt the red ensign instead of the union jack, since the acceptance of the union jack as a second flag is so ridiculous that the matter is not even worth discussing.

It would be tragic if, after such a long debate, we could not have a truly distinctive Canadian flag, and that is why a compromise is so essential. We should bear in mind that it is the young people of today who want a distinctive and essentially Canadian flag, the youth in every province of Canada.

I should like to point out to hon. members that they need have no fear, this is not a concession to Quebec, but a concession to the Canada of 1964.

When I go back in my riding and meet young French Canadians expressing separatist feelings, I tell them, as all hon. members do, to be a little more Canadian, in short, true Canadians.

A few weeks ago, one of them told me: "The rest of Canada is asking us to be Canadians and nothing more, to think only in terms of one Canada. Well, why do they still want to keep the union jack which is the emblem of another country?" I think it is worth while to work together in 1964 and do something that is fundamentally Canadian.

I know that it will undoubtedly call for a measure of sacrifice from some older members and that it will be with a degree of nostalgia that they will see another flag replace the red ensign. Unfortunately those are the facts of life.

As a matter of fact, it must be remembered that one day Sir Winston Churchill said: I will never preside over the dismemberment of the British empire. At that time he was wildly applauded, but times have changed. Today if those same Englishmen who applauded Churchill's patriotic speech were asked to take back India, Pakistan or Ceylon, I feel that they would be quite reluctant to do so.

In the course of the debate, several members have stressed the fact that the red ensign was the flag under which our Canadian forces fought in the last war. They were right, and their respect for it is still perfectly justified; our children and our grandchildren will also have every reason to respect it.

Mr. Speaker, I served in the Canadian navy, and let me tell you that if there was anything at that time that burned up Canadian sailors more than anything else it was to be mistaken for British sailors. What they wanted at all costs was to be recognized everywhere as Canadians, purely and simply. That is why one day, as we entered the ports of the royal navy in England, some ordinary Canadian seamen went up and painted a big red maple leaf on their ship's funnel. Those men were not French Canadians any more than they were English Canadians. They were just plain Canadian sailors who were proud to be Canadians and for whom the maple leaf was a distinctive Canadian emblem.

One of the greatest thrills we felt when Canadian ships entered an English port or joined a convoy was to hear the sailors aboard the other ships welcome us with those words: Hello Canada, because of the maple leaf on our funnels.

Mr. Speaker, this tradition, which was established in the navy during the war was maintained and was never criticized by anybody.

As far as I am concerned, at the time I was minister of transport, when colour had to be given to our coastguard, I insisted that a large red maple leaf be painted on the white funnels. Up to now, I have received no criticism at all.

Mr. Speaker, when the three maple leaf flag was introduced, I supported it without any reservation. I saw in it a factor of Canadian unity. I must say that, like many Canadians, I was disappointed by the partisanship which accompanied its introduction. Unfortunately, it has become somewhat too much the emblem of one party.

On the other hand, like many Conservatives, in the province of Quebec in particular, I must recognize that the stand of the majority of my party also disappointed me, and I need not insist further on this matter.

I am, therefore, suggesting the immediate appointment of a committee in order to determine the choice of a flag.

Personally, as I was saying a while ago, I think that a single maple leaf on that flag would be acceptable. And I suggest that we keep the red ensign as a flag commemorating our membership in the commonwealth.

However, I must say that if such a committee is appointed, I personally believe we should insist on the majority rule, provided it represents two thirds of the members of that committee. I suggest two thirds, because if one studies all the new constitutions set up over the past century, one realizes that when decisions of importance for modern and contemporary history have to be made in any of those countries, a two thirds majority is the maximum required.

It seems, therefore, that this would be reasonable in the circumstances and would provide a flag chosen by the majority.

Mr. Speaker, what I fear most about this debate is that it will result in racial strife.

Sincere Canadians want parliament to maintain its prestige, and I feel we should co-operate in building a fine Canada where it is good to live.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the compromise idea will prevail and that the house will take a decision without further delay.

As for me, I am opposed to a referendum, as I am against a general election on this kind of issue. I believe that both could result in a division within the country and could cause wrongs that would last much too long.

Undoubtedly, the flag debate has had interesting aspects, but I think that in the interest of national unity, it is time to stop paying lip service to that unity and start working towards it; let us give the country an essentially Canadian flag which will be respected from coast to coast.

Mr. C. A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, I was not supposed to speak this afternoon, but following the speeches which have just been delivered I feel that we will reach an agreement. If everyone cooperates and refrains from playing on emotions, I think that we will reach the agreement so ardently desired by the Canadian people.

I do not wish to extend the debate further, but I simply want to add a few words, so that we may bring to an end that marathon

debate which we have been patiently following for more than 20 days.

During the past week especially, our party has been trying by every possible means to work out an agreement. Even yesterday, we came within a hair's breadth of succeeding. However, if that has led to the suggestions made today or the agreement which we hope will soon be reached, our efforts will not have been in vain.

Mr. Speaker, we are confronted today with a contest that I would not qualify as national, but as a clash between two parties, perhaps well intended, but which are certainly too much taken by the ambition to win in turn some honours.

First of all the government presented us with a three maple leaf flag design. Everyone admits even today, even the hon. members on the government side, that if the government had handled the matter differently, if it had moved a motion to set up a committee for consideration of a flag design which would have received the approval of this parliament as a whole, the design presented then would have been undoubtedly more national in character than the one we now have before us.

Therefore, I blame a little the Liberal government which probably thought it was doing the right thing but certainly blundered in introducing a flag design the way it did. Later the government went back on its decision and rectified a little its mistake by making concessions.

Here I must commend the government for its broadmindedness when it was willing to recognize its past mistakes and to suggest to the house the establishment of a committee and a free vote on this flag business; I think those were the two stumbling blocks in the presentation of its flag.

I say that it was really accused, these days, of having introduced a Liberal flag. After all, it has almost become the general idea in the opposition in this parliament that the way of introducing it reflects too much the partisan spirit and not enough the national spirit. That is why we wish with all our hearts the national spirit to prevail in this parliament, and it is only then that we can reach a reasonable agreement.

On the other hand we note that the conservative party has reversed its policy, as was proper. Nor am I ready to blame completely the Tory party for its change of policy as a political party, two parties facing one another, one introducing its flag and the other changing its policy with another flag.

We must not forget that today, if the Conservative party just reversed their stand on the red ensign, they would not have unanimous agreement of their members any more, by the way, than the Liberals had 100 per cent agreement of their own members.

Mr. Habel: 99 per cent.

Mr. Gauthier: We saw members of both parties speak in this house against their own leader.

Mr. Cadieux (Terrbonne): Only one, and and that is why we say 99 per cent.

Mr. Gauthier: They say there was only one, but that is without counting those who will not speak up. It is for that reason that if both old line parties had held the necessary caucus in the first place, they would have reached an agreement on some design or on some criticism and we would have probably avoided this marathon. This means that this marathon was certainly brought about by failures on both sides.

From red ensign supporters, we heard pathetic speeches. I would not call them historic speeches because for us, the red ensign has no historical character, since it is only temporary.

An hon. Member: And besides, it is not patriotic.

Mr. Gauthier: The red ensign was accepted by parliament only conditionally and temporarily until there would be a really distinctive flag which would be our national flag.

Mr. Dupuis: Hear, hear.

Mr. Gauthier: When I hear the Conservatives say "We fought under that flag", I admit that they fought under the colours of that flag. But then, they must recognize that they only fought under a temporary flag.

I heard another Conservative member say: We taught our children that the red ensign is our national flag. Well, Mr. Speaker, if they did, they taught their children a lie because we in the province of Quebec taught our children the truth, namely that the red ensign, which we respect just the same, is only the temporary flag of Canada until we have our distinctive national flag. That is the truth, Mr. Speaker.

We always made it a point to teach the new generations the true meaning of our national policy. Even if it is said in this parliament that our children were taught that the red ensign is the national flag, I say and will always say that it is false, that it is a flag that was chosen to be used by our

troops on the battlefields, but it is not a national flag, only a temporary one.

I heard someone else say that the three-leaved flag was commercial in design. Since the red ensign is the flag of the British merchant marine, I wonder which of the two is more commercial. How can anyone say that one is less commercial than the other?

Mr. Speaker, I refer to those few statements made by the hon. members on both sides of the house only to show that they could not have been serious when they made such claims. I fail to understand how a Conservative, regardless of whether he is a French Canadian, an English speaking Canadian or an immigrant, could seriously seek to prove to the house that the red ensign is our national flag. No one could seriously do so.

I cannot imagine either that the Conservatives are serious when they ask for a referendum on the proposed flag. Last night, the hon. member for St. Jean-Iberville-Napierville (Mr. Dupuis) gave us a proof that was lacking up to now. As a matter of fact, some present Conservative members have actually disavowed in 1961 what they advocate today. It means therefore that someone is playing the fool, that there are some jokers in the house. We want to put an end to this sort of thing, because I do not think any responsible member wishes to make of this house a stage for make-believe. Every Canadian feels that this monumental farce should be stopped.

It is said that the right of free speech must be respected. I agree, Mr. Speaker, but when someone has expressed his views once, even twice or three times, I feel that when he speaks for the fourth time he is abusing the right of free speech. The farmers in our ridings call that sheer foolishness and say that those who are responsible for such abuses deserve to be sent to hospital.

I think that it is time for the Liberal government to face up to its responsibilities. If we could assume the government's responsibility, we would readily do so.

It appears that the motion we intend to introduce was irregular. Now, we have to amend it before introducing it. On the other hand after consulting experienced politicians, I learned that a motion to set up a committee of the house can be introduced only by a minister, and not by a private member.

Such a motion has to be introduced by a minister and that is why I rise today to demand that the Liberal government assume its responsibilities and introduce that motion concerning the setting up of the kind of committee which was suggested yesterday, a time limit being specified for the presentation of the committee's report and for the discussion of that report.

The government may rest assured that for the sake of peace and unity in this country we will wholeheartedly support such a motion. I would even go so far as to say that if, one day, it is obliged to impose closure, we will support it in order to safeguard Canadian unity, because the more we go along the present way, the more we deepen the chasm which is dividing Canadians. We must end this division and I am sure that we shall never reach any agreement by carrying on with this marathon. As a matter of fact the events of the last few days have proved that we could go on discussing this matter for another three months without attaining any results; instead of going forward we are going backward.

We must absolutely settle this matter and the only solution, in my opinion, is the one suggested by the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Balcer), speaking once more on behalf of his party, to the effect that a committee be set up to select a flag that would be approved by the majority of members. I say that the house is responsible for the choice of a distinctive national flag for Canada, and it should be done through a committee that would sit for 60 days, whose report could be discussed later for four, five or six days, that is for a determined period, when the majority could vote at last, once and for all on the distinctive national flag issue. I say a distinctive national flag, not two and not the red ensign, because I do not see why Canada, like all the other countries of the commonwealth, would not have her own distinctive national flag in the British commonwealth of nations. Can you find any other country of the commonwealth who needs two flags to indicate its participation in the commonwealth? If we are unable to fly our distinctive national flag, then we are not worthy of a flag, we do not deserve the name of Canadian nation.

We support the idea of a flag being chosen by a vote taken after six days of discussion on the report made to the house by a committee established for that purpose. I ask the ministers to introduce this motion this afternoon if possible or tomorrow at the latest so that we can put an end to this stupid marathon.

Mr. J. A. Habel (Cochrane): Mr. Speaker, I did not really intend to take part in the debate, as I wanted, if possible, to avoid

delaying the enactment of legislation on the national flag. But, 25 years ago this year, under circumstances similar to those we have here today and just a month before the arrival of Their Majesties King George VI and Queen Elizabeth at the Toronto legislature, I had the opportunity, as a French Canadian representative to rise on a motion to present Their Majesties with an address engraved on metal. At that time, after having heard various members who preceded me speak of the importance of making our Canadian children realize the significance of the British empire, and of our attachment to the commonwealth, I could not but remark that I very much deplored the fact that, in our Canadian schools we did not try to teach our children the true history of Canada, but rather the history of the British empire and that the true history of Canada should be based on the achievement of our forefathers, and the work accomplished by our fathers and grandfathers.

I added that one of the most important deficiencies on the occasion of the visit of Their Majesties was due to the fact that they would be welcomed in this country under various flags, as Canada did not have a distinctive national one. I mentioned that in the maritime provinces, the Scottish flag would be flown and in Quebec the tricolour as there was no provincial flag at the time, while the union jack would be hoisted in Ontario and, in the western provinces, probably the red ensign. I, incidentally, deplored the fact that, just the year before the Canadian scouts attending a jamboree in England were the only troops without a flag, some of them having adopted the union jack, while others were flying the red ensign. And, I defy the Conservatives to deny this statement.

I deplored those facts, adding that I was not making a speech on the flag with a view to the immediate adoption of a national flag, but that I wanted to express my views and launch the idea, so that I might, if the Lord does grant me a few more years, see a really distinctive flag being chosen for Canada.

Following that speech in the house, I received hundreds of letters from The Native Sons of Canada, an organization that is probably known to all members of the house. In these letters, coming from everywhere, from Halifax to Vancouver, I was asked to give a series of lectures on a national flag. I gave to all those letters the same answer, that is that I had not raised the question in view of the immediate adoption of a flag, but mainly to give rise to an idea in the public mind so that some day, we could have a really distinctive national flag.

This afternoon, the hon. member for Three Rivers was extraordinarily outspoken, in my opinion. I gather that for a member of parliament who has occupied several positions in his party it must be quite a performance to have to state in the house that he deplores the stand taken by the majority of his party's members. Therefore, I congratulate him for the courage he has shown.

I congratulate also the hon. member for Berthier-Maskinongé-Delanaudière (Mr. Paul) for the speech he made a while ago and more particularly for his remarks on the position of his leader with regard to the flag issue.

Mr. Speaker, I wish with heart and hand the right hon. Leader of the Opposition would study seriously the situation in which he puts his party at the present time.

[*Text*]

Mr. Churchill: Would you congratulate the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan)?

Mr. Habel: In answer to that question I would say that even in the best of families there are black sheep.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Habel: He has a right to his opinion and he is just as stubborn as you are.

[*Translation*]

I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that the right hon. Leader of the Opposition should realize that there is a limit to compromise. If, on the one hand, the Prime Minister has shown some good will in already accepting a compromise, the Leader of the Opposition ought to understand that he too is under some obligation to this country and that he is duty bound to promote national unity.

As the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Balcer) so aptly put it, let us stop referring to national unity while undermining it with fiery speeches.

Let us proceed with a serious examination of the flag issue and allow the elected representatives of the people to vote, so that this question, like the other matters concerning the Canadian people, can be settled by a majority vote in this house.

[*Text*]

Mr. D. R. Gundlock (Lethbridge): A great deal has been said about this flag issue. I am one of those who have said a few words. I could point out to you, Mr. Speaker, as I did

earlier in this debate, that we need only look under our desks to see the amount of literature, the number of words, the number of pages of words spoken on this subject.

As members of the official opposition we have been criticized both here in the house, and, I will admit it frankly, in other places for the attitude we have taken. We have sat in our seats and listened to the debate. We have listened to speeches made in other quarters of the house—speeches made by members opposite, by the leaders of other parties, by the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) and by other members of the government.

Only yesterday we listened to certain arguments put forward by the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette), who is very seldom in his seat. Today as usual he is not in his seat. The hon. member took up a great deal of the time of this house in speaking in particular about absenteeism in reference to this debate. An hon. member who speaks about other members being absent should certainly have something to back up what he says. The hon. member for Villeneuve put this forward in the form of a challenge, and in return I would like to challenge him: If he wants to rise in his place as a member of this house and criticize other members for not being here, certainly he should be present himself at times. I could be a little more personal in this regard, Mr. Speaker, but I realize that members of this house should not adopt that attitude.

The hon. member to whom I have referred yesterday said something to the effect that French Canadians will not swallow this sort of thing. He also mentioned that a person in a particular firm in my constituency of Lethbridge indicated his preference for a certain design of flag. This person also had something to say on whether or not there should be a plebiscite, but I will not go into that matter because I realize the question has yet to be settled.

I would remind the hon. member for Villeneuve that much earlier in this debate, on one of the days when he was not present, I reminded the house that in my constituency there were many more than just 1 per cent in favour of the particular design that is before the house in the resolution put forward by the government. As a matter of fact, I pointed out that according to my information, correspondence I have received, and the newspaper polls, 8 per cent of the people in my constituency were in favour of the particular design the government has brought forth in their resolution. I would repeat, not just 1 per cent but 8 per cent of a great number of people. I also pointed out that there were more people in favour of a design containing a single maple leaf. I even mentioned the percentage, which was 16 per cent. That is twice as many people as are in favour of the design proposed by the government. Mr. Speaker, we have listened to an hon. member of this house emphasizing the absenteeism of members. I would like to repeat, by way of emphasis, that those people who speak about absenteeism should be here more often. As I mentioned earlier, we have also listened to the leaders of and spokesmen for the different parties in this house. They have spoken with complete sincerity with regard to flag designs, and so on. I heard an hon. member the other day—I think it was the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Fisher), who is not in his seat at the moment either—

Mr. Douglas: He is at the thinkers conference.

Mr. Gundlock: Well, wherever and however, he is not in his seat at the moment. If my memory is correct, that hon. member said the Canadian ensign only flew at headquarters level. According to the information I have, the Canadian ensign flew at every victory on the field, as well as at defeats; it was not just flown at headquarters. I could be wrong, Mr. Speaker, but this is the fact according to my information.

Mr. Byrne: Hon. George Hees could not then have been at any battles.

Mr. Gundlock: I hear an hon. member opposite interjecting. I would be glad to resume my seat if he would get on his feet and repeat his interjection.

Mr. Byrne: Mr. Speaker, I simply said that Hon. George Hees could not have been at any battles, because he said he did not see the red ensign during all his years overseas.

Mr. Gundlock: I am very glad that the hon. member has made this interjection, or asked this question, or whatever it is. According to my information, what I have said is correct. If you delve a little more deeply into history, and in particular the history of Hon. George Hees, you will find that although he may not have seen the ensign, it was there. And he does not have to apologize for his actions. I could produce many people, affidavits and letters with regard to the actions of Hon. George Hees overseas. Many, many of them were very happy to have that

kind of man to lead them back when they were pinned down without an officer.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Gundlock: And it was on a voluntary basis. As I have said, Mr. Speaker, if you want to look through history you will find that the ensign was flying at that battle, on the field.

A great deal has been said about the recognition of Canada's flag, whether it is appropriate, whether it is legal, and all sorts of things. In this connection I should like to relate a personal experience. I was walking in front of the west block a week ago, and beside me was an American tourist. We saw the flags of the commonwealth flying in front of that building. The American tourist had no trouble recognizing Canada's flag; he was proud of it and said, "We recognize it readily and easily, and we are proud to have you as a neighbour".

I have spoken previously in this debate but I do not apologize at all for that, Mr. Speaker. I am quite proud to be a member of the Conservative party, the official opposition in this house, that is responsible for this issue being debated at the moment. We have been criticized a great deal in this connection, particularly in the house; nevertheless the attitude and the approach of this party in the debate has been to discuss certain designs and ways and means of bringing about a distinctive Canadian flag. As I said earlier, I am proud to be a member of the party which is really responsible for bringing this debate before the house and to this point today.

I should like to put on record, if I may, some words which were uttered on January 23, 1961, page 1318 of *Hansard*, by the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Horner). Much has been said about this, and indeed said only yesterday by a minister of the crown, a member of the government who, I am sorry to say, is not in his place at the moment. On this occasion the hon. member for Acadia referred to this question:

> Are you in favour of a truly distinctive Canadian flag? That is the first question that should be answered. If the answer is overwhelmingly in the affirmative then the government in power should have the courage to decide on a truly distinctive flag. It could establish a committee such as the one that met in 1945-46, if it wishes. I am convinced that those who expressed themselves in the census as wanting a flag would accept the design on which the government of the day decided.

That brings up another point, Mr. Speaker, although I think the house is already aware of it. Hon. members are realizing, and have done over the last few days, that the flag design proposed by the government was not considered by the government. I am beginning to wonder whether the government had an opportunity even to discuss this particular design. I am beginning to wonder whether the government—and by the government I mean the cabinet—did have such an opportunity. I am also wondering, Mr. Speaker, whether this design was presented to the government, or if you wish the cabinet, in the same way as it might have been presented to the caucus of the government party and in the same way as it was presented to this House of Commons—"This is it; take it or leave it".

Mr. Byrne: It was not, for one thing.

Mr. Winkler: No, it was not presented; that is correct. That is what the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) said.

Mr. Byrne: Well, he does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. Gundlock: I did not say that it was or that it was not. I only said I was beginning to wonder. As I said earlier, I am very proud to speak today as a member of the party which has brought the debate to this point, but all I said was that I was beginning to wonder.

Mr. Byrne: Then stop wondering, because it had been discussed in caucus many times.

Mr. Gundlock: I would be glad to have any information which is available, and I will gladly give up part of my time if the hon. member wants to get up and explain—

Mr. Byrne: You might as well; you are not saying anything.

Mr. Gundlock: —and to put his remarks on record.

Mr. Byrne: They are on record.

Mr. Gundlock: Would the hon. member like to do that?

Mr. Winkler: He is afraid to.

Mr. Byrne: My remarks are on record.

Mr. Gundlock: Well, I hope your remarks are on record. I am not trying to promote any sort of controversy; I am merely saying what is sincerely and honestly in my mind, and I have said that I am wondering about certain matters. Furthermore I am wondering whether there was not a deal between the Prime Minister of Canada and the prime minister of Quebec.

Mr. Moreau: Shame.

Mr. Gundlock: If the hon. member has the information I would be glad to have it. I am

saying that I am beginning to wonder, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Moreau: You are insinuating.

Mr. Gundlock: There is no insinuation whatever. I am beginning to wonder about this, and if anyone wants to put me straight I would be glad to yield the floor and have him put the facts on record.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member for Kootenay East (Mr. Byrne) has just said from his seat that the hon. member is lying. The remarks previously made by the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) are in direct contradiction to what the hon. member for Kootenay East is now saying. The members on this side of the house would very much appreciate it if that hon. member would get up on his feet and put on the record the remarks he has just made from his seat.

Mr. Winkler: Hear, hear.

Mr. Byrne: Mr. Speaker, if I understand the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. MacInnis), he stated that I had inferred that the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Gundlock) was lying. I did not use such a term, and I have never used such a term in the house. When the hon. member was wandering, or wondering—I do not know which was the word he used—whether this matter had been discussed in caucus, I cannot say what happened in cabinet because that is beyond my province but I can certainly tell him that this matter was discussed on several occasions in caucus before presentation.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, I accept the hon. member's explanation that he did not say that the hon. member was lying, but if the hon. member has any contribution to make, I would appreciate it if he would get to his feet before making it, so that it can be understood by members on this side. While I am on my feet I would also ask him to consider whether or not he is now saying that he is calling the hon. member for York-Humber a liar.

Mr. Byrne: Well, that does not trouble me too much. I have made a statement which is a correct statement. If it differs from the views of others then that is a matter for determination.

Mr. Olson: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I believe the actions of the hon. member for Kootenay East (Mr. Byrne) during the last few minutes have been clearly out of order. Citation 143 of Beauchesne states:

> Whilst a member is addressing the house, no one has a right to interrupt him by putting a question to him, or by making or demanding an explanation.

During the last few minutes the hon. member for Kootenay East has been trying to interrupt the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Gundlock) by asking him questions, making explanations, and so on. Under the rules of the house and under the citation to which I have just referred no member has the right to do this except with the express consent of the member who has the floor. The citation goes on:

> A member will, at times, allow such interruptions through a sense of courtesy to another, but it is entirely at the option of the member in possession of the floor to give way or not to an immediate explanation.

The hon. member for Lethbridge did offer to give way to the hon. member for Kootenay East if he wanted to get on his feet and make a speech giving his views on some of the matters the hon. member for Lethbridge was discussing. I noticed very clearly that the member for Kootenay East did not accept that offer, and therefore I think he ought to abide by these rules and allow the hon. member for Lethbridge, who I think has the right to make his own speech, to continue his speech uninterrupted.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. I think there is some merit in the point of order raised by the hon. member for Medicine Hat. One of the rules of this house is that an hon. member who is speaking has the right to make his remarks without interruption. Perhaps I should point out to the hon. member for Lethbridge that some of the interruptions which were made from the opposite side of the house may have been provoked by his insistance, or invitation, that someone should stand up and make a speech, and that he would then yield the floor. If the hon. member did yield the floor I would have some doubt as to whether he would again have leave to continue his speech.

Perhaps that hon. member will now continue.

Mr. Gundlock: Mr. Speaker, I thank you very much and hope that you will appreciate that I am a new member and probably overstep the rules. I should like to congratulate you for your forbearance, and will make a sincere attempt to comply with your ruling. What I said earlier was said sincerely and

with the serious hope that I will be corrected when I need correction.

I should like to read into the record at this time a letter I received only today from an individual who I am sure is not particularly a supporter of mine. This is a very sincere letter written by a Canadian citizen who happens to be one of my constituents. With your permission I shall read this letter into the record and then make some comment in respect of one or two points contained therein. The letter is addressed to me and commences as follows:

Dear Friend and M.P.

I appreciate your letters and information you have mailed at different times. I am willing to give you my opinion on this flag business, which is being very wrongly dealt with by both parties—

I am pleased that this individual did not identify the parties to which he referred, and on that basis perhaps I could excuse my own party, although I will not attempt to do so. The letter then continues:

—and is a disgrace to have spent this whole session the way it been. But I hope this Pearson flag will not be accepted if you have to stay there till next year. The best thing that could be done now is drop the whole flag business till some future and find out if any amount of people... approve...

Then some government that thought more of the country than they did of their policies, could appoint a committee of members from all the parties to choose a new flag. A vote on this flag business will only make more trouble. The side who loses will want to spit on the flag every time they see it. If Pearson forces his three maple leaves on this country he will not get all the blame, you who allow it to happen will get your share of it. A vote on the question will be as bad as—

And the next word is not quite clear. That letter was written by a Canadian citizen in an honest attempt to criticize this house as a whole, and I think it sets out some of the thoughts of many Canadians.

In this house we have all heard a great deal of reference to this flag issue. Only a moment ago a member to my left suggested that Canadians were not doing anything about the situation. As I have said on several previous occasions—one in particular—I think Canadians are doing something about the situation. They are trying very hard to accomplish an understanding throughout this country which will lead to a distinctive Canadian flag. On an earlier occasion I put on record what I thought a distinctive Canadian flag should be. Perhaps I should repeat what I said at that time.

For a variety of worth-while reasons I think we should use the Canadian ensign as a basic design for a new distinctive flag. Perhaps we could replace the union jack, as it appears on the present ensign, with a complete ensign of reduced size. We would then have approximately three quarters of the entire flag on which could appear a three maple leaf design, or a single maple leaf design which could be red, green or any other desirable colour. Perhaps it would be well to place a sheaf of wheat emblem, or a peace pipe emblem, on the fly of the flag, as I suggested earlier. I have repeated this suggestion, Mr. Speaker, for emphasis.

Over a period of days, weeks, months and even years I have thought about the flag, and it is utterly inconceivable to consider completely abandoning the use of what I refer to as our heritage, as exemplified by our present and legal flag—and it is our legal flag in spite of what some people suggest. Those individuals need only refer to certain orders in council, or to certain portions of *Hansard* to realize that fact.

Many flag designs have been proposed, Mr. Speaker. I should like to quote from an editorial in the Toronto *Telegram* of Saturday, August 22 last which I must say, in all fairness and honesty, is not at all complimentary to one party or another. It reads as follows:

The Canadian ensign must not be lowered without the consent of the people.

I realize it may be a little late for this sort of talk, but perhaps not.

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.

This brings me back to what I was saying earlier. Some members opposite took exception when I said I wondered whether the design contained in the resolution in the name of the Prime Minister was really discussed and considered by cabinet and by caucus. With all deference, I really wonder whether this took place. I have innumerable letters here—

Mr. Byrne: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Gundlock: —that point out the fact—

Mr. Byrne: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Cape Breton South made the assertion that I had called the hon. member for Lethbridge a liar because I said that this matter had been discussed in caucus. I have made the statement while standing in my place, that this matter

was discussed in caucus. There is no longer any reason for the hon. member for Lethbridge to say that he wonders whether it was discussed in the Liberal caucus. I have stated that to be the fact and he must accept my word.

Mr. Gundlock: On the question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, probably I should have made myself clearer. Again I have to apologize, because as a new member of the house I sometimes forget certain rules. I should have made it clear earlier that what I was wondering about was whether this matter was discussed by the cabinet and in caucus prior to the House of Commons being presented with the resolution. This is what I was trying to point out but possibly I did not make myself clear. The point I was trying to make was whether members of all parties in the house were confronted with this resolution in the same way as the cabinet and the Liberal caucus were. That is the only point I was trying to make, and I hope the hon. member appreciates that. I neglected to refer to the time. I was reading from an editorial in the Toronto *Telegram* which goes on to state:

> 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.

If I may deviate for a moment, Mr. Speaker, I agree with this kind of thinking. The government did not have a mandate to bring this particular design before parliament. I challenge the members of the government or any private member opposite to point out to me where the government had a clear mandate, let alone even an implied mandate, from the people of Canada to bring in this particular flag design.

I said earlier that I have a multitude of letters. They are not only from supporters of the party to which I belong but in many cases are from supporters of the government party and in some cases from supporters of the parties to the left. I should like to compliment them at this moment, if I may. Members of the other parties in the house as well as members of the official opposition have contributed a great deal to this debate.

Mr. Byrne: That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. Gundlock: Certainly it is a matter of opinion; it is my opinion. I was only trying to be somewhat gracious in saying that members of every party in the house have contributed a great deal to this debate. I said earlier and I repeat by way of emphasis that I am proud to be speaking today as a member of the party that has brought the debate to this point. If it is not possible to pay a slight tribute to other parties in the house on occasion, Mr. Speaker, I will refrain from doing so in the future.

Earlier I took some exception to the remarks of a previous speaker from the party to my far left who said that nothing was being done in the country to try to solve the problem. I said earlier in the house and at great length that I thought something was being done. In particular, I referred to the fact that something was being done in the city of Lethbridge in my constituency. I asked the question whether any other city in Canada was doing the same thing. I also pointed out what the consensus was in my constituency with regard to a flag design. I referred to percentage figures. I should like to repeat what I said earlier in the house. Every two weeks during the past school summer holidays the city of Lethbridge has sent 20 high school students to Montreal and has arranged to have 20 Montreal students brought to the homes of the Lethbridge students. This exchange has been going on every two weeks all summer. My constituents have delegated me to say that they are overwhelmingly in favour of the red ensign. I would also express my opinion on certain designs that might be a compromise, but I want to challenge those who say that nothing is being done. I am particularly proud of the fact that my own city is doing something, and I doubt if there is any other city in Canada doing the same thing. This is the kind of thing that will really resolve this question, and there is more involved in this than just the flag design.

This is a question of people living together, a problem we have had since the early days of confederation. I am very proud of our confederation arrangement. It is something which is unique and something we should guard very jealously. My people in my constituency, if I have to put it that way, are working with your people and, as I have said previously, I hope when we use adjectives denoting racial origin in this house it is only in a geographical sense.

We have our differences, the same as members of any Canadian family have their differences. We have our arguments, but I have no doubt that we can work out our differences. I have always tried to defer to your rulings, Mr. Speaker. Quite frankly on this occasion I

have tried to attract the attention of hon. members opposite, but I have sincerely and honestly brought these points before the house and in the summary of my speech, if it can be called that, I pointed out that I am quite sure we as Canadians will resolve the issue of a distinctive Canadian flag design.

Mr. Macaluso: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Gundlock: Yes.

Mr. Macaluso: During the course of his speech the hon. member said he was wondering whether or not there had been some deal arranged between the Prime Minister and Premier Lesage of Quebec. Has he also been wondering whether a deal was arranged between the Prime Minister and Premier Stanfield of Nova Scotia and the former prime minister of Ontario, Hon. Leslie Frost, who have both said they are in favour of a distinctive flag for Canada?

Mr. Starr: That is too tricky.

Mr. Macaluso: No prompting over there.

Mr. Gundlock: I said I was wondering if there had been a deal between the Prime Minister of Canada and the prime minister of Quebec. I only wonder this because there are some things which are becoming very obvious.

Mr. Lachance: How about the question?

Mr. Macaluso: I asked the hon. member if he had been wondering whether these other two gentlemen ever made a deal with the Prime Minister?

Mr. Gundlock: The simple answer is no, I have not been wondering about that.

Mr. F. J. Bigg (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, I usually try to make my remarks positive, but before I start the main body of my talk I have to make some small criticism of the critics. In this flag debate hon. members, with the exception of those in the Conservative party, whenever they have intervened or interjected have made personal remarks designed to destroy the character of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker). I take exception to this, and I also object to interjections from hon. members opposite. I prefer that they stand and make their speeches.

This character assassination has gone on too long, and if you look behind it you can see the reason for it is very plain. To be old fashioned about it, in other words there are forces of evil at work in the world today. I am old fashioned enough to believe there is right and wrong in the world today and I am ready to take my stand on what I think is right.

We hear complaints on all sides that we do not have leadership in our country today. I am not going to say whether or not we do have, but I am inclined to believe that we do. I think the standard of public service in Canada today is as high as or higher than it has ever been. I for one am not satisfied to run down parliament, or run down the kind of men who come here. It is a dirty bird that dirties its own nest. I think there are in this house men of courage, men of vision and men of leadership. I am sorry if at any time they appear to be bound by party ties, and if this is so I am sure it is equally true on either side of the house, and in the smaller groups in the corner; but I say with all sincerity that there are dedicated men in all corners of the house.

Sometimes they are misled. Sometimes their theories of government and theories of political need are clouded, and I think that some intellectuals of our country are often responsible for this. I have just read a very meaningful essay by Mr. Scott Symons in *Executive* magazine. He is a man who is out of politics; he is in charge of the Canadian exhibition at the Toronto museum, and I commend his article to hon. members. He refers to English Canadians, and at the outset I would like to say I do not like using hyphenated words, but there are English Canadians the same as there are French Canadians. One would have hoped that over a period of 97 years we would have learned better, that we would have become simply Canadians, and as an English speaking Canadian and as one of Anglo-Saxon origin I bemoan this.

The other day I asked for co-operation and consent for our side of the picture. I begged that we do not take a revered symbol from our war memorials. Is this a rabid thing to ask on behalf of the widows and mothers of those who died voluntarily to keep our country free, those who died in the second world war which many of us have already forgotten? But when one refers to this some of our egghead gossips say, "You are trotting out the flag, trying to make yourself a war hero." Mr. Speaker, I was not a war hero. I was an observer most of the time. I spent five and a half years overseas away from my family, and most of the time I was not fighting. I was one of those Milton spoke about when he said, "They also

serve who only stand and wait." I waited, but I was there. I also had a spot of fighting in Belgium, Holland and Germany.

I want to talk about what happened in 1940. There is something to be learned from history. In case I bore you—

An hon. Member: You do.

Mr. Bigg: —let me say there is something to be learned from history. I am not going back to the middle ages, but to 1940. What happened in 1940? Western civilization was scared to death. The Germans had 350 divisions of well armed and well trained men. What were they addicted to?—a narrow nationalism. I hope nobody in this house is devoted to narrow nationalism, either English speaking or French. All right. In 1940 we had a pitiful little army sitting at one end of the Maginot line. The Maginot line was full of people who did not believe in France, and so France fell. Around the right end of that wall, which was only half a wall, came the panzer divisions. And what happened? The pitifully small English speaking army had to run for it. And there they were on the beaches of Dunkirk. What happened then? Yes, I am speaking about the unity of Canada, and if the hon. member does not understand that I am speaking about the unity of Canada I advise him to listen for the next 35 minutes because he may learn some small thing. I believe in the unity of Canada and volunteered, myself, to help preserve that unity; and I would do it again. I am talking about the subamendment, don't you worry. All right; I am talking about leadership, which means unity. Without leadership you have no unity. They had leadership in England in those days. They had a man, King George VI. He was not only a king; he was a real man. He was not afraid to put his Christian faith above everything else. What did he do? He called a national day of prayer; and on May 26, 1940, 365,000 men without arms or anything with which to fight back were gathered on the beaches of Dunkirk. King George put his Christian faith ahead of his royalty and begged the people of England to get down on their knees and pray. And they did; and so did I.

An hon. Member: Were you scared?

Mr. Bigg: Yes, I was scared. But I was not so scared that I was not over there. Where was the hon. member who made that interruption from his seat?

An hon. Member: I was there.

Mr. Bigg: Then you do not have to ask me that question; you were scared, too. I was there. We prayed; and five days later 330,000 fighting men were safe home in England.

This I call a miracle—the miracle of Dunkirk. It came about because we had leadership in England in those days and we had faith in the three Christian crosses which are embodied in our Christian flag. And when France fell, because she did not have faith in herself, where did de Gaulle go? He went to seek the protection of the British flag. Four years later he was able to mass the forces of the free world and return to help deliver France and the rest of Europe from the terror of the nazi regime. Do not call the men who went there fools and cowards. Scared, we may have been, but not cowards—

Mr. Francis: No one has done that.

Mr. Bigg: I am telling you right now. You say you are as willing to meet me as I am to meet you. Would you like to look at *Hansard*. It is in *Hansard*. When I begged you to leave these symbols of our faith on our war memorials to the boys who cannot fight for themselves, what did you say? Only one replied, I admit. Is there anybody else who agrees with him? "We shall rub you off". Is this the way to answer an appeal for unity? "We shall rub you off"—would the gentleman like to get up and explain what he meant? I know who he is, and so do you, Mr. Speaker. The writers of *Hansard* had the decency to leave his name off the record and I will have the decency to leave his name off, now—"We shall rub you off". There is only one way to deal with that kind of talk. But is this not a chamber in which to discuss a subject of this kind like gentlemen? Would the hon. member like to stand on his feet and make his observations now? I am willing to yield the floor.

Mr. Francis: I have listened to a fair amount of this debate and I should like to know when any hon. member suggested that the men who fought and died had, somehow, done something cowardly. I do not think anybody said that.

Mr. Bigg: If you were attending as you should have been, you heard those inferences. You heard the fact that the Conservative party was charged with trying to make its members out as war heroes. If you did not hear that, you were not here. It is in *Hansard*; you must have read it if you have done your homework. I do mine.

Mr. Francis: Would the hon. member give the citation from *Hansard* to which he refers?

Mr. Bigg: I do not have it at hand. I have been waiting for over six weeks—

An hon. Member: What about the sub-amendment?

Mr. Bigg: I am talking now about unity in Canada, and we must have it, yet there can be no unity as long as one party is pitted against the other on an issue like this. I am asking for a proper hearing and I am complaining that when I get up to make my contribution I am told I will be rubbed off. Do members of this house think for a moment that this man is capable of rubbing me off physically? He takes the protection of this house. We are not supposed to be school boys. I am not supposed to ask him out behind the shed. Thirty years ago I might have been that foolish, but we get nowhere by fighting. I am asking for unity and leadership. I have told a little story about King George VI. Would members opposite deny that this was a proper type of leadership, or that we did not have something to cling to and fight for? Are all symbols useless? If symbols mean nothing, why are we so anxious to change them? Why must we give up our Christian crosses? The hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam, (Mr. Douglas) a minister of the Christian gospel, said yesterday—

Mr. Scott: What page?

Mr. Bigg: Read it. He said the cross of St. George was nothing more or less than a banner for rapine, murder and piracy. That is what he said as reported at page 7737.

An hon. Member: He did not say that.

Mr. Bigg: I will read it from *Hansard*. It is at page 7737:

> St. George's cross was first used in the crusade when the kings, barons and knights of Christendom perpetrated murder, rapine and plunder in the name of Christianity—

Mr. Scott: What is inaccurate about that?

Mr. Bigg: Is this really a fair summary of the use of the cross of St. George? Would one say that any country had an unblemished record in history? No. I suppose there have been British ships which fired on people without proper warning. There was the Boston tea party. There have been many crimes perpetrated throughout history. But is it fair to take one or two crimes out of history and say: This is a summary of British history? I was about to tell you, if you would keep your mouths shut for a few minutes and listen, that there are pages in Britain's history which are noble—that there are times when under these Christian crosses Britain lived up to its responsibilities, and lived up to them alone.

There are admirers of the great United States of America, and I am one of them. But it took them a long time to hear the bugle. In the days when England fought alone, she fought under the flag I am speaking of. All I am saying is this: Is it fair to downgrade it?

I have said before, and I say again, that I am willing to accept and will accept any flag design decided upon by a fair vote in the House of Commons, if we can get together on this issue. I beg the government to do this. I beg hon. members on that side of the house to stand up and say those symbols which we have should be torn down, if that is what they believe. You are safe over there; you can threaten to rub me out, with the protection of the house behind you.

Mr. Tardif: It isn't that important.

Mr. Bigg: Then why did you say it?

Mr. Tardif: You said it.

Mr. Bigg: Hon. members opposite know who said it. But who cares, Mr. Speaker? I am not going to name them because this is beneath contempt. But I beg them not to use that kind of talk. They ask for co-operation and unity. Is it not unity we are trying to achieve? Is it not leadership? Are they not seized with the responsibility of showing leadership in their party and in their constituencies?

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, is Sir Wilfrid Laurier a reasonable reference? I think so. The Liberals were a great party in those days, and Sir Wilfrid Laurier was a statesman; he believed in the unity of Canada and he believed in that unity under the British flag. Isn't that so?

Mr. Tardif: Where did he say that?

Mr. Bigg: In *Hansard* for 1905 at page 1423, Sir Wilfrid Laurier said haste is no virtue and he begged us to approach all problems connected with Canada, her future and unity, with kindness, forbearance, love and brotherhood. He said nothing about rubbing people out. He said, "Let us get together". This was in 1905 when he was talking about bringing into the union the new provinces being created in the Northwest Territories. They did well in 1905; they created two new provinces in the Northwest Territories. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan and Alberta know nothing of this division or this talk of two races fighting each other. They know where they are, but in those

provinces we have a good many other races as well; and we get along just fine because we practise what we preach.

The criticism that has come principally from the far corner of the house has been that they are the only reasonable people, the only ones who understand the problem. I warn the Liberal party to watch them. They are more clever than you think. They pretend to co-operate with you, but what do they hope to do? They hope to take over everybody in Canada who has been brainwashed with these different forms of socialism. They think the Liberals are the ones who are softened up for this sort of thing. They are getting the help of many so-called intellectuals. They have brainwashed our people. The fact that they are sincere makes no difference; the fact that they are pitifully sincere makes no difference whatsoever, because they are getting into the warp and woof of our thinking, until now it is almost sacrilege to say that socialism is not the only hope. Whom do we get this from? We get it particularly from parsons without a pulpit. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the Christian religion is the highest form of ideology that we have; it is even higher than politics. This is a standard we might all remember. That is why I mentioned King George VI. This was his standard, because he thought that to serve God was to rule, and when he did not serve God he was not fit for the throne. As far as I know, he was; and as far as I know, his daughter is.

I say to those who wish to make a republic of Canada that they would do well to remember this. Do we not need an arbitrator, a referee, in this game of politics? Do we not need an umpire in this baseball game? The Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) ought to know that, because he is a baseball man. You need an umpire. Freedom wears a crown. I say to the members of the Liberal party, if you do not know anything about history, and particularly Canadian history, why not sit in this chamber and listen to the flag debate?

The fourth estate have largely abandoned their stand in this connection. They are fond of calling us Pharisees here in the pit. We also get it sometimes from some members, the defunct parsons. They are good at this sort of thing. The fourth estate include themselves, I suppose, when they say we are a bunch of hypocrites. The press love it; there is nothing they like better than talking about $18,000 a year hypocrites. But this is not true. We may have Pharisees among us, and in the press gallery there may be the odd scribe, in the biblical sense. There may be those who are willing to blacken white and whiten black. Let them preach to themselves. Let them write the truth up there in the press gallery.

We had a speech from the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan). To me it sounded like the bare truth. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, it went unchallenged. Was it beneath their contempt to challenge it? I think not. I admire the man who stands up and tells others the truth as he understands it. I say to hon. members opposite, have some party unity; stand behind your man and say, "This is where we stand, too". I know many of you would like to say that but you have not the courage to stand up and say, "We were not consulted". I am looking for leadership, because leadership brings unity. Without leadership we will not have unity. There are those in this house who say we have no leadership. What do you suppose they want, Mr. Speaker? They want nothing more than naked power. One of them would like to be Speaker; he wishes he had taken the job. One of them would like to be prime minister. Perhaps two or three would like to be prime minister. They say they would like to be prime minister and have the responsibility of uniting this country.

Our Prime Minister gave great hopes of this. Many of us who were here when he was chosen leader of the party had hopes of this leadership. We thought he might be another Sir Wilfrid Laurier and might take the reins and make clearcut, manly decisions and explain them to us in this house as though we were equals. The prime minister is supposed to be the first amongst equals, but that has all been changed since 1925. The Prime Minister of Canada has the sole power to dissolve parliament and appoint cabinet ministers. He has taken, in the name of a previous leader of that party, Mr. King, the supreme power in this case.

Some people tell us that what we want is good, strong leadership. This is so, Mr. Speaker; but we need good, strong leadership from a man with a conscience, a man who has courage. I want the Prime Minister to share with us this superior knowledge that he has. I represent 65,000 Canadian people, and it is my right to have questions answered in the house. I do not have my questions answered. They say to me back home, "What is the matter? Why can't you get your questions answered. What is the price of wheat going to be? What is going to be done about hog support prices?" But to this government these

are things that do not count. They say we are only farmers. Now they will not even call us farmers, because the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Hays) is ready to call us grocery producers, manufacturers of vitamin pills. The attitude is, "We can ignore them; they are not farmers any more". We need the kind of leadership given by Sir Wilfrid Laurier. He was a great Canadian. He built Canada solidly and soundly. This is the kind of leadership we need from the prime minister of our country, whether he is a Liberal, Conservative, or whether, heaven forbid, he is a socialist, labour leader or whatever they are called. We want a prime minister who will discuss these policies with the rest of us in this house.

When I hear the hon. member for York-Humber say he was not consulted, I believe him. It has never been denied and I believe him. I believe him with all my heart. Here was a one-man truth squad. He had the courage to stand up and say: "Let the rest say what they like but I am going to tell the truth. I will put my political reputation on the line and stand the risk of being called a liar. But I am not a liar; I have told the truth". As I say, I believe him. It is this sort of man whom I would be proud to serve. One might even be tempted to join the Liberal party if there were 100 others like him. I would be proud to let him sit next to me any time, because he tells the truth, which is 90 per cent of being a good member in this house. If people cannot trust your word, then as far as I am concerned it is no use your coming here. A lie is a lie no matter how it is told. But if you tell a lie, whether it be a careless lie or any other kind of lie, at least have the moral decency to admit it. Have the courage to say that you must be wrong, or that you forgot, or that you were not in charge of the facts, and then start again. I believe in reform.

I should like to see the Liberal party as it was in the days of Laurier, when that party gave the country the leadership it needed. I do not like to see the Liberal party relying on the shaky support of the socialists, because the whole socialist philosophy is based on a false premise. They pretend that man needs no spiritual leadership. They believe that man in his own native state is some lovely co-operative creature. But I ask hon. members, what has been their experience of this in life? Is that true, or does a man need training and standards? Does he not need to stick to the rules which his father and mother taught him, to read history and to learn that the path to destruction is the path of hatred and non-co-operation? That is the cause of all misery in the world, of all hunger and of all war. Our unemployed parsons get up and talk about the love of man. But how about honouring thy father and thy mother? How about honouring the standards of our parents?

I do not say to the French speaking people of this country that they should abandon everything they believe in. I say, stand up and be proud of them, and I will be proud of you. I am proud of the great French tradition which we have. I am proud of those who fought with us to hold off the Americans and to keep this country a free country of our own. I am proud of those men who went to western Canada in their canoes and who carved out a new country. I am proud of those who set up the two new provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta and who told the people there to try and get along together. I remember the positive things which were done, and I say we should forget this empty, petty fighting. If I am doing any empty, petty fighting I ask hon. members to challenge me by standing on their feet. They do not have to do this today; take *Hansard* tomorrow and read it. If they can find one word in *Hansard* which can be regarded as intolerance, if there is anything but gratitude for the great co-operation of the province of Quebec, tell me. I should know whether or not French Canadians are good people, because the Van Doos were in our division and I would say that they are the finest troops in the world. And in case hon. members think I am narrow about this matter, let me say that I am proud of our Governor General, Canada's greatest living soldier. I am sincerely interested in their happiness, believe me, and I hope that some day they will have the courage to stand on their feet and offer me the same co-operation and show the same respect for the traditions of my people; the same respect for my small contribution to our country's safety and present welfare. I repeat once more, whenever I speak one word against la belle province, throw it down my throat.

At the present time, Mr. Speaker, I am making a pitiful attempt to learn the French language, and I will continue to do so. I do this not as a sop to Quebec but because I admire the French language. Some of the greatest poetry and philosophy has been written in that language. I favour anything which will keep French Canadians in our country. I also favour a democratic method of getting unity, which is this: Do not hold a gun to our heads. Offer us a chance to meet you on equal ground. Let us talk it

over. Let us have a parley. There is a story of the great northwest which might help to break some of the ice here. The Idaho Kid came up to Saskatchewan. He crossed over the border and Sergeant Kelly of the mounted police was sitting in a hotel. The Idaho Kid walked up to Sergeant Kelly and said: "Are you Sergeant Kelly?". Sergeant Kelly said yes. So the Idaho Kid said: "I have always wanted to shoot a mounted policeman". Then Kelly said: "Take that .45 out of my face or I'll bite the end off it", and he stood up and arrested him.

I say you will never get anywhere if you hold any kind of gun at the head of a Canadian, whether be he French Canadian, English Canadian, Ukrainian Canadian or just a straight Canadian, which I hope we all are. Do not try to bully him, because he does not bully easily. Treat him like a gentleman. Bring him into the picture. This is the place we are supposed to discuss things and make suggestions—not give ultimatums. No ultimatum ever put on the floor of this house will be received by this party. At this point I will quote Churchill, who said never, never, never give up your principles; if you are right, stick to them. If you believe in parleys instead of the "or else" approach, if you believe in co-operation and collaboration, not force, stick to your belief. He did, and if he had not, I do not know where we would be today. That is leadership. That is the kind of leadership we want.

The Germans believed in force, although I sincerely hope that today they have changed their minds. During the last war they sent out their battleship *Deutschland* on the north Atlantic, and that vessel came upon a little convoy of merchant ships. The *Deutschland* thought it was going to have a field day. But there was a captain on board a British merchant ship who thought otherwise. He turned out of the convoy and steered straight at the *Deutschland*, and the *Deutschland* spent all her time firing on this boat so that the others were able to get away. This captain did not like the "or else" ultimatum. Then there was the battle of the river Plate. The battleship *Graf Spee* was discovered there by three little boats; and what happened? With co-operation, skill, guts and bravery these three little boats made her scuttle herself; she could not take it. These are events which I cannot help but admire. I am sorry, but I am not ready to throw up my traditions. I think such events as this are admired by the whole world, certainly by the free world.

I ask these hon. members for co-operation, and I say this: To have unity in Canada they must not be led down the garden path by the people who want to seize their power. The New Democratic party know they cannot beat us, but they know they can beat them because they do not know where they are going.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Bigg: We know where we are going, and we are going to go there. We are going ahead toward a bigger and better united Canada, and we appeal to you people to come with us, instead of fooling around with these ideas of socialism and communism fed into you through the back door.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Bigg: Look out. I appreciate the groans, because they do not think there is any danger in this at all.

An hon. Member: What about the C.C.F.?

Mr. Bigg: The C.C.F. lacked the courage to make up their minds. But their leader has his mind made up and he will take the support which would normally come to the Liberal party, being that party of the little people. Do you remember the little people, Mr. Speaker? If you are looking after the little people I suggest you consider the wages being paid to some of the people working on this hill, and rectify that situation.

Perhaps you should give some consideration to the situation in which our native people find themselves. How far have they progressed during these 97 years of progress? What do you intend to do to help them? We gave them the right to vote in an attempt to give them self-confidence, and the self-confidence of these people must be attained before they can become good citizens. You are now attempting to take away their flag. What confidence will they have in politicians, or do you think they look at all for spiritual leadership from the British crown? I may be wrong, and you can certainly find out by talking with these people, but my understanding is that they want this treaty with the Queen to last for as long as the sun shines and the waters run. I do not think they will approve of politicians who attempt to change that treaty. What are you going to do after you remove that which is the Queen's flag in the eyes of these people?

Can you honestly suggest that you desire to retain our overseas associations; and if you do not, why are you not honest and say so? If you desire to form a republican party

I am sure some citizens in Canada will support you. If you agree with that idea you should have the courage to stand up for it. We are now experiencing an evolutionary state and indicating our belief in the advancement of political science. Where do you honestly stand in this regard?

I stand behind British tradition under the British crown. Everyone is aware that the British crown has no physical force, that it is a rubber stamp for our government; but there is a principle of fair play and justice involved. Governments quail before these standards if they are well informed, and I suggest that we take a serious look at our problems. We should seriously consider our present symbols of tradition.

I am sure some members at least on this side of the house honour the fatherland of their parents in the same way I expect hon. members opposite honour their parents' fatherland. I have never pretended that there are not basically two origins of Canadian people, and I respect both.

Perhaps if we could turn back the pages of time and start again, a completely new flag would be acceptable. I can envisage one suggestion that might be acceptable if we could go back in time. Perhaps the union jack quartered with the lily banner of France, following the lines of heraldry, would be acceptable as representing racial origin. I do not think we can go back in time and forget tradition. Certainly there is no indication of that in the tenor of this debate to date.

When members on this side of the house speak on this flag issue they do not receive the kind of encouragement I would expect from individuals who are attempting to take part in the debate in a spirit of conciliation. I agree with the principle of equal rights, but one question in this regard has never been answered: Why must we desert that which we believe in; why should there be a one-way deal?

I do not see anything in those traditions I revere which is divisive. I would be the first individual in this house to suggest that Canada is a great sovereign nation, because we are in fact a sovereign nation. The Queen does nothing more than place a legal stamp of approval on that which we wish to do. Whatever we propose she accepts. What more can we ask? We certainly need a referee to rule in respect of problems between our two originating peoples, who have not yet reached a mutual understanding in the way that Laurier envisaged. Sir Wilfrid Laurier admitted, as I think we must, that there are troubles and difficulties between our peoples. If we continue to pretend, as do our socialist friends, that we are loving brothers together, I do not think we will find a way out of our difficulty. The socialists believe that all we have to do to settle the difficulties is dissolve the two old parties. They think everyone would then be happy. I am surprised that the members on the other side of the house are not aware of that fact. Time and time again members of the small parties to my left have castigated our leaders.

I hope you will forgive me for not knowing all the well known quotations of Woodsworth, but he said in the 1930's that the Liberals say terrible things about the Conservatives, the Conservatives say terrible things about the Liberals, and we socialists agree with both sides, that neither of them is any good. Lo and behold, some of the intellectualists in this country have taken up that hue and cry. That cry has been taken up as well by certain members of the press and has become Canada's national amusement, second only to Beatlemania. We criticize your leader in exactly the same terms you use to criticize our leader. I suggest as a warning that we are playing into the hands of those little groups down to my left in the corner who wish to seize power.

Our parliamentary system was set up on the premise that we are all gentlemen and would attempt to settle our disagreements by consultation and negotiation. I suggest that when we rise in our places to curse each other we are playing into the hands of those small groups. If we play the parliamentary game properly, and I use that term in its proper sense, we would have little difficulty solving our problems.

I think there should be a general reformation so that some members of this house have liberal feelings, while others approach things conservatively. The Liberals now suggest that we make haste hastily, while the historic approach of the Conservative party has been, let us make haste slowly. Sir Wilfrid Laurier said, let us be careful, because haste in itself is not good. I should like to know why there is a need for haste today in respect of this flag issue. Why must we settle the issue now in view of our past 97 years of existence without a distinctive flag? We have used the British crown as a symbol of tradition. I am not suggesting that it is universally popular or acceptable. Very few people refer to the British crown tradition as a basis of argument. Certainly that argument is not possible

when we use it, and I imagine less popular when you use it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. I must advise the hon. gentleman that his time has expired.

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, in taking part today in this debate I should like to make reference to certain statements made in recent days, and call attention particularly to the remarks of the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Fisher), as they appear at page 7643 of *Hansard*. That hon. member indicated his sincere belief that the government had made some concessions in respect of a free vote. He has apparently been taken in. I did not realize he was the gullible type. The Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) has hoodwinked him by suggesting there would be a free vote and that there would not be an election as a result of the outcome of that vote.

Mr. Speaker, I should like also to refer to the acceptance of the free vote suggestion by the leader of the New Democratic party. His remarks are recorded at page 7739 of *Hansard*. That hon. gentleman said:

> I readily acknowledge to the Prime Minister that the government has made the major concessions, and almost the only concessions that have been made on this issue. The government has agreed to a free vote, so that an election is not hanging on the outcome.

Those two gentlemen are men of considerable experience in this house, and I should have thought they would be able to interpret the offer made by the Prime Minister with greater acumen. I ask them to qualify their belief in respect of that offer after considering the attitude taken by members on both sides of this house. In support of my feeling in this regard I refer to the whip of the Liberal party, who has concerned himself greatly with pairs. He is concerned about the absence from the house possibly for very good reasons, of members of his own party, and has put forth great efforts to cover them with pairs from this side of the house, whether from the Conservative party or some other group in the house. If the leader of the New Democratic party and the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Fisher) really believe that such a thing as a free vote will take place on this matter, why then does the Liberal whip concern himself with pairs? It is very obvious that in a vote considered to be free the necessity for pairs goes out the window. So the idea of a free vote promoted by the Prime Minister has been denied by his own party whip in seeking pairs, and I would hope that the leader of the N.D.P. and the hon. member for Port Arthur would be able to see the situation before us now more clearly.

As found on page 7739 of *Hansard*, the leader of the New Democratic party made something else quite clear in his speech. My interpretation of his remarks indicates to me, and I am quite sure would indicate to all members of the house upon examination, that the members of that party, since he is speaking for them as their leader, are obviously against the new flag that has been presented to the house. As I understand the situation, they have prepared an amendment embodying a flag that they think will unite Canada. However, I should like to read into the record one very worthwhile contribution that the leader of that party made to the debate yesterday in order to substantiate my argument at this time. As found on the page to which I have referred, he said:

> I think we have to begin by remembering that dealing with a flag issue is not the same as dealing with a legislative matter. If this was a matter of some important legislative significance, there are parliamentary means of bringing the matter to a decision. In respect of this question, even if we could force a decision it would be a Pyrrhic decision. A flag adopted by Canada should represent the consensus and should be launched with the general support of the vast majority of the Canadian people. It should be an instrument for forging unity rather than creating division, and no flag will accomplish that if it is conceived in controversy and born in bitterness.

I heartily endorse this statement of the leader of the New Democratic party and I call the attention of the house to the fact that any further pushing on the part of the government to try to put their flag across is a definite contradiction of these remarks which were referred to yesterday by the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Dupuis) as a very good contribution to the debate. The minister can check his own words. He said he was in full support of what the leader of the New Democratic party had said. Therefore he must be in full support of the idea that for the government to push this matter any further is ridiculous because bitterness is certainly evident and has been evident in the last few days.

I should also like to refer to remarks made by the Prime Minister following the vote yesterday. As found on page 7736 of *Hansard*, he said:

> Mr. Speaker, I can understand the right hon. gentleman's feeling of frustration, when only 44 members of his party were here; but I am at a loss to understand his irritation at being delayed from attending what he himself used to refer to

ironically as an egghead conference. As a result, Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to give a ruling whether there is any question of privilege whatever involved in the point the right hon. gentleman has raised.

My objection to these remarks of the Prime Minister is that they are unfair, uncalled for and false. The Prime Minister said that only 44 members of this party were here, and again I come back to the Liberal whip's efforts to find pairs for members of his party. I would also point out that having only 85 members of his party here or, to use the words of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp), 85 members of the group he is leading, does not constitute an attendance record about which he should brag. The Prime Minister's words were uncalled for, unfair and false. There were more than 44 Conservative members here. A considerable number of Conservatives did not vote for the simple reason that they were covering members of the Liberal party who were absent. This is an arrangement made among members. I personally had made such an arrangement. At no time did I rise and announce I was paired with such and such a member because I consider this to be a useless waste of the time of the house. If I am going to co-operate with a member I will pair with him. This is a matter between the two of us and something which we will look after ourselves. The Prime Minister's reference that there were only 44 members of this party present was not in accordance with the facts. I might also say that while I have recognized a pair during the votes that have taken place in the last week or so I have made it quite clear to the member with whom I have had this arrangement that when the house does have the opportunity to vote on the flag resolution itself I have no intention of doing anything other than to vote against it.

I should also like to refer to some other remarks made during the debate and with your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, I might also refer to certain rulings that have been made. On page 7540 of *Hansard* we find this remark by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill):

No one can say I did not listen intently, or with courtesy and politeness, to the right hon. gentleman when he was speaking, as did my hon. friends, and I think I might be permitted to say what I have to say without these noisy interruptions.

He went on to give the house a dressing down because he considered he was being interrupted. I might also say that when I attempted to ask a question that evening the Chair ruled that fair play should be involved in the carrying on of the debate. I took it from that remark that any attempt by me to ask a question of the member speaking at the time was being very unfair. I refer again to the fact that the Speaker himself said that no one had interrupted the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) and I call attention again to these words of the Minister of Transport:

No one can say I did not listen intently, or with courtesy and politeness—

In that regard I would refer to the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition where you will find that he was interrupted on 40 occasions, 9 of the interruptions being by the Minister of Transport. I am sorry he is not in his place. He maintains he is the most courteous gentleman in the house but he has the rudest manner of any member of the house. He maintained that he listened with courtesy when the fact is that if hon. members will check the speech of the Leader of the Opposition they will find that that very minister interrupted nine times.

I would also refer to page 7539 of *Hansard* where certain remarks made by the Minister of Transport are found, which I maintained at that time were in direct contradiction of the contribution made by the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan). Before the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss LaMarsh) leaves the house I should like to thank her for the kind invitation she extended to me a few moments ago. I know this is not in keeping with the tenor of my other remarks but I do wish to express my appreciation to her for the invitation.

To get back to the remarks made by the Minister of Transport, which I say were in direct contradiction to those made by the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan), I might point out that he maintained the Prime Minister made statements on "The Nation's Business" in respect to a distinctive Canadian flag, and I might also point out that in the second last full paragraph on page 7539 he said this:

When the present Prime Minister said this in 1960, it was accepted, and that position was accepted by the Liberal party, and it was the position we took at the election of 1962. It was in our literature.

Herein lies a direct contradiction, and it is very interesting to point out that each time there seems to be a difference of opinion on the Conservative side of the house the Liberals, in their ability to put across lies and propaganda, will point the finger and say, "Ah, ah, division; another follower leaving your leader." I would call to your attention the remark made by the hon. member for

Cochrane (Mr. Habel) this afternoon, when there was a difference of opinion expressed by him with respect to the hon. member for York-Humber. Did he refer to him as a deserter of the party policy, or as deserting the ranks? No. In his opinion he was a black sheep. This is how the Liberal party refers to somebody who does not fall in line with the dictates of their leader.

Mr. Habel: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is right when he says I referred to a black sheep. What I said was that in a group there was always a black sheep, but I added that it was the hon. member's privilege to stand by his convictions. That is what I said, and I do not want the hon. member to change my words.

Mr. Cowan: On a question of privilege, I would like to ask the hon. member for Cochrane if he is aware this is a free vote?

Mr. Habel: A free vote, in my opinion, is one where the hon. member has a right to vote in the same way as hon. members opposite will have the right to vote.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cameron (High Park)): The hon. member for Cochrane has explained his position, and I think the hon. member for Cape Breton South should now proceed with the rest of his remarks.

Mr. Nasserden: Mr. Speaker, I would like your ruling on whether or not the term black sheep is parliamentary?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cameron (High Park)): For the benefit of the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Nasserden) I personally do not consider it an unparliamentary term, and I so rule.

Mr. MacInnis: I did not quite catch your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cameron (High Park)): I said I did not consider the reference to a black sheep was an unparliamentary term.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, I am in full agreement with that; I was taking no exception to the use of the phrase. I might also say that if the hon. member for Cochrane had a question of privilege, we all realize each and every one of us are here as individuals and we will vote according to our conscience, provided our party dictates will permit; and I point out that very recently with respect to the legislation put forward providing for the trustees I saw fit to go my own way. I am sure all members willingly would do the same, and if such were the case the outcome of a vote on the flag, provided it were a free vote, would be anything other than what the Liberal party is planning today.

Mr. Habel: On another question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I do not think the hon. member has a right to question our consciences. We will certainly vote according to our consciences.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, I never—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cameron (High Park)): Order. I was under the impression we were debating an amendment dealing with how the results of a plebiscite, if it were held, should be divulged. It seems to me the hon. member for Cape Breton South is straying a fairly considerable distance from that particular subject. I think the hon. member for Cochrane has a point and that there should be no reflection or imputation as to how hon. members express their opinions in regard to the matter before the house. I am speaking to the hon. member for Cape Breton South in a kindly spirit. I hope he will take it that way and will refrain from making remarks which I feel are entirely uncalled for.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, I accept your ruling. I at no time tried to question the conscience of the hon. member for Cochrane. I would only remind him that possibly he should question his own. The ruling in reference to the subamendment is quite accurate. However, I would remind each and every member of the house that if I am going to be curtailed to speak on the subamendment only, I would suggest to the house that possibly starting with the speech made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp), and winding up as late as last evening with the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Dupuis)—

Mr. Dupuis: I talked about the referendum all the time.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, on this matter I would ask the Minister without Portfolio to examine his speech and he will find it was practically all made up of quotations referring to the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Horner).

Mr. Dupuis: About the referendum.

Mr. MacInnis: He was quoting continually from speeches made in 1960 or 1961, prior to the flag resolution, or whatever year he chose to look up. Before the hon. member for Cochrane imagined he had a question of privilege I was pointing out that there were

several contradictions made here in the house. We have heard a good, detailed explanation by the hon. member for York-Humber as to what was the stand of the Liberal party prior to the last election in reference to a distinctive Canadian flag. This was detailed and backed up by illustrations from pamphlets which he had. I might also say here that the rulings coming from the Chair seem to be awkward to understand in that the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) came into the house and he had with him a brochure dealing with different flags, and the ruling was that he was not allowed to have any such thing in the house. But the Minister without Portfolio on occasion has had what he called an authentic example of the three maple leaves on one stem, and of course he has had his bumper stickers to display. At no time did the Chair rule that the hon. member should not have these in on display, while at the same time ruling that the hon. member for Edmonton West should not have with him a pamphlet showing different flags of different nationalities.

When the hon. member for York-Humber was putting forward his argument he did it with detail and with pamphlets to support his argument. Then the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) took exception. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious someone is lying. Of course it is for us to decide, for each and every one of us to decide who was lying. All I can say is that when I am confronted with the written evidence by one member, the hon. member for York-Humber, I therefore have to accept his side of the story. The Minister of Transport was not telling the truth when he said this was carried in their campaign literature. At least he did not in any way support his argument, as did the hon. member for York-Humber. So we can understand from the arguments put forward that the Minister of Transport, representing Bonavista-Twillingate, was entirely wrong in the —if I may use the term—accusation which was pointed towards the hon. member for York-Humber, which was done also this afternoon by the hon. member from Scarborough, and I might also say the yapper from Kootenay East who is no longer in his seat, who very seldom makes a contribution from his feet. He is probably now somewhere about the city saying what he said in the House of Commons, but he never gets on his feet and makes a contribution. He likes to sit there interjecting day after day after day, and when he is on his feet he is only reading something passed to him from the minister's office in order to bring certain information before the house.

As I said, the hon. member for York-Humber substantiated every argument he put forward, and at no time to my knowledge did the Liberal party put before the people of Canada anything in the way of a definite decision to bring forward a distinctive Canadian flag.

Speaking of distinctive Canadian flags, the Minister without Portfolio is here. I would very much like to find out how he can qualify a statement he made last night, and how another hon. member, I think from York North, can qualify a statement he made some time ago in this debate, and how other members of the Liberal party can substantiate their arguments in respect to a distinctive Canadian flag. Should the Minister without Portfolio be wondering just what he did say last night, I call his attention to page 7762 of *Hansard* where he will find these words recorded in the second column:

> Mr. Hales: What about the second flag?
>
> Mr. Dupuis: You should begin by settling the first problem. You are so mixed up with the first —we will speak about the second later.

Mr. Dupuis: That is right.

Mr. MacInnis: The Minister without Portfolio and the hon. member for Cochrane say: "That is right". Fine. They are proposing a distinctive Canadian flag, they say. But a distinctive Canadian flag can be distinctive only as one flag; it cannot be distinctive as two. The minister is prepared to get up and talk about a second flag, and the hon. member for Cochrane says "That is right".

Mr. Dupuis: Does the hon. member wish me to answer?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cameron (High Park)): Is the hon. member yielding the floor to the Minister without Portfolio?

Mr. MacInnis: It is apparent that I am not. I am still on my feet.

Mr. Dupuis: If the hon. member does not want to have an answer he should not ask questions.

Mr. MacInnis: I did not ask a question. I might possibly be prepared to yield the floor to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Hays). He seems to have something to say, though he says very little about agriculture. If he has something to say about the flag I would consider yielding to him for a few moments. It would only take a few moments

for him to get his views across, if he does not know any more about the flag than he does about agriculture.

Members opposite talk about a distinctive flag. But how can anybody qualify that idea by talking about a second flag? I am sorry to see the hon. member for Burin-Burgeo (Mr. Carter) about to leave, because I had a question I wished to put to him. With regard to the opening remarks made on this subject by the hon. member for York North (Mr. Addison)—I do not have the words before me, but they can be checked and if anyone wishes to raise a question of privilege he can do so—I should like to repeat much the same comment. The hon. member said when he spoke on this subject, in his introductory remarks: "The first flag I intend to speak about—". Then there is a second flag. What is distinctive about proposing that there should be two flags?

How did this situation come about? Again I am sorry the Minister of Transport is not here. It is well known that the premier of Newfoundland insisted that the union jack should be included and that it should be written into the bill. Well, there was some cloak and dagger work going on in the background, and I repeat that I think the Minister of Transport had a direct hand in preparing this legislation. I think it took him about two weeks to do it, but finally he came up with the idea that there should be a two flag resolution. Again I ask the question: What can be distinctive about something which is put forward in two parts? Nothing can be distinctive as long as it is brought before the house in a two-part resolution. The second part, in my opinion, is a dubious method of trying to put it across to the premier of Newfoundland that his wishes are being met. They are not being met and the premier stands a good chance of being the victim of a complete double cross down the line.

I hope the hon. member whom I see resuming his seat is not doing so with the intention of telling the house that he hopes to support the maple leaf flag as being one distinctive flag.

Mr. Cashin: I should like to remind the hon. member that I have already spoken on this subject, so he might refer to *Hansard* if he wishes to know my views.

Mr. MacInnis: If the hon. member is so keen on putting forward the idea of a three maple leaf flag I suggest he should not overlook the opportunity of speaking a second time. It will take him a lot more speeches before he can convince Mr. Smallwood in Newfoundland that he is getting what he asked for. He did not get the union jack written into the legislation as he wanted, but the Minister of Transport, with some help from other quarters, put forward this dubious method of a two part resolution as a means of satisfying him.

I should like to hear from the members representing the maritime provinces. I should like to hear the members from Halifax, Antigonish and Yarmouth stand in their places and give unqualified support to this three maple leaf design. What the Halifax members have done so far is to offer only qualified support, after they had been given prior information with respect to what the resolution would contain. Then they made statements which were, in effect, statements of qualified support for the resolution favouring the three maple leaf flag. Let them speak. After all, they have been invited by their own leader to do so. The Prime Minister wants every member to make a contribution. I ask them now to get up and express unqualified support for this three maple leaf flag. How many of them intend to do so. The hon. member for Cochrane spoke about examining one's conscience. Let them examine their consciences and see whether they can give the Prime Minister's maple leaf design the unqualified support he is trying to infer he has received. The hon. member for York-Humber made it clear that there was division in the Liberal party. I, too, made it clear when I challenged members of the government to get up and say that they, too, gave the Prime Minister's design their unqualified support. The flag proposed by the Prime Minister does not have the unqualified support of his backbenchers. It does not even have the unqualified support of his cabinet ministers.

Mr. Dupuis: Does the hon. member want me to answer him? He was asking me to stand up and answer him. If he wants an answer, let me give it.

Mr. MacInnis: I would very much like—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Cameron (High Park)): The hon. member for Cape Breton South has challenged a number of members of the house to get up and make statements and I think he should probably be prepared to permit them to do so, having made that challenge.

Mr. MacInnis: I hope to be permitted to finish the remarks I was making with respect to this question. I said I challenged any

cabinet minister to get up in the house and make a statement of unqualified approval for the proposed new flag. And when we come to the minister whose views were made known directly to me, I will confront him with his remarks and back my statements with witnesses who were present when he made his views known about his feelings with regard to the three maple leaf flag.

Mr. Dupuis: Name him.

Mr. MacInnis: I do not have to name him. He is perfectly capable of coming into the house and speaking for himself. Let this cabinet minister explain his position to the Prime Minister and to the house. To use the dignified expression of the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Tardif), let him have the intestinal fortitude to stand up and tell the house and the Prime Minister what he told me in the presence of witnesses, namely that he does not understand the choice of the three maple leaf design and that he is also—

Mr. Dupuis: Name him.

Mr. MacInnis: Why should I?

Mr. Dupuis: Because we should like to know whom you are talking about.

Mr. MacInnis: The Minister without Portfolio wishes to find out who in his party or in his cabinet does not favour the three maple leaf flag. I suggest he should keep his ears open. It has been made quite evident to me and other members of this party that many members on the other side of the house have found themselves in a very embarrassing position, because they freely admit that correspondence they have received from their constituents proves to them without a doubt that the three maple leaf flag does not have the support of their constituents; and with regard to those members to whom I am referring, in most cases their constituents are standing firm on behalf of the red ensign. Why are not these members coming forward and making themselves heard? Why should not the members of the Liberal party stand up, at the invitation of the Prime Minister, and make quite clear to the people of this country and the members of this house just why they support the three maple leaf flag?

Mr. Habel: Then let us have a vote.

Mr. MacInnis: Will the hon. member for Cochrane stop his yapping? I have had experience with the hon. member previously, right up in his own constituency. My experience was in sitting down as a guest in his constituency, with a vacant chair that was left for him, and he did not show up. I have been in his riding, Mr. Speaker, and I might say that the reception I got was one the hon. member should have been there to get for himself.

Mr. Habel: They did not elect a new member, though.

Mr. MacInnis: Why should not these members stand up and give their reasons for supporting the three maple leaf flag? They have been invited by the Prime Minister to do so. Why should they not rise and give his design their unqualified support? I should like to hear from the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Hellyer). I should like to hear from the Prime Minister himself. I wonder why these hon. gentlemen permit their speeches to go out in a brochure that is spread across this country and foreign countries, because in those speeches the red ensign is designated as a distinctive Canadian flag. Speeches appear in this brochure by the Prime Minister, the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Martin) and the Minister of National Defence. Part of that brochure contains a card displaying the red ensign as a distinctive Canadian flag. Am I to understand that the Minister of National Defence, the Secretary of State for External Affairs and the Prime Minister are going to withdraw their speeches from that particular brochure?

The Minister without Portfolio wants people named; he wants this, he wants that. He spent 50 minutes speaking on this subject last night. I agree that there were many interjections and interruptions, but that is usual here.

Mr. Dupuis: There were 11 interruptions from you.

Mr. MacInnis: Seven?

Mr. Dupuis: Eleven.

Mr. MacInnis: Then I did very well. In view of what the Minister without Portfolio was saying, he deserved 70 interruptions, not seven.

Mr. Dupuis: Eleven.

Mr. MacInnis: I might say, Mr. Speaker, that if the Minister without Portfolio does not stop embarrassing his own government he might not be a minister, even one without portfolio. He spoke on this subject last night for 50 minutes. I agree with him that there were many interruptions. I believe that my interruptions mainly consisted of points of order, and on one occasion I referred to a

ruling the Chair made and I was quickly corrected. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, one of the points of order I wanted to raise was this. I was reminded last night by the Chair that the rules do cover this question, and nobody is allowed to refer to votes. But the surprising thing is that when the ruling was put into effect last night it only followed by a few hours the Prime Minister's reference to a vote that had taken place. Nobody saw fit to rise and point out to the Prime Minister that he was breaking the rules. However, the minute somebody on this side of the house did this, it was immediately said it was against the rules. Many rules have been broken on the other side of the house. I say to the Minister without Portfolio that although he spoke for 50 minutes on this subject last night, not one word did he say in support of the three maple leaf flag, the flag of his Prime Minister. It is true that he accepted the Prime Minister's invitation to speak on this matter, but he did not put forward anything in support of the three maple leaf flag—not one word. As was mentioned in the house last night, the chief huckster of the Liberal party in this particular matter has not had one word to say in support of this flag. Having had 50 minutes in which to promote his own little enterprise, I am surprised that he did not see fit to deal with this question. Possibly there was no profit motive to move him.

An hon. Member: You are talking about the sticker-licker.

Mr. MacInnis: That is exactly right. He sells bumper stickers, as I understand it. There was no profit motive—

Mr. Dupuis: There should be one on your mouth.

Mr. MacInnis: As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, the Minister without Portfolio is selling bumper stickers at a price—

Mr. Dupuis: Do you want one for your mouth?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. MacInnis: Will you speak a little louder, Mr. Speaker, the minister cannot hear you. It is very odd, Mr. Speaker, that when there are interjections from this side of the house, the Chair is quite anxious to rise immediately at times and call us to order, as happened in the case of the Minister of Transport. I see that minister has arrived in the chamber, that man who tries to promote himself as the most polite and gracious member of the house. That is what he claims. He says, "I listened without interrupting". He says he is very gracious, and so on; but since he is here I would remind him that the last time he rose in the house and tried to promote himself as the Emily Post of parliament—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. MacInnis: —if he would look back just a few pages of *Hansard* prior to making that statement he would find out how mannerly he is. He is most rude. What he said in his own defence can be contradicted if one refers to *Hansard* a few pages earlier, where it will be seen that he interrupted the Leader of the Opposition on nine occasions, although he claimed he did not interrupt him at all.

I now return to the subject of the Minister without Portfolio. There was no profit motive involved, so during those 50 minutes he did not say a word in defence of the three maple leaf flag. Yet he sells bumper stickers, I understand, at a higher price than one would pay elsewhere. Therefore the profit motive moves the Minister without Portfolio. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that this profit motive might easily rule him out of the position he now enjoys as Minister without Portfolio.

Mr. Speaker, may I call it six o'clock?

Mr. Dupuis: You said nothing intelligent in your speech.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Starr: Mr. Speaker, assuming that we go on with this debate tomorrow, may I ask the house leader what he intends to call for Friday in the way of estimates?

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, with the assumption alluded to by the hon. member, on Friday we would begin by a discussion of the estimates of the Department of National Health and Welfare, after which we would deal with the estimates of the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys. Then if there is time left we will discuss the estimates of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, September 10, 1964

The house met at 2 p.m.

CANADIAN FLAG

AGREEMENT OF PARTY LEADERS RESPECTING COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the house may be interested if I make a brief report on a meeting which was held in my office this morning of the leaders of four parties. There was one party leader missing, the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette), and he had indicated previously that he would not be at the meeting this morning.

Mr. Speaker, we met this morning, I think I can say for us all, very conscious of our responsibilities and very anxious to reach agreement on a way out of what I think I can call a parliamentary impasse on the flag debate, an agreement which could be conducive to a decision being reached without long delay on this matter, and with a maximum of agreement. To adapt the analogy of the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam, at the very friendly meeting this morning there were no bulls and no toreadors. There were not even any picadors.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pearson: Like all the best witticisms, Mr. Speaker, that one was entirely unintended.

At the meeting we discussed, as I said, a way out of our difficulty. As the house knows, agreement in principle was reached some time ago about the reference of this question to a committee; the difficulty was in reaching agreement on how the committee would operate and what would happen when its report was submitted to the house. These difficulties, Mr. Speaker, were cleared off this morning when we agreed on the following procedure.

The current flag debate should be suspended and the matter referred to a committee by a resolution which in agreed terms should be put on the order paper as soon as possible. The house leader would be willing, indeed anxious, to consult house leaders of the other parties later this afternoon on the terms of a resolution of this kind, and if agreement could be reached on those terms this afternoon and if the house were willing to give unanimous agreement later in the day, then that resolution could be disposed of by unanimous agreement with a minimum of delay and the committee could be set up and put to work at once.

The committee, as we agreed this morning, will consist of 15 members; 7 Liberals, 5 Conservatives, 1 New Democrat, 1 Social Crediter and 1 Creditiste. It was agreed that the committee would report back to the house in the normal way within six weeks.

The committee will meet—and I should emphasize this—after there has already been an exhaustive consideration of all sides of the question in the house. Perhaps it should also be pointed out that this consideration was given by the house during the time when normally there would have been a parliamentary recess. While the committee would, of course, determine its own procedure, we felt—and I think I can speak for the other leaders on this point—that there would be a better chance of reaching an agreed solution, and that is our objective, if those meetings or at least most of them could be confidential. I think that would be conducive to the most constructive kind of consideration and discussion.

When the committee's report was ready there would be another meeting of the party leaders to determine the length of time that should be devoted in the house to a discussion of that report. If the report were unanimous or virtually unanimous, as I sincerely hope it will be, then there would be no problem because the subsequent debate would, I am sure, be a very short one. If there were a strong division of opinion in the committee and a substantial and strongly held minority view, then of course there would be a problem.

So far as the government are concerned, and having regard to the long debate we have already had, we maintain both the view that a reasonable time limit would then be essential and also the hope that it could be obtained by agreement. However, Mr. Speaker, a decision on this matter is to be

deferred and perhaps, as I have said, the work of the committee will make that decision not a difficult one.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, the proposed committee will be successful in its work. It begins that work, I know, with the good will of all members on all sides of the house. We have had our strong differences of opinion on this flag issue. They have been sincerely held and vigorously expressed, and this is not the first time in Canadian history that differences have been strongly held and vigorously expressed over a considerable period of time. While we may have these differences, and while we may express these differences very strongly, I know, Mr. Speaker, we have no differences in our devotion and loyalty to a strong and united Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pearson: If we are honest in our differences, as I believe we are, we have only one thought in the discussion of these differences; the unity of our country, pride in its progress and faith in its destiny.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister spoke well and effectively when he stated that strong differences of opinion make for the expression of strong opinions in parliament; and strong opinions in parliament, held conscientiously and honestly, should always receive the attention of this chamber and always will.

The Prime Minister mentioned that this is not the first time there have been lengthy debates. I think of the debates of 1910 and 1911, and again in 1912, when for weeks and months on end parliament debated. Indeed, Right Hon. Arthur Meighen received from Sir Wilfrid Laurier the highest tribute that could come from one great parliamentarian to another. Sir Wilfrid on more than one occasion spoke for Liberalism and what it stood for. He held that men should express themselves forcefully and at length. Indeed, he pointed out that the opposition in 1885, in 1896, and again in 1910, 1911 and 1912, on each and every occasion had stood firm for what it believed represented the opinion of many Canadians, and ultimately brought about in the crucible of discussion either an alternative being offered by the government, or on two occasions, election campaigns which entirely supported the opposition and the stand that it took for a long period of time.

We are not here to decide, and I hope we never will have to decide, the question on a national flag for Canada in a grand assize of the people. We took our stand. The Prime Minister has set out the agreement arrived at today. I was one who from the beginning felt—I say this in no partisan sense, having before me at all times, as has the Prime Minister, the need of preserving, maintaining and conserving unity in the country—that this was a matter that might well have come before a committee as was the case in 1945 and 1946.

I think the first hon. member to suggest a committee was the hon. member for London, on July 2. On July 22 in the course of a television appearance on "The Nation's Business" I asked the question why there should not be a committee. At that time I suggested a committee of both houses of parliament such as had been set up by Mr. King, so that in calmness and with no political bias a recommendation for a flag could be made.

The hon. member for Qu'Appelle dealt with this matter at length, and I personally brought before the leaders on the 18th day of August, the suggestion of a committee. I am not going to burden the house with my notes in that regard, but on August 20 I made the suggestion of 15 members, representative of the various parties in accordance with the formula placed before the house by the Prime Minister.

But as the Prime Minister has stated, the meetings among the party leaders did not bring a solution to this problem, in that some felt that whatever recommendation was reached by such a committee should be accepted by the house with a mere token debate or, one might say, with a merely formal and controlled discussion. Our view has been consistent that such a committee should be set up. I would hope that what the Prime Minister has said will be achieved, namely that the committee will produce a recommendation for a flag on the basis of a virtually unanimous decision. After all, flags cannot be imposed.

While fighting strongly throughout for what I believe to be right, in the interests of our country my foremost consideration at all times has been to conciliate, and in what we have achieved here there has been a measure of agreement that I am sure will cause members of the house as a whole to

congratulate themselves on belonging to a chamber that could bring about so complete an agreement.

I was one who believed that the committee would have to meet for some three months of discussion, because this is not something that can be brought about simply by putting a slug in a slot machine and turning out a flag or, in other words, giving a direction to a committee and achieving an instant flag.

I want to make myself perfectly clear, that so far as the Conservative members are concerned they are going into that committee entirely free to come to that conclusion which in their individual opinion is for the benefit of Canada, our first consideration. I do not like in camera meetings in general. However, in this case I am in agreement. If we have an open meeting no one can change his opinion without receiving honourable mention both in the press and over the radio. In other words, whatever position is taken by a member at the first meeting or the first time he speaks becomes a question of history and the record will speak, while you can sit down and exchange opinions, moved by patriotic purpose. I am sure that sitting together for six weeks an agreement should be reached.

Now, I want to say this. While no limitation will be placed on the committee in advance, we in this party are unchanged in our view that unless 80 per cent to 90 per cent of the committee are in agreement we could not, consistent with our consciences and our responsibilities as members, agree to accept a recommendation from the committee without full and untrammelled debate in this house. The Prime Minister said that after the committee has made its recommendation the leaders will endeavour to determine the length of time to be allotted to the debate following that recommendation. I put in this proviso, and I make this very clear, not for the purpose of holding this up in any way. Our view is that the report of a committee of parliament which does not represent virtual unanimity cannot be accepted by the opposition as the appropriate occasion to bring about a diminution, reduction or curtailment of debate.

Now, sir, the Prime Minister has stated that there was a large amount of agreement. There has been very little between us for some time except on the question of what should take place after the committee reported. We were able to resolve that and agree in principle. Mention was made of the fact that a resolution will be placed on the order paper. I have not consulted with my party in this regard, although I did consult fully in respect of the questions that were discussed at the leaders' meeting this morning, but I think I speak for them when I say that after the resolution has been prepared—and it is not a difficult resolution to prepare—I see no reason why we would not immediately give our consent to the order to set up the committee without waiting for the period set out in the rules, so the committee might be appointed at an early date.

The next question concerns what the committee might do. I feel there are many Canadians, organized groups and interested people, who would like to make representations, and I would hope that the committee, in order to operate effectively, might permit, within a set time, any organization or individual to put forward its or his views. In addition, the committee might consider whatever designs may have a general appeal as an alternative to the one presented by the government. Indeed, I think this committee, though of course it would be for the committee itself to decide, might well build on the committee reports of 1945 and 1946. There is a tremendous volume of material to be found in the records of that committee. The Secretary of State for External Affairs was a member of that committee as was the hon. member for Kootenay West, and they would be able to corroborate what I say, namely that that committee did a great amount of ground work and research which would be available to the committee we are now about to set up if there is general agreement in the house.

Personally I am very pleased at the giant step forward we have made today. I say to the Prime Minister that I was glad to hear his words when he said that a parliament in which arguments are advanced at length should not be subject to the condemnation which, too frequently and without a reading of history, has been heaped on this parliament in recent weeks.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Parliament represents the voice of the people. No one is obstructing parliament who is speaking for a large number of Canadians who would otherwise be voiceless. No political party, however strong it is, can carry on a fight unless what it stands for is straightforward, honest and touches the heartstrings of the people. We have carried on that fight. Now we have come together on a suggestion which we on this side advanced long since. We have had

our disagreements on this matter, and they were strongly felt. Now I hope all of us will close ranks and, in that committee, do honour to parliament, do honour to the members composing it, and show those who criticize us that parliament knows what its responsibilities are and that it epitomizes the finest in parliamentary government, and always will.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, there will be general relief in Canada that some working agreement has been reached by the party leaders at the meeting held in the Prime Minister's office this morning. I agree with the Prime Minister that there were no bulls present. This was a steering committee.

Some hon. Members: Oh.

Mr. Douglas: Six weeks of almost continuous debate has an enervating effect upon even the most vigorous male members of the bovine species.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the house will give general approval to the compromise arrangement which has been worked out and which has been placed before us by the Prime Minister. I hope it will not be spoiled by anyone trying to take credit for it, because this proposal came from many members in different parts of the house at different times, and that it will not be damaged by accusations that any party has made a retreat. I have never felt that stubbornness was a civic virtue. In any public issue a measure of compromise is necessary. Some have to make more concessions than others, and I think the greater the concession the greater the credit to those who are willing to make those concessions. Therefore I make a special appeal to the press of this country that there shall be no suggestion that any party has caved in or that anyone has beaten a retreat. Rather let it be said that all the political parties in this house have sought to find a solution in a most difficult situation, and that instead of demonstrating timidity a measure of statesmanship has been shown in reaching this agreement.

I hope the house realizes, as I am sure it does, that we are not out of the woods yet. We are in the position of a man who has signed a note for his debts, a note which will become due in six weeks' time. At that time we shall still have to face the problem which is now before us. I hope the committee will be able to find an answer. We are placing a great responsibility upon its members, because if after debating this matter off and on for some two and a half months we have not found a solution, it is evident that the committee has a formidable task ahead of it. Yet I feel confident that if they approach this task in a spirit of co-operation and with a flexibility of mind and attitude, they will find a solution. If they cannot we will still face the problem we face now. I am one of those who has suggested all along that there ought to be a limit on the debate if there is not virtually a unanimous decision, but I do not think there is any value in arguing about that at the present time, as such arguments may be totally unnecessary if the committee produces a virtually unanimous decision.

I think all of us would want to wish the committee and those appointed to it every success in their endeavours, and to assure them that when they bring back their report they will have our grateful thanks for the work they have done. I trust that the committee and the House of Commons will be able to give Canada something no other parliament has been able to give it, a national flag approved by the parliament of Canada; and I trust when that flag has been approved it will fly over a country where the people are united and strong and have a sense of national pride and national purpose.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that not only the members of this house but the people of Canada will be grateful for the decision that was reached at the leaders' meeting this morning and which has now been announced to us. I am sure likewise that this assignment that we are giving to a committee yet to be appointed is a most grave and important responsibility so far as our nation and this parliament are concerned.

I would like to thank the Prime Minister for his concise, non-partisan, honourable statement regarding that which we had agreed upon earlier today. I think it is that spirit which he evidenced in his remarks that assures us this committee is going to be able to meet its responsibility and bring forth, not a compromise—I do not think that is really the word that should be used—but an answer to the problem which we are concerned with and which the nation expects us to solve.

Certainly we have proved today, as it has been proved many times in the history of our

country, that our politicians, our men responsible for government, have been able to agree in a responsible way on a responsible decision for the good of the country. It is well that we should remind ourselves that no emblem, no flag whatever it is, will in itself establish the meaning and loyalties which a flag should carry to a nation and its people. It is only as those things which people themselves represent and stand for are known and respected, not only to their friends but to themselves, that the emblems and flag of a nation can be held in the regard and esteem that they should be. In other words it is not a flag that makes a nation; it is a nation that makes a flag, and this likewise applies to parliament. It is actions, not words, that truly prove what a nation is, and likewise this is true of its people.

We have placed a great responsibility on this committee, not only to decide what the future flag of Canada should be but also to redeem some of the public's respect that this institution has lost during the last few weeks of this debate. I do not think at this point it is necessary to remark further upon the decisions or underline our interpretations of what those decisions mean. Suffice it to say that we in this party will co-operate in every way possible to make the work of the committee constructive and responsible. We look forward with optimism to substantial agreement in the committee, and this in such a way that when its report comes back to parliament it will require only a minimum of debate. In that way we will prove that parliament can act and fulfil its responsibilities as those who elected its members expect it to act.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, it is with real pleasure that I heard the Prime Minister announce, awhile ago, that at last they had been able to agree on certain points this morning. It may be that my absence was beneficial to that meeting but my reason was already known since I stated, following the last meeting of the five party leaders, that I would no longer attend such meetings. It is not that we wanted to block the adoption of a flag; far from it. The stand taken by the Ralliement Creditiste is very well known to the Prime Minister, to the Leader of the Opposition and to the other party leaders. Our position is that we will not oppose the adoption of a distinctive national flag. That is our stand.

Mr. Speaker, day before yesterday my colleague from Mégantic (Mr. Langlois) suggested, in his speech, the setting-up of a 15 member committee, exactly what was proposed, a moment ago, by the leader of the official opposition.

We also asked that this committee consider the question for 60 days. This morning there was agreement on six weeks. It is even better.

This committee will be made up of seven Liberals, five Conservatives, one member of the New Democratic party, one Social Credit member and one member of the Ralliement Creditiste. I trust that each member of this parliamentary committee that we are going to establish will have at heart not the past, but the future of Canada. Consequently I would suggest that all parties avoid appointing old fogies to the committee. Let us choose young men, people who have their whole lives before them and who can contribute to the building of our country in the years to come. Thus it would be possible to get the unanimity that the Leader of the Opposition insists upon; considering all that has been said here during the past six weeks, it is obvious that there are still old-fashioned people in Canada. Unfortunately, there are people who turn their eyes to the past instead of looking toward the future.

That is why I would suggest that as many young people as possible be appointed to the committee: young Liberals, young Conservatives, a young New Democrat, a young Social Crediter and a young member of the Ralliement Creditiste. As far as our party is concerned, there is no problem; it is entirely made up of young people, and that is why we can confidently think of Canada's future.

The Leader of the Opposition said that parliament represented the voice of the people. That is precisely what we have been trying to make clear to the whole house for several weeks: parliament represents the voice of the people.

That is why when the Prime Minister decided on a free vote we stated that a free majority vote would necessarily represent the majority opinion of the Canadian people right here in parliament. Why has a free vote not been accepted? In order to prevent the majority from thrusting its opinion on the minority, but we are told, nevertheless, that parliament represents the voice of the people. Then a retreat is sounded and it is suggested once again in parliament that a committee be established. We are told: We shall see in

six weeks; another meeting of party leaders will be held to decide whether the debate will be restricted or not. Then, we might find ourselves at our starting point, but I hope not.

That is why I express, once again, the wish that this committee be made up of young members who look to Canada's future, not in terms of a province or a feeling, but of a sovereign country, able to decide by itself what it must do in order to develop and to fulfil itself.

An hon. Member: That is when you are at your best.

Mr. Caouette: I understand that my hon. friend can say that I am at my best, and it is true.

Mr. Speaker, we hope that this very important issue of the national flag will be solved as soon as possible. I think that we will thus show the people as a whole that we are thinking of them and not only of quarrelling as we have been doing for several weeks in this house.

Mr. Speaker, the Ralliement Creditiste will not object to the choice of a distinctive national flag. We will support the report of the committee which will recommend a distinctive national flag, because as Canadians we want to be recognized throughout the world as Canadians with our own symbols.

[*Text*]

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I should like to table certain correspondence, but before doing so perhaps I might be permitted to state that the house leader will get in touch with the house leaders of the other parties with a view to holding a meeting this afternoon to work on the resolution. I think I should point out at once, however, that with regard to the suggestion made by the hon. member for Villeneuve, out of deference to my elderly colleagues our representative will have no authority to discuss an age limit or a time limit.

DOMINION-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

TABLING OF LETTERS TO PROVINCES RESPECTING CONTRACTING-OUT ARRANGEMENTS

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I should like to table copies of letters which I wrote to the heads of the governments of the provinces on August 15, 1964 on the subject of contracting-out arrangements for conditional grants and shared cost programs. The letters submit to the provinces for their consideration proposals which emerged as a result of discussions which took place in Ottawa in June of this year pursuant to a decision of the federal-provincial conference held in Quebec city last spring.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, would it not be a good idea to have those letters made an appendix to today's *Hansard*?

Mr. Pearson: I have no objection at all to that, Mr. Speaker. These letters would have been tabled earlier but I was hoping that in tabling them I would be able to table the replies as well. However, I have not received all the replies, so I think only the letters themselves should be tabled. They could be made an appendix to *Hansard*.

Mr. Speaker: Does the house agree?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Editor's note: For text of letters referred to above see Appendix.*]

PRIVILEGE

MR. SCOTT—PRESENCE IN HOUSE DURING VOTE ON FLAG DEBATE

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether I could ask the indulgence of the house on a point of personal privilege. In a story in last night's Toronto *Star* headed "Nine Toronto M.P.'s miss flag vote" I am listed among the group of Toronto M.P.'s who were absent on Tuesday night for the vote on the motion to adjourn the flag debate. I have in my hand *Hansard* for Tuesday, September 8 and on page 7736 the record shows that I was present and voted in favour of adjourning the debate.

I am quite prepared to accept responsibility in my constituency for any votes for which I am absent, but I do object to being reported absent when I am in fact in attendance in the chamber. I am satisfied that this was an inadvertent mistake by the reporter. At the same time such mistakes are damaging; and although retractions can never catch up to the original statement, I trust the newspaper in question will take some action to correct the error and the impression it conveyed to its many readers in Danforth riding.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

CIRCULATION OF "HATE" LITERATURE AGAINST JEWS

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 Minister of Justice having to do with some letters I sent him which contained hate literature which is being sent out rather widely to people of the Jewish faith. The letter contains the threat of what would happen to Jewish people and altogether is a most scurrilous form of attempted blackmail.

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I must say that this matter which has been raised by the right hon. gentleman was also raised with me this morning by other members of the house, all of whom I am sure were greatly concerned. I undertake to look into this literature and material which has been referred to me, and I shall give an answer to the house as early as possible.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this question of hate literature and the action to be taken under the Criminal Code has been under consideration by the government for months, would the minister consider setting up a special committee of the house to look into the whole problem, to hear the law officers of the crown, and to ascertain whether action has been taken in other parts of the world without interference with freedom, to the end that the house might favour the recommendation of amendments to the Criminal Code making punishable this kind of activity which apparently is flourishing quite widely? If my information is correct, under the law as it now stands the law officers believe there is no way in which prosecution can be successfully launched against such activity.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, this is a suggestion which I should make it my duty to consider further and to discuss fully with my colleagues.

PUBLIC SERVICE

VANCOUVER—SALARIES OF CUSTOMS OFFICIALS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the President of the Privy Council. May I ask him whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that under the new group B salary increases in the Department of National Revenue, customs appraisers grade 1, collectors grade 2, customs, excise, excise tax officers grade 1, individuals who require some ten or 15 years' training, a recent analysis has shown that in the city of Vancouver these salaries are exactly the same as those paid by the city to its garbage collectors and ditch diggers. I should like to ask the minister whether the treasury board is prepared to make some comparison of these salary ranges with those of other people doing comparable work outside the government, and then review these salaries in light of that investigation.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, this matter has not been drawn to my attention before. I will look into all the points raised by the hon. member in his statement.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): I have a supplementary question. Has the minister not received a communication from A. T. Greig, president of the Vancouver branch of the customs and excise officers' association, in this connection; and does he agree with the suggestion therein that as a result of what has been pointed out about low levels of salaries for those in such exalted positions as customs appraiser 1, collector 2, customs, excise, excise tax officer 1, the morale of the civil service has hit a new low and will deteriorate further unless action is taken?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I do not believe I have received such a letter. However, I will have the records checked to see whether one has been received.

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): I have a supplementary question. Will the minister at the same time check into the matter of the increase in salaries for House of Commons staff, and will he also assure us that when these increases are granted they will be commensurate with the increased work that the staff is doing?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, this question was dealt with in an answer I gave some days ago, and if the hon. member will refer to that answer he will find an answer to his question.

UNITED NATIONS

FINANCIAL DIFFICULTIES RESPECTING PEACE KEEPING OPERATIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the statement of the secretary general of the United Nations, Mr. U Thant, that the financial crisis as far as the peace keeping forces

of the UN are concerned, is rapidly coming to a critical point, and as this relates also to the peace keeping forces in Cyprus, can the minister give us some information in respect of the first question about the over-all picture, and more specifically about what is happening in relation to the Cyprus peace keeping force?

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I indicated yesterday that the secretary general is to make a report to the security council with his proposals for the United Nations peace force in Cyprus within the course of the next few days. Until that report is made I am not in a position to comment as to future intentions.

With regard to the financial situation, I fully concur in the statement made by the secretary general yesterday, speaking to the 21 member working group set up to deal with the financing of the United Nations. Canada is a member of that committee, and the government has instructed its spokesmen on that committee to take every step they can to bring about a solution. The government believes that article 19 of the charter is automatic, and that the failure of a country to extricate itself from the application of that article means that it would lose its vote at the general assembly.

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. Last Thursday I asked the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, whether any other nations other than the United Kingdom had undertaken to provide any part of the $2 million that the secretary general has indicated is the minimum requirement to maintain the peace keeping force in Cyprus. I wonder whether the Secretary of State for External Affairs can tell us now if any other nation has undertaken to provide some of this $2 million.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): There has been no formal announcement, but I believe one other nation is prepared to put up a portion. I am not at liberty at this moment to give the name of the country.

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

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

[Mr. Thompson.]

In view of the fact that the Liberal government of the province of Quebec has just borrowed $100 million from the Social Credit government of British Columbia, would the Prime Minister seriously consider borrowing from Social Credit British Columbia, in order to finance the federal budget deficit?

[*Text*]

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I had not thought of it up to this moment, Mr. Speaker.

FISHERIES

LIMIT ON DAILY KILL OF POTHEAD WHALES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. P. V. Noble (Grey North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address this question to the Minister of Fisheries. Has the minister given any consideration to introducing legislation which would limit the daily kill of pothead whales?

Hon. H. J. Robichaud (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, this matter has received the attention of my department. However, no consideration has been given at this time to introducing legislation which would limit the daily kill of pothead whales.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

MEETING BETWEEN PRIME MINISTER AND U.S. PRESIDENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Prime Minister. Has the Prime Minister accepted an invitation from the President of the United States to take part in a joint celebration of the ratification of the Columbia river treaty at Blaine, Washington, in the near future?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker, an announcement was made on this matter yesterday evening in Washington and in Ottawa.

Mr. Herridge: Is the answer yes?

Mr. Pearson: Yes.

Mr. Herridge: Is the answer yes? I did not hear the Prime Minister very clearly.

Mr. Pearson: Oui.

Mr. Herridge: Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a supplementary question. Does the Prime Minister think it appropriate to attend this joint celebration in view of the fact that this can

be considered an indirect participation by the Prime Minister in the United States election, and in view of the fact that a large number of Canadians do not consider the ratification of this treaty as an occasion for celebration?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I do indeed consider ratification of this treaty as an occasion for celebration; and as the two governments concerned are those of the United States and Canada I think it highly appropriate that the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of the government of Canada should celebrate it jointly.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria): I have a question for the right hon. Prime Minister which arises from the forthcoming meeting with President Johnson of the United States. May I ask the Prime Minister if it is correct that he is going to offer the services of Mr. Keith Davey to the President for the period of the next two months?

Mr. Pearson: I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, we cannot spare him.

MALAYSIA—INQUIRY AS TO COMMONWEALTH ASSISTANCE

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs a question with regard to assistance to Malaysia. His answer yesterday lacked his customary clarity and lucidity, and he cast some doubt on an article appearing in the *Globe and Mail*, normally a reliable paper. Would the minister answer the third part of my question yesterday? What aid is being given to Malaysia by other commonwealth countries? Inadvertently he omitted to answer that question.

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I agree with my hon. friend that the *Globe and Mail* observes excellent standards of journalism and accuracy in its reporting. I thought I had answered my hon. friend's last question. Perhaps he will allow me to look at it to make sure.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

CONSIDERATION OF PENSION AND LABOUR LEGISLATION—POSSIBLE RECESS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister, and I direct it to him rather than having to rise two or three times to ask questions of some of the ministers around him. In view of the fact that parliament will now be able to deal with other business, will some of that other business be put on the order paper right away; and I refer specifically to the latest version of the Canada pension plan and to the proposed national labour code?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker. There is a good deal of business, and important business, already on the order paper. Now that it seems probable that we will be proceeding very shortly to other items of business I think it would be desirable for me to make a statement in relation to the order of such business in the few weeks ahead, and I will be glad to do that within a day or so.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the Prime Minister is yet in a position to advise what his suggestion will be to the house; whether he intends to go ahead with the urgent business that has been referred to as such or, on the other hand, does he intend to suggest a vacation, if I may call it that, for a couple of weeks, after having brought on one or two of the very important matters that we are all anxious to get cleared away?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, perhaps we ought to see how we get along with our business next week, and in the light of the progress we are able to make we can then decide whether we deserve a holiday.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, that is very clear and would almost do honour to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. I ask the Prime Minister whether he has in mind at all moving a motion to provide for a couple of weeks' vacation so we can get back to our constituencies, after this important legislation to which he alludes has received the attention of the house.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, this matter certainly is in the back of my mind and has been for some time—

An hon. Member: How far back?

Mr. Pearson: —but before it is moved to the front of my mind I think I ought to have and I will have discussions with my colleagues and with the representatives of the other parties.

Mr. Knowles: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. If any consideration is given

to a recess—and by "if" I mean I do not think we should have one—will the Prime Minister undertake that the Canada pension plan will at least be advanced to the point where it is referred to a committee before there is a break of any kind in our work?

An hon. Member: You have got your halo on again today.

Mr. Pearson: I will certainly give consideration to that matter, and it will be dealt with in the statement I have promised to make.

INQUIRY AS TO BUSINESS FOR TODAY

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): I should like to ask the house leader, in view of the incorrect assumption made by the hon. member for Ontario last night with regard to the work that might be undertaken today, if he would record now for *Hansard* what we are to do immediately orders of the day are called?

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure the hon. member for Ontario is just as happy as I am, and as all members are, over the incorrectness of his assumption last night that we might not be dealing with estimates today. In view of the most commendable arrangement or agreement reached by the leaders of the various parties, we will be calling the estimates of the Department of National Health and Welfare immediately after this question period, so the house will go into committee of supply right away. The order in which estimates will be discussed will be as announced last night, national health and welfare, mines and technical surveys and citizenship and immigration.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

INQUIRY AS TO INCREASES IN ALLOWANCES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. Nasserden (Rosthern): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Veterans Affairs. Would the minister inform the house how soon the increases and adjustments in veterans allowances will be announced?

Hon. Roger Teillet (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I answered that question last week. I have nothing further to add at this time.

[Mr. Knowles.]

AGRICULTURE

TURKEYS—INQUIRY AS TO STEPS TO MAINTAIN PRICES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reynold Rapp (Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. Is anything going to be done so far as turkey prices are concerned to prevent prices from going down farther or, better still, is anything going to be done to restore prices to an acceptable level?

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, turkey prices are consistent with what they have been in the last four years. As a matter of fact they are a little higher. In the last two weeks there have been no importations of turkeys from the United States, and turkey prices are fairly firm. I will be discussing all the problems of the turkey producers with them at the Fort Garry hotel on Monday next.

NORTHERN ALBERTA—INQUIRY AS TO FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. F. J. Bigg (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Has the government taken steps to alleviate the situation in northern Alberta and Saskatchewan resulting from severe rain damage to crops in addition to very low yields?

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): This comes under the provincial governments. If and when they make representations to the federal government, we then consider the problem.

Mr. Bigg: May I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has any overture been made by the province of Alberta in this regard?

Mr. Hays: No, Mr. Speaker.

CIVIL DEFENCE

STEPS TO BE TAKEN IF ALARM SOUNDED

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Associate Minister of National Defence a question, in order to clear up an answer he gave yesterday, when he said that the first thing to do, in case of an air raid warning,

was to turn on the radio. Inasmuch as following last Saturday's false alarm no radio station had received any information, and local stations could get no information from any source, can the minister throw some additional light on the question and tell us what exactly should be done in case of an air raid warning?

Hon. Lucien Cardin (Associate Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, in the pamphlet distributed by the department it is set out that when the sirens are sounded, the first thing to do is to turn on the radio. If there is absolutely nothing abnormal in the programs of the radio station, it can reasonably be concluded that the sirens were activated by a short circuit or something of that nature, and that there is really no attack.

Mr. Martineau: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a supplementary question. Can the minister tell us why this information was not immediately communicated to the radio stations?

Mr. Cardin: Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge the official who was in charge of the station made representations to the Bell Telephone Company.

[*Text*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PAYMENT OF INDEMNITY OF LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Guy Marcoux (Quebec-Montmorency): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the President of the Privy Council; I gave him notice of this question. Has the salary increase to members of parliament, passed by parliament in 1963 and referred to by the right hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) on September 1, 1964, as reported on page 7538 of *Hansard*, been held back on the cheque of the Leader of the Opposition?

If so, on what authority can that increase be held back from the salary of the Leader of the Opposition?

[*Text*]

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for giving me notice of his question. I would advise him that the additional part of the sessional allowance payable to the Leader of the Opposition is not being withheld. Cheques for the full sessional allowance have been sent to him. However, these cheques have not been cashed, nor have they been returned to the department.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcoux: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Have some other hon. members followed the same policy as the Leader of the Opposition?

[*Text*]

Mr. McIlraith: Not so far as I know.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

INQUIRY AS TO PROVISION OF NEW ANTI-SUBMARINE VESSELS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Pictou): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Associate Minister of National Defence arising out of the answer he gave yesterday regarding the possible modernization of our present anti-submarine vessels. Can the minister give the house any idea when the government may be expected to make a decision on the matter of new anti-submarine vessels, following the report which was made to the minister a short time ago?

Hon. Lucien Cardin (Associate Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows the department has been studying this matter for some time, and has received an anti-submarine warfare report, but I would not care to name the date when a decision can be made.

Mr. MacEwan: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I recall the Minister of National Defence stating that he hoped it would be late this fall. Would the minister concur in that statement?

Mr. Cardin: I would agree with the minister's statement, but just what he means by "late this fall" is open to question.

LA MACAZA, QUE.—TREATMENT OF PEACE DEMONSTRATORS BY R.C.A.F. POLICE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. William Dean Howe (Hamilton South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Associate Minister of National Defence. Is the minister in a position to confirm or deny reports of brutal treatment of the peace demonstrators at La Macaza, Quebec, at the hands of the R.C.A.F. police?

Hon. Lucien Cardin (Associate Minister of National Defence): I would prefer to take this question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

Inquiries of the Ministry

DRUGS

PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION REPRESENTATION ON BODIES CONSIDERING PROFESSIONAL MATTERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. R. Southam (Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I have a question I should like to direct to the Prime Minister. Is the Prime Minister in a position to answer the question I asked him on Tuesday last respecting the appointment of representatives of the Canadian pharmaceutical association on committees, boards or commissions set up to consider matters directly or indirectly affecting the profession and/or the distribution of drugs to the people of Canada?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I apologize to my hon. friend. I had an answer to that question yesterday. I have not got my book with me today, but I promise to bring forward the answer tomorrow morning.

GRAIN

VANCOUVER—POSSIBLE SALE OF ELEVATOR

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. H. Horner (Acadia): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport. Is it the policy of the national harbours board to sell their grain handling facilities in Vancouver and, if so, how will this aid in the development of further grain handling facilities in that port?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I think I heard every word of the hon. gentleman's question except the word that really mattered.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Is it the policy of the national harbours board to sell their grain handling facilities in the port of Vancouver, and how will this aid in the development of the port and the stepping up of the development of grain handling facilities there?

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, there is no question of any policy involved. There have been some discussions about the possible sale of one grain elevator, but since the size of the elevator will not be changed by its sale I would not think that would have any effect on the amount of grain handled.

[Mr. Cardin.]

DOMINION-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

SPEECH BY SECRETARY OF STATE RESPECTING DECENTRALIZATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Colin Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State arising out of a news report in this morning's *Gazette* of a speech the minister made at the Richelieu club in Quebec city, in which he is quoted as saying that co-operative federalism "must be associated with the idea of decentralization," both fiscal and legislative. How far does the minister consider fiscal decentralization can go beyond its present stage without endangering the stability of confederation?

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I did not advocate any further decentralization in that field, and I will be very glad indeed to send a copy of my speech to the hon. member.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

ALLOCATION OF FREE TIME TO POLITICAL PARTIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): I should like to ask the Secretary of State if he can inform the house about the allocation of free political time by the C.B.C. to the various parties on those programs called "The Nation's Business" or "Les Affaires d'État". A decision has been taken in this respect, and I should like him to give, if he can, information as to how this allocation was made.

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne (Secretary of State): I have not been informed that a recent decision has been taken. It may be that it has. I will look into it and have an answer next week.

Mr. Olson: While the minister is looking into this matter, will he also provide the house with a copy of the formula that was used in establishing this allocation?

Mr. Lamontagne: I will be glad to do so, Mr. Speaker.

TRADE

UNITED KINGDOM—PROTESTS AGAINST ANTI-DUMPING PRACTICES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): I have a question for the Minister of Trade and Commerce

which arises out of a speech by Edward Heath in Great Britain, in which he called on Canada to mitigate its anti-dumping laws against imports from the United Kingdom. Has the government given consideration to this suggestion? If it has made a decision, can he indicate that decision to the house?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): The government has been considering this question for some time, and both the Minister of Finance and I have made brief statements on the question. I would be very happy to obtain these for the hon. member.

COAL

INQUIRY AS TO ANNOUNCEMENT OF NATIONAL POLICY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys. In view of the fact that for the last 20 years members of this party have been advocating that the government establish a national coal policy, is it the government's intention to announce a national coal policy before the end of this year?

Hon. W. M. Benidickson (Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys): Mr. Speaker, my estimates will be called either later today or tomorrow, and I believe that would be the appropriate time to reply to the hon. member.

TRANS-CANADA HIGHWAY

COMPLAINTS RESPECTING PAYMENT FOR PROPERTY PURCHASED OR EXPROPRIATED

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. P. Deschatelets (Minister of Public Works): Yesterday the hon. member for Kootenay West asked whether the government accepted any responsibility arising out of the purchase or expropriation of land under the Trans-Canada Highway Act. The answer is no. May I say that under the trans-Canada highway agreement the title to the right of way is held by the provinces. The costs of acquisition of the right of way are not shared by the federal government; therefore we cannot accept responsibility for the dealings between the provinces and the owners.

SUPPLY

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

Supply—Health and Welfare

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE

1. Departmental administration, $2,099,000.

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Chairman, the Department of National Health and Welfare is asking parliament to approve expenditures of more than $1¼ billion for the year 1964-65. This represents an increase of 4.9 per cent over our budget for last year, and I think this might be an appropriate time to review some of the department's activities, past, present and future, notwithstanding the fact that for more than two days now hon. members have had an opportunity to go over some of the department's estimates while dealing with interim supply.

Before doing so, however, I should perhaps remind hon. members that as usual the total shown in the estimates does not include an appropriation for payments under the Old Age Security Act. It will be noted that the blue book shows on page 5 anticipated expenditures of another $882 million from the old age security fund. This means that altogether my department expects to spend something more than $2 billion in the current year. It means also, Mr. Chairman, that the department is busier than it has ever been in the 20 years since it was reconstituted from the old pensions and national health department.

The Chairman: Order, please; it is very difficult to hear the minister who has the floor now, particularly in view of the fact that the two ministers in front of her are speaking into the same microphone.

Mr. Favreau: I think we both should make public apologies to the minister.

Miss LaMarsh: In both its main branches, health and welfare, important strides are being taken to ensure to all Canadians the highest standards of health throughout their lives, as well as adequate protection for the years during which, for reasons of age or infirmity, they are no longer able to work.

In all our efforts to date, Mr. Chairman, we have maintained an ever closer liaison with our counterparts in the provincial government, and I am sure this co-operation will continue to grow as time goes on. This co-ordination of effort with the provinces has been aptly called "co-operative federalism" and nowhere has it been more in evidence than in the fields of health and welfare. So far during my term as minister we have had

no fewer than seven meetings with provincial ministers holding one or other of these portfolios.

These conferences started with the one which was held on July 25 and July 26, 1963, at which the Canada pension plan proposals and the municipal loans legislation were studied. A further conference on September 9 and 10 of last year was called to deal with the Canada pension plan. From November 26 to November 29 a federal-provincial meeting of premiers was held at which various matters in both the health and welfare fields were discussed. Almost concurrently with these meetings we held our first conference on smoking and health.

Hon. members will also recall the Quebec meetings held at the end of March and beginning of April of this year, at which the various cost sharing programs came under close scrutiny. On May 28 and 29 another fruitful conference of ministers of welfare was held, at which careful study was given to the various public assistance programs. Finally, Mr. Chairman, I met with my provincial counterparts on the health side on July 20 and 21, and I have recently reported to the house on this.

I would not pretend for a minute, sir, that there has always been complete agreement or that the road has not had its bumps. Hon. members are well aware that the federal government has not always been able to do precisely what it originally set out to do or precisely when it intended to do it. We have sought the views of the provinces in areas of mutual concern and jurisdiction, and they have sought ours. But if there have been differences as to approach or method, there has been no difference in the ultimate objective—the highest possible standards of health and welfare for all Canadians. That will continue to be the goal; and if the same spirit of give and take which has marked our endeavours so far continues to prevail as I am sure it will, then we can all look forward to even greater accomplishments in the future.

Mr. Chairman, these 1964-65 estimates do not include provision for expenditures related to the implementation of the Canada pension plan nor to any matter arising from the tabling of the first volume of the report of the royal commission on health services. As hon. members are aware, we expect to have legislation respecting the former before the house during this present session. It remains our intention to have the plan in operation on January 1, 1966.

[Miss LaMarsh.]

A national health plan, of course, is another story. Before any legislative proposals can be made in this respect, long and careful study must be given to the report of the Hall commission. At this moment, in fact, some 14 committees in my department are engaged in a most comprehensive examination of the commission's proposals contained in the first volume.

It is expected that our own analysis should be completed in time to present the general position of the federal government to a federal-provincial conference by early next year. I intend to keep the house informed on this subject, as the proposals provide a comprehensive review of the health field, with a basic objective of providing the best possible health care for all Canadians.

I might mention in passing, sir, that in this matter, as in others involving my department in the past, we have been accused by some of moving too fast; by others, of moving too slowly. I suppose this is to be expected and I would simply like to assure hon. members that the government intends to push ahead with the greatest dispatch consistent with sound planning. Our progress may also depend on other factors, including co-operation from all hon. members on both sides of this house.

There are many other important health matters which I am sure will be raised in the discussion of the estimates of my department. For example, I place a great deal of importance on the forthcoming federal-provincial conference on mental retardation. A steering committee has just about completed arrangements for the conference, and the provinces are all co-operating most enthusiastically. It should provide an opportunity for a thorough discussion and assessment of programs for dealing with mental retardation in Canada, with suitable recommendations for future action. In particular, responsibilities of the various agencies in this field will be considered with a view to the co-ordination and integration of effective arrangements for the retarded.

The meeting will be held October 19 to 22, and it is expected that it will bring together 150 persons very closely identified with services for the retarded. These will include representatives from several agencies of the federal government, provincial departments such as health, welfare, education and labour, and representatives from various professional and voluntary associations with special interests and competence in the field. I would hope the conference would lead to greatly improved

provisions for the retarded in Canada, and that future programs would develop on a co-ordinated and planned basis. Our intentions in this area, incidentally, constitute an interesting parallel with similar programs in the United States, so notably stimulated and encouraged by the late President Kennedy.

Another health program which I would like to mention and which is indicative of important developments in the health fields supported by my department is the one concerning the health hazards of cigarette smoking. Hon. members will recall that at the first Canadian conference on smoking and health, last November, interested federal and provincial health departments and professional and voluntary health organizations agreed that a nation-wide program was necessary to discourage the cigarette smoking habit in Canada, particularly among young people. Federal funds were allotted in the amount of $600,000 to be spread over five years, $400,000 for health education and $200,000 for research.

The Department of National Health and Welfare is endeavouring to provide leadership by assisting in the co-ordination of activities of the various government and non-government agencies, by producing basic educational materials for use across the country, and by promoting research into the extent and nature of the smoking habit in Canada and the motivational aspects of smoking.

Two technical advisory committees have been established, one on health education and the other on research. A reference book and an information kit have recently been prepared and distributed. The program of support for research has attracted 19 inquiries from universities in seven provinces, and four projects have already been approved. Also we plan to assist in the distribution of a number of interesting films on the subject. I might add here that the results we have seen so far do not point to any dramatic advance. Our statistics follow rather an erratic pattern, but I am happy to report that the net result is one of slow but steady progress.

The co-operation of the various interested groups has been splendid. An expanded meeting of the technical advisory committee on health education this month will facilitate even wider participation in this program by health workers and educators.

In the field of food and drug control, hon. members will recall that our food and drug regulations have been strengthened during the past year by the promulgation of new control measures. These deal with such matters as the introduction, control and assessment of new drugs; establishment of minimum standards for milk to be used for manufacturing purposes; the addition of several drugs to the list of those which may be sold only on prescription; minimum processing requirements for fish products in hermetically sealed containers to reduce the dangers of botuline poisoning; minimum standards for manufacturing facilities and analytical controls and records required for the manufacture of drugs; standards for live, oral polio virus vaccine; and the distribution of samples of drugs to the medical, dental, veterinary and pharmaceutical professions.

The funds proposed will provide for the inspection, analytical, research and administrative services required to administer this legislation and provide a reasonable degree of protection to Canadian consumers.

This requires that the number of personnel engaged in this work and other facilities be increased to keep pace with the steadily increasing volume and complexity of new processes and new products.

Hon. members will recall that we recently set up an advisory council of consumers which will advise me and my department on subjects related to our food and drug regulations. The committee will hold its first meeting here on October 13 and 14.

If I can turn now, Mr. Chairman, to the activities of our welfare branch, I think this is an opportune time to give members a progress report on the implementation of our new youth allowances program which was passed by the house in July of this year. This particular legislation, which features a somewhat different approach than family allowances, provides for the payment to parents of an allowance of $10 per month for a dependant child aged 16 or 17 who is either in full time attendance at school or university or who is unable to attend school because of a physical or mental infirmity.

The youth allowances act is being administered by the family allowances and old age security division of my department. Since its passage the department has been busy forwarding youth allowances application forms to all parents in Canada who have children aged 16 or 17. It was possible to locate the names of the families concerned from our family allowance records. Some half million application forms were sent out to parents across Canada for September 1. These have already started to flow back into our regional offices in the capital cities of the provinces. As of today I am advised that very few problems are being encountered, so

there appears to be every expectation that youth allowances cheques will go forward to eligible parents at the end of this month.

In a situation where a child is unable to attend school because of a mental or physical disability, the parent in question will be sent a certificate which must be completed by a doctor, attesting to the fact that the child is incapable of attending school.

There will be a number of cases where the application form will not reach the parent due to a change of address having taken place since the parent stopped receiving family allowances for the child. Through the use of newspaper advertisements and radio spot announcements, parents who did not receive application forms have been requested to write to their regional director for these forms. All the periodical press of the country, including the ethnic press, has been used for this purpose. Parents whose applications are late because of having to obtain medical certificates, or due to the form not having been received by September 1, will not be penalized by any loss of allowance because of the retroactive provision in the legislation.

Due to the requirement that the youth must be in full time attendance at school, we obviously need the co-operation of the provincial education authorities involved. I am happy to report that I wrote to all the provincial ministers of education, and that the response we have received so far has been most encouraging.

The province of Quebec is continuing its own program, which was initiated in 1960, and will receive from the federal government a fiscal equivalent provided for in the federal-provincial revision act.

It is anticipated that 375,000 children will be registered for the allowance. This will cost some $27 million for the remainder of the current fiscal year. In the full year it is expected the cost will be in the order of $45 million.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word about our public assistance programs. The department has been giving close attention to the four federal-provincial public assistance programs; that is, the three so-called categorical programs of old age assistance, blind persons allowances and disabled persons allowances, and general assistance provided under the Unemployment Assistance Act. Together, these four programs involve an annual federal expenditure of nearly $190 million, and provide basic or supplementary assistance for some 800,000 persons. While these programs are of incalculable value in providing the essentials of life to those covered by them, questions have been raised for some time about methods of arriving at a better integrated and more flexible public assistance program.

At the federal-provincial conference of premiers last November there was a unanimous agreement that efforts should be made with this objective in view. Accordingly a working group of federal-provincial officials met in February, and the ministers of welfare met with me in May to discuss means of achieving this goal. A further meeting of ministers is planned for later this fall. This sort of action is slow, since it involves the co-operation of the provinces, territories and the federal government and we are all working at different paces, but we are moving forward as quickly as possible.

Among the points brought out in the discussions with the provinces was the fact that the approach taken in the Unemployment Insurance Act, through which the provinces set the rates and determine the conditions under which assistance is granted, should form the basis of any broader public assistance programs that may be developed. Emphasis was also placed on the development of an assistance program designed to encourage self support and the reduction of dependency. The welfare grants program has a role to play in promoting the development and sharing in the costs of social services needed to give this positive emphasis to the public assistance programs.

While much of the discussion with the provinces was concerned with the development of a broader public assistance program, the need for the retention of the present categorical assistance programs on an optional basis by the provinces was emphasized. Accordingly, improvements in these individual programs must also be considered. In particular the program of allowances for people who are permanently and totally disabled needs to be reviewed in the light of the views expressed by many members of this house, as well as in the light of the provisions for disability benefits which are proposed under the Canada pension plan.

It is to be hoped that the federal and provincial governments can work out a mutually satisfactory approach to public assistance, and that the social insurance provisions of the Canada pension plan will be paralleled by an integrated and improved social assistance program.

I might add here, Mr. Chairman, that the welfare grants program continues its planned

expansion as a means of assisting in the development and strengthening of welfare services in Canada. This year $1 million has been allocated to the program, compared with $500,000 in the fiscal year 1963-64. Present plans call for an annual increase of $500,000 until a yearly total of $2½ million is reached.

The program achieves its purpose in a broad and flexible way, partly through directly administered provisions and partly through sharing arrangements with the provinces. Efforts are focused in three main areas; the improvement of the quality and quantity of welfare staff, the expansion of welfare services, and research which holds promise of great improvement in welfare services.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, a word about a program which is small in cost but great in public interest; that is, fitness and amateur sport. The amount made available to us was raised this year to $3 million. Although it is too soon to make any final evaluation of the impact the program is having on fitness and amateur sport in Canada, there is a mounting volume of evidence that considerable progress is being made in a number of the important parts of the program. More than $1 million was allocated in grants to 43 national sports governing bodies and fitness agencies, and 56 per cent of this amount was for training of coaches and participants. About 25 per cent went for assistance to national competition and 15 per cent to international competition.

A sum of $1 million was allocated to the provinces to assist them in developing the services at the local community level which are the lifeblood of the program. Grants are made on a basis whereby the federal government pays 60 per cent and the provinces 40 per cent, except in the case of undergraduate scholarships and bursaries where the federal government pays the full amount. We have been able within the past month or two to offer to the provinces new three year agreements, and we are now negotiating with the provinces on this basis. Up to this time the agreements have been for one year only, and there have been many complaints by the provinces that it was impossible to plan ahead on such a short term basis.

The remaining funds were used for a post-graduate scholarship program through which assistance was given to the training of highly qualified teaching personnel, to fitness research where the co-operation of the universities is being received in the build up of a program that will help to tell us more about the nature of fitness, and to a technical information services program which includes films, manuals of instruction and other techniques for raising sporting skills. The program has not been used to assist capital development because the sums involved are far too great for a $3 million appropriation. However, the department does maintain liaison with the Department of Labour, and through the municipal winter works incentive program the department provides aid for the construction of local sports and recreational facilities.

I have only touched, Mr. Chairman, on some of the highlights of the activities of the Department of National Health and Welfare. There are all told some 29 divisions in the department, and it would take a very long time indeed to give the committee a detailed report on each and every one of them. I have been minister of the department for about 15 months, and daily I encounter a new twist or quirk, a new office or some personnel under my responsibility. I have enjoyed my work. I have enjoyed the people with whom I work.

In concluding I should particularly like to mention the departmental secretary, Miss Olive Waters, who is seated on the floor of the house at the moment, who is the first woman to appear on the floor on the occasion of my estimates to advise me and who, I am sorry to say, is concluding her last year with the department. I should also like to thank the house for the courteous treatment they have given me—except for the first 30 seconds—

Mr. Knowles: Don't blame all of us for that.

Miss LaMarsh: —and have shown my department in the past, and for the expeditious consideration which I hope hon. members will give the present estimates which are outlined in the blue book.

Mr. Monteith: Mr. Chairman, the minister has requested the expeditious passage of her estimates, and I am sure she can count on this. As will be recalled, on July 28 last at the time of our consideration of interim supply we spent a full day discussing the estimates of the Department of National Health and Welfare. Many of the members of the party to which I have the honour to belong spoke at that time; and subsequently, under some pressure, the minister did reply on August 5 to some of the questions which were asked. As a consequence we feel that these estimates have been discussed already to some degree. While there will be a few things that my colleagues, and others in other parties, will no doubt wish to comment upon, I

do not anticipate any lengthy debate at this stage as far as we are concerned.

The minister, as she put it, touched on the highlights in the department and mentioned that she was meeting new problems every day. I well recall asking a former deputy minister of the department, after having been minister myself for some few weeks, when a person would ever get to feel as though he really might know something about this department. His rather glib reply to me was "Oh, about three years". So I can assure the minister that she has some little time to go, according to this former deputy minister, before she should have everything at her fingertips.

The minister has mentioned the amount which is being spent. I think something over $2 billion has been devoted to the department including old age security. Eight years ago, if I recall correctly, in 1956-57 the total expenditures including old age security were something in the neighbourhood of $880 million. So the expenditure this year represents more than a 100 per cent increase, 110 per cent to 115 per cent. I know it is money well spent in, as the minister said, an endeavour to provide higher standards of health and life for the citizens of Canada.

At some time when the minister is replying I hope she will give us some indication of just what is happening with regard to the cost sharing programs with the provinces. The Prime Minister tabled letters in this respect today. I have not seen them as yet, and perhaps they will set out the proposals in some detail.

The minister mentioned that she has been having a very busy time with seven dominion-provincial meetings. I feel she would probably have to agree that a couple of those meetings were pretty useless when you look back on them. I am thinking of the July, 1963 meeting and the December, 1963 meeting dealing with the Canada pension plan, which has undergone so many changes.

I do want to commend the minister for the steps she has been taking concerning mental retardation. The forthcoming conference cannot help but be of assistance in this respect, as this illness is a serious matter affecting many people in Canada.

The minister also mentioned the food and drug regulations have been strengthened and which is a good thing. With regard to the advisory council of consumers, we will have to wait and see what comes out of it.

The youth allowances program, as she mentioned, while a little late appears to be getting under way at this stage, and I am pleased to note that she suggested there were few problems encountered thus far.

With regard to the public assistance program I wonder whether the minister at some stage would indicate whether she has had any suggestions, particularly from the province of Saskatchewan. It occurs to me there is a move afoot out there to suggest that unemployment assistance only be paid in return for work, or perhaps I should say that work should be done in return for public assistance. I wonder whether the minister has any comments on that point.

I should also like to ask her what is the state of the present welfare council, or the welfare council authorized by the previous government. She mentioned the grants being advanced amounting to $500,000, which I recall was the plan devised and which has been followed. This amount is being increased by $500,000 a year until $2.5 million is reached.

The fitness and amateur sport program, which carries the statutory figure of $5 million, is being increased by actual expenditures from $2 million to $3 million this year. I realize that this program cannot be hurried into because the department must make sure that the expenditures are worthy and meet the requirements intended for them. The expenditures have to be studied very carefully, and as a consequence the department cannot leap into a program like this too hurriedly. In other words it must feel its way.

I do not propose to say anything more at this stage, Mr. Chairman. Possibly there will be further questions when we get into the items. However, if I might be permitted one word of commendation to Miss Waters, I should like to join in the minister's words in this respect and wish her well.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, I hope it is a good omen that we are dealing with the estimates of this department sooner than we expected. Granted, this is only a matter of 24 hours, but it is a welcome change from the long delays we are experiencing in respect of some of the important legislative items that the Minister of National Health and Welfare should be bringing before us.

I want to say also that we think it is not inappropriate for the minister to refer to the total amount of money which is provided by parliament for expenditure by or through her department, because this does indicate not only the importance of the work of the department but the tremendous importance

of the subjects covered and the efforts that are made under the aegis of this department to cope with the very real needs of the Canadian people. The minister used the round figure of something over $2 billion as the total amount spent by this department. If my arithmetic is a little more accurate than it was the other day, when I asked her a question about a minor point, that is nearly 30 per cent of the total money spent in a year by the federal government. This indicates that Canadians regard the health, social security and general welfare of our people as one of the most important functions of government.

I should like to make one slight correction in the wording used by the minister, and I do so not to quarrel with her over a technicality, but rather to make a point. If I heard her correctly she said that her department was asking parliament to approve of the expenditure of approximately $1,250 million. Then she went on to refer to the $800 million that came out of the old age security fund, making a total of over $2 billion. I am sure she knows what I am referring to. Actually she comes before parliament asking for approval in respect of only $104 million, for something over $1 billion does not have to be approved by parliament from year to year, because this has been made statutory in the various enactments such as the Old Age Security Act, the Family Allowances Act, and other measures. As I have said, I mention this fact not to quarrel over a technicality with the minister, but rather to make the point that parliament is very sure of itself in this field. It has made permanent enactments which make it clear that we regard social security, social welfare and the health of our people as of major importance in the whole scheme of government as we know it in this country.

We were pleased to hear the report of the minister in respect of the wide range of work that is being done by this department. We were pleased to hear of the extent of cooperation that she and her department experience with the governments and corresponding departments of the provinces of Canada. We were also pleased to learn of the work that is going on inside her department, particularly that being conducted by a number of committees.

I suppose, since I am commenting on some of the things the minister has said, I had better not overlook one point or it might be noticed. I do say very genuinely, at any rate, that I should like to join with the minister and the former minister in complimenting the department for having the services of Miss Waters. Perhaps Miss Waters would not mind if the two deputy ministers who are sitting at the table in front of the minister might also be mentioned as contributing very effectively to the work of this department.

Mr. Chairman, it was good to hear the minister say today that it is still the intention of the government that the Canada pension plan will be brought into effect and be operative by January, 1966. I do not want to sound cynical or lacking in faith; I do not want to sound as though I had not paid heed to the advice of the minister that I possess my soul in patience, or whatever the advice has been from the minister. But, I do express concern as a result of all the delays we have experienced as to whether or not we are going to get this important legislation.

In the short period of time I had earlier today, because word did get around that we might have health and welfare estimates before us this afternoon, I looked over some of the debates of the past, earlier this year and last year, and I found it almost embarrassing to read some of the things that I said as long ago as July, 1963. The things I said then in respect of the Canada pension plan would make one think that the millennium was just around the corner. In the meantime we have had so many delays that one wonders whether that millennium is going to be a millennium in coming. I plead with the minister not to feel that she can put us off from day to day with statements such as, "a statement will be made soon" or "everybody is working on this matter as fast as possible".

Earlier today, when we were on orders of the day, I was quite serious when I made the point that the business of this house, now that we have got over the flag impasse for six weeks, should be organized so that we can get on with the Canada pension plan right away. In my view we should be at it not later than next week. One of the reasons I expressed myself earlier today as opposed to the House of Commons taking a recess at this time is because of the importance of the Canada pension plan itself. I favour a recess for our staff, and I think that it can be worked out, indeed, we must work it out; but we have been telling the country for a long time that we have felt there was important business for us to get at, and for that reason we wanted some agreement made about the flag debate. Let us not spoil all that by asking now for a holiday, when there is this important question of the Canada pension plan, as well as other important business to be dealt with at this time.

Mr. Martineau: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. member a question on this subject?

Mr. Knowles: Certainly.

Mr. Martineau: He said he did not think we should ask for a holiday at this time. Has he considered the situation of the staff which has been working here overtime?

The Chairman: Order. May I suggest to the hon. members of this committee that we are getting away from the subject matter of this resolution if we begin to consider matters such as the one raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, and the hon. member for Pontiac-Témiscamingue.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, I do not need to be out of order to answer that question, because I answered it by what I said about 90 seconds ago.

So far as the Canada pension plan is concerned, Mr. Chairman, this is one of the responsibilities of this department, and one of the items to which the minister herself referred in her opening statement. I suggest to her that it is not sufficient for us to be willing to stay here to deal with it, but what has to be done is to have the legislation brought before us. We are glad that we were given the white paper some time ago—on August 10 I believe it was. It is an excellent document which probably tells us more than the members generally will be able to comprehend when they receive the bill itself, because I expect the bill will be so complicated we will all readily agree to give it second reading and refer it to a committee. I do not think we will be able to discuss it here, because of its tremendous complications.

Mr. Chairman, the minister's responsibility is to get that piece of legislation before us. I ask her to consider what is happening to the calendar. We are well into the month of September and if I can count months it is only a little over three months until Christmas. It is not impossible, even with the kind of accord and agreement we have reached in parliament today, for other roadblocks to occur, for other matters to be debated at length and for this important piece of legislation to be put off again and again. It is not impossible for other difficulties to arise in discussions with the provinces. It is not impossible for difficulties to arise when the matter goes before a special joint committee. These various difficulties could add up to the postponing of this legislation into 1965, and if that happens it is quite possible that the intention the minister stated today could fail to be realized.

This is an important matter not just to the Liberal party which campaigned so heavily on it in the last two elections. It is also an important matter to parliament and it is an extremely important matter to the people of Canada. Judging from the white paper and from all we have heard and read about the matter, it strikes me that a great many people have put much thought into this plan. We will probably find some flaws in it, some things that we want to improve, but generally it strikes me as a good piece of social legislation, and what is now needed is that we get it on the statute books. Before we know it other parliamentary crises could arise. There could even be an election next year or the year following. By this sort of thing these benefits could be denied to many people who are waiting for them and who are entitled to them.

So I urge the minister to get the resolution respecting the Canada pension plan on the order paper next week, and I offer her this bit of co-operation. I am one of those persons who attend meetings of the house leaders where we try to organize the business of the house, and I tell her, though she knows it very well, that the minute the resolution preceding the Canada pension plan is on the order paper I will be pleading with her house leader and the other house leaders that we give it the very highest priority. We cannot do that at the meetings of house leaders if the legislation is not on the order paper.

Because we have got the white paper on the Canada pension plan one could go into some of its details, but I will resist that temptation. I will wait hopefully for that debate next week. But there is one thing in the pension field with regard to older people which I feel I must press upon the minister. I asked her a question the other day arising out of a resolution passed by the united senior citizens of Ontario. She took the question seriously and it was a serious question, but a colleague in the party to my right referred to it as though it was a question asked in jest. It certainly was not asked in such a vein.

My question had to do with the request that many people now over 70 and now receiving old age security of $75 a month are asking for an increase in that pension and the figure they are now suggesting is $100 a month, which I support. I know it is very easy to say there was an increase last year and also the year before and that we have done pretty well in the few years since the amount was $40 a month. I know it is easy to say that

we are going to be coping with the whole problem of old age security on the broader basis that is involved in the Canada pension plan, but the fact still remains that there are still many Canadians over 70 and many more who will become 70 before the Canada pension plan comes into effect who have no prospect of anything other than old age security as we now know it. We feel it is not good enough just to make provision to take care of needs in the years that lie ahead. We think we have to consider the needs of our people here and now.

There is no question in my mind that when the Canada pension plan comes into effect and we have this two stage program, old age security and the Canada pension plan, the amount paid under old age security will have to be increased in the course of time and that if the kind of pension we envisage is going to be available a decade or two or three from now the amounts paid under both the Canada pension plan and old age security will have to be increased. Since this is coming anyway, I ask the house to get over the notion that we have seen the end of increases in old age security itself. If we are going to make these increases let us have in mind the older people of the present time, who will rejoice in the knowledge that other people are going to do better as they become older, and let us see to it that we increase old age security now and make things better for them as well while they are still with us.

As I say, Mr. Chairman, I welcome very strongly the minister's statement today that it is still the government's intention to have the Canada pension plan in operation by January, 1966. I welcomed in July the statement of the Minister of Justice that so far as the government was concerned the Canada pension plan would be enacted at this session of parliament. But we have had promises of this kind before over the years. My plea today is that these promises be kept at this session. We promise our full co-operation to get this done and we ask the minister and the government to do their part so far as this whole matter is concerned.

We welcome also the brief review the minister gave of the various other programs in the social welfare field, the categorical programs and the other forms of assistance and social welfare. We are glad to know these programs are constantly being reviewed by the federal government and the provinces. I know that in speaking to the minister I am speaking to one of the converted. I am sure she is even more converted now than she was a year ago, having got to know more about the work of her department; but I plead that she press on with the idea of integrating these programs and overcoming the patchwork approach to social security which has been inevitable because of the way the whole matter has grown up.

I also ask that the government realize that social security is not just a form of charity for people who are in need. It is a part of our whole approach to our kind of society in which we believe there is a case for the redistribution of wealth so that people will be enabled to live according to their needs and be able to live according to what society is able to produce. Other departments than the minister's, the Department of Labour in particular, are concerned with the problem of automation. I listened to a part of the speech the Minister of Labour made in Toronto the other day on this question and since then he has supplied all of us with copies of this speech. It is not surprising to learn that he is concerned about what automation is doing to the processes of collective bargaining and to the employment picture. We are all concerned. This sort of thing hastens the day when governments will have to be concerned not just with providing social security payments of the order we now envisage, but when governments in the name of society will have to be concerned about the distribution of the mass of income that we produce according to the needs of our people rather than in accordance with the industrial or other work they are able to perform. Many a modern economist and sociologist is recognizing the fact that the day may not be far off when we will have to pay people who do not work at all, not through some form of relief but actually pay them to enable them to live and make it possible for them to engage in creative and constructive pursuits. I suggest that this problem concerns not only the Department of Labour but will concern this minister's department because this is the department where we have laid the groundwork for finding ways in which to distribute the wealth we produce among our people.

A few decades ago social legislation was only for the poor. Not very long ago I heard Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King—I think he was sitting in the very seat in which the minister is sitting now—stand up in this house and talk about the needy poor. Even when he used that phrase 20 years ago there were those in this house who castigated him for it. They said, surely we had moved on from that time. Of course Mr.

King belonged to an earlier generation and that was reflected in his thinking. This was what social welfare was, simply picking up the pieces, helping to provide an ambulance to pick up those who had suffered in the processes of our society and of our economy. We have moved on from that point and we realize that the maintenance of an adequate standard of living, not just keeping people alive, but enabling them to enjoy the benefits of our age, enabling them to live a constructive life, is one of the goals of our society.

We are going to have to move a great deal farther in that direction in the next decade. There is already co-operation between the Department of National Health and Welfare and the Department of Labour on a number of matters. I think there should be a great deal of study of this whole question of how we can expand the pension, social welfare and assistance programs we have so that our people can live and perform as they ought to, and not suffer from the processes of automation.

There is one other main branch of the minister's department with which I shall deal, and some of my colleagues will be speaking about this is greater detail. I want to say just a few words about it at this point. I refer to the whole question of health which has again been brought into sharp focus by a report. I refer, of course, to the report of the Hall royal commission. We have had many reports and documents in this field in the years that have gone by. The minister recalls that when I was speaking on her estimates last year I drew to her attention a draft bill for a national health program which had been tabled in this House of Commons by one of her predecessors, Right Hon. Ian Mackenzie, back in 1944. I found it a matter of some interest that the minister admitted to me, either publicly or privately and I am sure it does not matter which, that she had not heard of that particular draft bill until I drew it to her attention. This was one of a great many documents. There was the Marsh report and several other huge volumes during the years I have been here, and even before that.

The Hall report is another one and it has brought the whole question of the community's responsibility for the health of our people into sharp focus. We agree that it is an excellent report. Like most reports, it contains one or two things with which we do not entirely agree. But the general call for a health charter for Canadians is one that all of us welcome most heartily. When one reads this report even sketchily he gets the impression that the members of the commission, who were not New Democratic appointees to start with and who were not socialistic in their thinking, became convinced as they studied the matter that the only answer to the health problem of Canada was a health charter for Canada somewhat along the lines of that spelled out in the report. We hope however this is not going to be just another massive and valuable document that will decorate the shelves of the library and be referred to for years to come.

I welcome the minister's statement that there are 14 committees in her department studying the various aspects of this report. I welcome her statement that it is hoped that this study will have proceeded sufficiently to enable the government to present a position to a federal-provincial meeting some time in 1965. However I strongly express the hope that is not just for the purpose of entertaining those who attend the meeting, but rather that this will be a step in the direction of urging that this legislation be brought into effect. I know that this government has had a rather rough time of it since it got elected. It promised action in 60 days and that 60 day slogan became almost a millstone around its neck. Then the government had trouble with the first Gordon budget. Then there was the Canada pension plan which we were going to get right away, but which we are still hoping to get. Health care was part of the Liberal party's platform in the last election. I believe the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam was faced with a Liberal candidate who put the health program so high on the list it was going to be enacted in a matter of months.

Mr. Pugh: Do not forget the scholarships.

Mr. Knowles: Scholarships was another of the government's promises. I believe there was a promise about a flag, and they have had a bit of trouble with that as well. I urge the government not to be discouraged because it has had this kind of trouble, not to be discouraged to the point of putting the health plan too far down the list. It is perhaps even more important than the Canada pension plan and the minister knows how important we feel that is. If this government or the minister in charge of this department really want to do something for Canada, I suggest they should make a serious effort to get a health charter for Canadians

on the statute books during the life of this parliament.

The impression we get, and I am sure the impression the press men have, including those who are friendly to the Liberal party, is that the most the government plans in this field is to get the pension plan on the books, perhaps the national labour code, and then be able to use that in an election campaign. They would say, you have this and we will go on with a health plan if you re-elect us. This is not good enough. This is not acting in a responsible manner. Now that we have the Hall report and this government committeed to act in the health field, I urge that there should be no thought of the health plan being put off for the next parliament, but rather plans should be made to get this legislation before this house during the life of the present parliament. It is a tenuous life this parliament leads. You never know when it is going to fall on some major issue, some minor issue or even some procedural issue. I think the thing for the government to do is to assume it still has life, and while it has that life it should act on these important matters.

There are other things I should like to discuss, but quite frankly I would be repeating what I have said on other occasions about improvements that might be made in the Blind Persons Act and the Disabled Persons Act, unemployment assistance and some of these other things. Some of the programs to which the minister has referred deserve comment. This comment can be made by other members as the debate proceeds. As the minister expected I would, however, I want at this time to urge that she get moving with something more than a Liberal pace, that she get moving with some real speed on these two important matters, the Canada pension plan and a health charter for the people of this country.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Chairman, while I do not want to delay the discussion unnecessarily, I would like to make a few remarks on the National Health and Welfare estimates, to call the attention of the house on the fact that at first sight, no extraordinary changes appear in the departmental estimates. Several items have remained the same, whereas some others show a slight increase like, for instance, the contribution to the provinces, following arrangements made between them and the federal government. We also note an increase in medical services. The largest increase concerns the new estimates for the old age pension plan.

This pension plan will not directly concern the province of Quebec, as Quebec citizens will have their own pension plan, but I may say that even that plan does not inspire much confidence as far as I am concerned, because I consider it simply as a product of capitalism.

When we look at this pension plan, we wonder whether the government really wanted to help old people in need, or come to the rescue of government finance, because under that plan the small wage earner who gets from $1,000 to $6,000 will be taxed again, whereas those in higher brackets will not be affected.

Now, it is precisely the small wage earners who have to raise a family on $3,000, $4,000 or $5,000 a year, who are of concern to us, because they will have to shoulder another tax to be eligible for a pension 25, 30 or 40 years hence.

Mr. Chairman, after having studied every program and every bill which was enacted by the house, I wonder whether there is a true and honest concern for individual welfare. I am asking this question seriously, because since my arrival in this house, it seems to me that all the acts I have studied have been drawn up not in the interest of the individual, but with finance in mind.

I feel that, in setting up the present scheme, the government's chief purpose is to create a tremendous fund where it can dig at will, while luring the people with a pension they could hope to receive when they reach the age of 70.

Mr. Chairman, if the government were really sincere and truly wanted to protect people and our older citizens, it could use a much less complicated means than the pension plan it is now proposing. In fact, we are now paying our old people a pension of $75 a month from the age of 70.

We want our old people to receive a pension of $100 a month, for that is exactly what the new plan proposes, $100 and less—I say "and less", because I find that, under that scheme, the aged person will have to prove that, all his life, he earned a salary of $6,000 a year. Therefore, the person who will establish that he earned only $3,000 a year will receive only $50 per month as stipulated in the proposed plan, and so on. Those who earn only between $3,000 and $4,000 a year will receive a pension in keeping with their salary.

During all that time, the Canadian citizen will have been deprived of the necessities of life in order to have a guaranteed pension of $100. Because the most needy people will not

be able to reach the maximum fixed by the government, their pension will be limited to $60, $50 and maybe even to $40 per month. And that is what this government calls equity.

Instead of all that camouflage, the government could have raised the present pension from $75 to $100 per month and pay it out of the surplus income of the wealthy without overtaxing the little people.

Those earning $6,000 and over could have been taxed in order to pay for that additional pension of $25 a month. Thus, I think the government would have been much more logical and would have proven that they were working to improve the situation of small wage earners while securing a $100 pension for everybody, including those who have millions of dollars. I think that is a principle of social distribution which is fair and equitable for everybody.

But we have chosen once more to take billions of dollars out of the pockets of the small wage earner to give him a few crumbs when he reaches 70 years of age.

I say that if today with the pension—I see somebody opposite who laughs at the low income people; he should not laugh at them because the father of ten or 12 children earning less than $5,000 a year will be burdened even more as a result of this famous pension plan. Let us not laugh at our small wage earners; instead let us consider their plight more seriously and let us help them by providing them with a more adequate social pension.

If the Minister of National Health and Welfare wishes to bring about some improvements, we could even today pay without a means test a pension to those who have reached 65 years of age, instead of waiting until they are 70.

We could do away with this army of small inspectors, all these branch offices which cost millions of dollars to this department, and with the savings realized by eliminating these petty inspectors—I was about to say those small patronage dispensers—who study the cases of persons 65 to 70 years of age in order to find a way to get out of paying pensions to them, we could pay, without a means test, part of the statutory pension to persons 65 to 70 years of age.

Mr. Chairman, an item which impressed me especially is that of family allowances.

The government provided family allowances several years ago, and I wonder whether the Minister of National Health and Welfare has ever thought of revising them in keeping with the rise in the cost of living.

[Mr. Gauthier.]

There is some talk of increasing family allowances; requests are made, large families especially write to the government. But the government pretends not to hear those requests and remains silent when questions are directed to its members in the house concerning the problem of family allowances.

All salaries are increased nowadays, the administration costs have increased; the only item which is left untouched is that of family allowances.

It is precisely the only way to help large families and set a fairer salary balance.

If two family heads receive the same salary, but one has two or three children while the other has ten or more, the only way to balance their salaries is precisely through family allowances.

Again, I wonder if the Minister of National Health and Welfare thought of this. In the estimates, I see only a small increase, which I gather is merely the result of the population increase. But, in fact, there are no changes whatsoever as far as family allowances are concerned. And no changes are announced either, and sometimes I wonder if the minister does not intend to reduce them instead of increasing them.

Mr. Chairman, there are very interesting items in the estimates of the Department of National Health and Welfare, and the most interesting of them all, even more interesting than old age pensions, is family allowances.

It is really a shame today to see that a country like Canada is unable to make an effort to help large families balance their budgets through proportionate family allowances, so that they might live like other workers who have little or no family.

I feel that this question must be considered, and I ask the minister to consider it seriously and introduce a few amendments so that we might hope for at least a 100 per cent increase in family allowances. The cost of living has actually more than doubled during the last decade. I feel the time has come to be logical.

If the minister acts along those lines, I think that she will make a useful contribution to Canada's future.

Mr. Marcoux: Mr. Chairman, we were all taken by surprise, this afternoon, when the party leaders' decision to set up a committee to study the flag question left us free to discuss the estimates of the Department of National Health and Welfare. However, since I am sure that those estimates will be approved sometime today and probably early this evening, I should like to say a few

words just to show that we have always been highly interested in that department and that we are always glad to offer a few suggestions to the minister.

In my opinion, the Department of National Health and Welfare, as organized at the present time, is surely the one whose activities do the most to prepare a general election.

I always deplored the fact that both health and social welfare come under the same department. In my opinion, the government should seriously consider dividing that department in two so that health, a matter of the utmost importance for the whole country, will be kept completely apart from another one just as important, social welfare.

Social welfare is indeed very important, although the needs in that field are recognized in general at election time only.

That was obvious several times, when family allowances were granted for the first time and later when various adjustments were made. We know that had been done arbitrarily and at the very last minute, just before an election, because it was realized that the results of that election could depend on votes cast by parents.

Also, it was realized that an increase in old age pensions was granted almost at the same time, in order to profit from the vote of Canada's senior citizens.

Therefore, I think that if this department was split in two, the health of the Canadian citizens would not at all be impaired and the question of social welfare would be studied rationally, systematically and progressively, not only in keeping with the cost of living, but also with the social evolution of the population, and not because of the political implications which such an increase in allowances might have among the Canadian population.

It is noteworthy that little by little various pressures, sometimes very subtle, are exerted by followers of certain political doctrines and also by some newspapermen in their editorials. Thus, our democratic system seems to evolve slowly towards a system against which we fought bitterly in wartime.

We should not deceive ourselves nor think that things which were bad before are now better; because more and more people are hoping for the social welfare state and for the government to play an ever increasing role, we should not think that they are right when they were wrong a few years ago.

It is not because the number of thieves in the country is increasing that the legislation against theft should be amended. The government should not come to believe that theft is a good thing simply because more thieves are committed. We should not do like certain political partisans who approve of theft when it is in favour of their party but reject it when it is in favour of other groups.

I believe that while it is in order to greet with some hope the establishment of a pension plan or fund for the Canadian people, while it is in order to rejoice at the fact that individuals who benefit from social assistance will perhaps have their day because there will be an election at a given time, I think that we must be very sparing in praising the government.

It must be realized that we are on very slippery ground, that we are implementing schemes which have been tried out in other countries where it has been shown that those so-called liberating plans always bring us back, sooner or later, to systems that become centralizing, dictatorial and detrimental to the people, although they had supposedly been established to help them.

As an example, I will refer only to Great Britain, where a system was established supposedly to satisfy all the needs of the British people—since it is a step forward as regards the existing hospital insurance legislation—where the health insurance system was to solve all problems; nevertheless, a short time after the implementation of that system, it was realized that the amounts of money invested were getting phenomenal and extravagant, that the operating cost of the system was such that medical care began to decrease, that medical research was practically nonexistent and that hospitalization costs were becoming unbearable to the taxpayer, because, after all, the revenues needed for the maintenance of that whole system are always derived from taxes, in short, the taxpayer has to pay for it.

This means that far from freeing the British people from expenditures incurred through illness, this scheme has made them extraordinarily vulnerable, because the treatments which were supposed to be given at a minimum cost have now reached astronomical figures.

I think that from time to time, committees should be set up, such as the one which will consider the flag issue, in order to ascertain the views of the various parties which, after all, reflect the views of the Canadian people, before launching an ill-considered scheme that we know nothing about. Before being compelled to back down, we might be better advised to consult people

and to do more research in this field. Before assuming that exceptionally good results will be achieved, it might be better to follow the example of countries that have used the different systems.

I feel the Canadian people would become more cautious and have second thoughts before insisting on the ill-considered intrusion of the state in the fields of health, welfare and social security.

If I remember correctly certain notions of social science I may have learned, it seems to me that state intervention, no matter how intensive or far reaching should be meant to establish some happy medium among the people and to provide the majority with the basic necessities.

I do not believe that it is by increasing the cost of government services, while decreasing the number of services, that the people can be served.

Therefore, I caution the government, as well as hon. members, not to think that pension plans, health insurance plans and hospital insurance plans will be cure-alls for all our present ills.

It is not because the capitalist system is defective in itself but simply because, in its present application, this system does not take into account hard facts nor its own weaknesses. For fear of having to relinquish some prerogatives, we are unwillingly getting into another plan for which the government is not anxious, against which it once fought, but in which it cannot help but flounder.

Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to speak at length. In addition to her statement on the Canada pension plan, the minister referred to the research made or co-ordinated by her department with regard to cigarette smoking which is related to metabolic disturbances causing heart trouble and blamed also for its effects on lung cancer.

I feel that the government is to be commended for having accepted its responsibilities in this field. I do not believe, however, that in this respect as in others, the government should give strict orders to all the people, because studies made up to now have failed to show the actual cause or any close relationship between the use of tobacco and lung cancer or cardiovascular diseases.

I also take this opportunity to say a few words on fluoridation. That is another controversial matter which has been considered and discussed without having been unanimously settled.

I do not see how the government could give any directives or definite opinions in this field, when ideas all over the world differ on the matter.

We should keep in mind that, when the Minister of National Health and Welfare places her authority behind a statement, a medical report or an investigation on a given subject, it has great influence on the public.

I believe that the Department of National Health and Welfare, while supporting the national health league and various other organizations which advocate water fluoridation should limit its activities. It should not increase the various subsidies and more particularly take no decision before the government thoroughly and satisfactorily studies the question. Moreover, the government should note the views expressed by the various scientists of our own national research council.

Mr. Chairman, I would have liked to end my remarks immediately, but since I still have a few comments to make, may I call it five o'clock?

[*Text*]

The Chairman: Order. In order to permit the house to proceed to the consideration of private members' business, pursuant to section 3 of standing order 15 it is my duty to leave the chair.

Progress reported.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: 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 (papers), public bills.

CANADIAN FLAG

ESTABLISHMENT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

[*Translation*]

Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, may I have the unanimous consent of the house to revert to motions in order to present a motion in accordance with the statement made this morning?

[*Text*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed that the minister has consent to revert to motions?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Favreau: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill):

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.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: By consent, is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE BILLS

BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY OF CANADA

The house resumed from Thursday, August 27, 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.*

Mr. Brown: Mr. Chairman, as sponsor of Bill No. S-27, I should like to take this opportunity of answering one or two questions which were asked by the hon. member for Greenwood, the hon. member for Timiskaming and others.

I should like to repeat, Mr. Chairman, what I have already said in the course of this debate, that it is the wish of the Bell Telephone Company of Canada, through this bill, to increase the number of its directors in order to deal more effectively with the growth and complexity of the diverse problems that confront it in the operation of its business during these times. The committee and the house have already been made aware of the general growth and development of this company since its charter was issued, and particularly since the year 1927 when it began to make use of its full quota of directors. It is the view of the company that the complexity and diversity of matters and problems coming before its board make it desirable at this time to request parliament to grant it an increase in the permissible size of its board of directors, and there is no other reason. I might say there is no other hidden reason behind the company's request to parliament at this time. Nor is there any change in the policies or plans envisaged which might be facilitated by an increase in the size of its board of directors. I wish to state emphatically that it is not the intention of the company to use any additional directors allowed for the purpose of amalgamation or merger with any other company.

The hon. member for Greenwood referred to an application of Industrial Wire and Cable Company to the board of transport commissioners respecting the relationship between the Bell Telephone Company and the Northern Electric Company, in respect of which a ruling was given that the Bell Telephone Company was legally entitled to own shares in the Northern Electric Company. As hon. members know, the Bell Telephone Company now owns 100 per cent of the shares of the Northern Electric Company.

It was pointed out to the committee that a further question before the board of transport commissioners in this application was never dealt with, namely whether the board was entitled to review the financial affairs of the Northern Electric Company. I believe I have been asked why this question was never considered. I cannot give the answer to that question because this is a matter for the board of transport commissioners. The applicant, namely Industrial Wire and Cable Company, has never asked the board for a hearing on this question. There is nothing to prevent the applicant from asking the board for a hearing at this time, and I am assured that there is no objection from the Bell Telephone Company to its doing so.

With respect to the annual report of the Northern Electric Company, I might state that this annual report is available to any hon. member, at any time, for inspection and can be obtained upon request. It has already been supplied to a number of hon. members who have requested it.

I was further asked whether the Bell Telephone Company would permit some, or one, of the directors to be appointed by the parliament of Canada. It is pointless for me to answer this question. The directors are appointed by the shareholders of the company at the annual meetings of the company. The board of transport commissioners is the institution which has been charged by parliament to protect the public.

Mr. Chairman, I have endeavoured to answer the questions which have been raised in regard to these very important matters as carefully as possible.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Chairman, I think during the consideration of this bill it would be well for us to review the position of this company and its operations over the last number of years so that we may have a clear idea of what sort of a corporate body we are considering.

The company was incorporated in 1880 under special act of the dominion government as a result of the consolidation of a

number of smaller companies at that time. From then on it began to absorb a number of other companies. In 1954 it merged the former subsidiaries, Eastern Townships Telephone Company and the Chapleau Telephone System. Also in 1954 it absorbed the Welland County Telephone Company. The following year it absorbed the Saguenay-Quebec Telephone Company, and the Charlevoix Telephone Company. In 1956 it merged the Kamaraska Telephone Company, and in 1957 it acquired the Mount Albert Telephone Company. In 1957 it also acquired 272,000 common shares of Northern Electric Company, increased its holdings in this company in 1962, and my latest information is that it is still holding 99 per cent of the common shares. However, there is very little difference between 99 per cent and 100 per cent. In 1959 it merged the Yamaska Telephone Company and in the following year it acquired the Madawaska Telephone Company. In 1962 it acquired control of the Avalon Telephone Company.

I am reciting these facts, Mr. Chairman, not in criticism of the actions of this company, because I think that is the logical method by which a public utility such as a telephone company must operate, because there is no room for competition in this particular field, but to underline the fact that this company has, since 1880, virtually taken over the whole of the telephone business in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario. In fact, Moody's Annual states that this company owns and operates the most important telephone system in Quebec and Ontario over an area of 887,000 square miles, serving a population of 11,700,000.

This is a very large proportion of the total population of Canada. I think it is important we should realize this because we can then realize the vital importance of this company and its operations to the people of central Canada. The operations of the company affect the private lives of all individuals who have to have telephones for their own domestic purposes and every business in central Canada is utterly dependant on this company for the efficient communication system it requires. As I say, I am not complaining for the moment about the monopoly position of this company but I want to underline the fact that it is a monopoly and that by the very nature of its business it has been a monopoly.

There have been questions raised with regard to the transactions that take place between the Bell Telephone Company and its almost wholly owned subsidiary, the Northern Electric Company. These questions have had to do with whether or not this may be one method by which the parent company can salt away a large part of its earnings and come within the terms of the rate structure set by the board of transport commissioners. I have no conclusive evidence in this regard but I do have here the annual report of Northern Electric for 1962 which sets out some rather interesting figures. For instance, it tells us that in 1962 this company's cash on hand and in banks was almost 50 per cent higher than it had been in 1961. In 1961 the amount was just over $2 million and in 1962 it was just over $3½ million.

But here is the real milk in the coconut. In 1961 short term investments of the Northern Electric Company amounted to only $2,624,000 but by the following year they had increased five times to $11,054,000. It is very obvious that Northern Electric Company is doing extremely well out of its manufacturing of telephone equipment, the vast majority of which, according to the vice president of Bell Telephone, is sold to its parent company, Bell Telephone. If one were of a suspicious nature, which I am far from being, one might imagine that the Bell Telephone Company perhaps found it advantageous to pay to its wholly owned subsidiary rather larger prices for telephone equipment than were normally justified.

The Chairman: Order. I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member but it is my duty to remind him that he should in some way relate his remarks to the item before us now.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): They will be related.

The Chairman: He knows as well as I do the provisions of the standing order about relevancy and I would invite him to keep that in mind as we proceed.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I will, Mr. Chairman, and you will realize as I go on with what I am saying that my remarks are completely relevant. There are certain matters that I think must be made plain to the committee. The first, and to my mind the most important, is to recognize the monopoly position of this company and the complete dependence of the very large proportion of Canadians who live in central Canada on the operations of the company.

The company has come before us to ask us to authorize the appointment of five new directors. My colleagues in this party have proposed that three of these directors should be appointed by the government or by parlia-

ment as public representatives on the board to keep an eye, if you like, on the public interest in the operations of this company. I think you will agree, Mr. Chairman, that if as we contend this is advisable, then there is one thing these public representatives should also keep a very close eye on, namely the operations of this wholly owned subsidiary, because it may well be that an examination of the books of Northern Electric in conjunction with an examination of the books of the parent company may show that the public interest is not being fully protected in the relationships and the transactions between the parent and subsidiary companies.

I have quoted some figures to suggest, ever so gently, that in the balance sheet presented by the Northern Electric Company there may be some grounds for this doubt and suspicion. For instance, the net earnings of this company, most of whose business is with the Bell Telephone Company, amounted to less than $5½ million in 1961 but by the following year its net earnings had reached $8,834,000. That would appear to me to be a matter of very great interest to anyone appointed to the board of directors of the Bell Telephone Company to protect the public interest. Therefore I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it is quite relevant to the argument I am presenting for the necessity of having some measure of public control and supervision over companies that are of such vital interest to such a large portion of the population.

My own personal view, of course, which stems quite naturally from my political and economic views, is that this company should be a crown corporation, that it is perfectly ridiculous that something so vital to the welfare of the people of Canada should be left in the hands of private individuals. I think it is nonsensical. I see no particular hope of achieving that end now, but I do think that parliament has a responsibility to consider whether or not it should decide at this point that a company of this size and importance should have some measure of public supervision.

When we discussed this matter with the vice president of the Bell Telephone Company he was rather plaintive. He wanted to know why we were singling out the Bell Telephone Company and why we did not apply the same yardstick to other companies. I said I would be delighted to do so and intended to do so on every occasion that one popped up its head here and rendered itself liable to this sort of treatment, which has been perhaps unfortunate for the Bell Telephone Company in that they were the first to come to parliament with such a request and were obvious targets for this sort of development—which I really think is one that to most thoughtful people would constitute a very moderate and reasonable demand on the part of our party with regard to the control of this company.

In my discussions with the vice president of the Bell Telephone Company I pointed out to him that such provisions were not unheard of in the world and that there were places where the supervision and direction went much farther. I pointed out, for instance, that in France there is a public director on the board of directors of every bank who, incidentally, has the power of veto over directorial decisions. There are a number of public directors appointed to such industrial operations as the French steel industry in which the public has an investment of only 30 per cent. Obviously it was decided in France that corporations that were important to the welfare of the whole country must be subjected to some measure of public control and public supervision. I think we have been very modest in suggesting that out of these five new directors three should be public representatives, and not demanding that the whole five should be.

I was interested in the remarks made by the vice president to me with regard to not only the purpose in seeking this authorization but the sort of people they had in mind to get. He told me they had in mind people from the academic world. Just what they were going to be doing on a telephone company's board I was not quite sure, but possibly the idea was that they would lend a certain air of intellectual responsibility to the company's operations. But it did occur to me at the time, if the company considers it is in its interests and presumably in the interests of the public to have people from the academic world sitting on the board of directors, how much more important it is that directors should be appointed vested with the responsibility of guarding the public interest, and not just academic interest or whatever interest these people were supposed to be concerned with in the operations of this company. I hope the House of Commons will not pass the bill until it is amended to incorporate the provision that members of this party have advanced in earlier discussions of this matter.

Mr. Scott: I wanted to ask the sponsor of the bill a question, as to whether or not he had discussed with the Bell Telephone Company directors the request we made for rep-

resentation on the board of members of the government, and if so what was the nature of their response to this request? Are they prepared to entertain the idea or are they turning it down flat?

Mr. Brown: I endeavoured to answer that question. As the company is set up, the directors are appointed by the shareholders. Unless the law is changed or varied this matter cannot be the subject of discussion here because appointments to the board have to be approved by the shareholders.

Mr. Scott: That is a technically correct answer. However, it does seem that whoever the board wants to get on the board somehow manages to be elected at the annual meeting. A very small percentage of these shares is being voted under proxies and by some strange process or coincidence, to my knowledge the choice of the administration is always elected to the board. I have not the slightest doubt if your gentleman would give us this assurance, that the nominees of the government would be on the slate, or whatever they call it, we would be happy to have that assurance. I think they can give us the kind of guarantee that would result in these people being elected at a shareholders meeting. I still want to know whether or not they are prepared to consider the idea and give us that assurance.

Mr. Brown: I could not give that assurance at this time. It was discussed, but as I stated no director is competent to state that the parliament of Canada should appoint a director to the company.

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Chairman, in speaking on previous Thursdays in connection with this Bill S-37 by which the Bell Telephone Company of Canada seeks to increase the number of directors from 15 to 20, I have pointed out that my interest in this bill stems from the fact that a competing company with Northern Electric is located within the riding of York West. The factory or production centre is in the riding of York West, but many of the employees of that company are residents of the riding of York-Humber.

Now, some time ago the hon. member for Timiskaming asked a rhetorical question as to why the Bell Telephone Company wished to increase its directors from 15 to 20. I might state that, personally, I am in favour of increasing the number from 15 to 20 if we should ever get to a vote. However, in answer to the hon. member for Timiskaming I should like to suggest that the company wants more directors in order to strengthen its hold on Northern Electric. The hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands stated that the Bell Telephone Company controls 99 per cent of the stock of Northern Electric, which company is not under public supervision.

I have in my hands a *Hansard* report of the standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines. This is the report of a meeting held on Tuesday, July 7, 1964. Mr. Vincent, the president of the Bell Telephone Company answered a question by one of the hon. members for Halifax which is recorded on page 416 of this report, and I quote:

> We own 100 per cent of Northern Electric Company Limited.

There may be some directors with qualifying shares which would not be in the name of the Bell Telephone Company but may be entered in the name of the directors. However, the president of the Bell Telephone Company states that they own 100 per cent of Northern Electric Limited. Then, Mr. Regan, one of the two members for Halifax, questioned the representative of the Bell Telephone Company during this committee meeting. He asked specifically if it was not correct that Bell was entitled to own shares of Northern Electric Company simply because of a certain clause in their charter which states that they can buy any company operating a telephone line. Mr. Venne, who is vice president and general counsel gave the answer which is recorded on page 417 as follows—he is quoting section 4 of the incorporating act:

> The company shall also have power to enter into any arrangement with any person or company possessing, as proprietor, any line of telegraphic or telephonic communication, or any power or right to use communication by means of the telephone upon such terms and in such manner as the board of directors may, from time to time, deem expedient or advisable, or to become a shareholder in any such corporation.

Now, I have read the entire transcript of the evidence in the hearing before the board of transport commissioners some months ago in which the Bell Telephone Company was seeking some adjustment in its rates and capitalization and in which the Industrial Wire and Cable Company—which is located close to my riding—entered objections as intervenor. Many questions were asked during the hearing before the board concerning Bell Telephone Company's control of Northern Electric. The evidence, given under oath and available from the public record, indicates that the president, vice president and general counsel of the Bell Telephone Company

pointed out that they were able to buy the shares of Northern Electric Company because Northern Electric owned a telephone company. Thus, section 4 of their charter allowed them to own another telephone company.

Well, further evidence brought out the fact that there is a telephone line of 19,000 feet in length between the Northern Electric plant in Montreal and one building of the Bell Telephone Company. You and I, being laymen in this telephonic communication business, would think the telephone line owned exclusively by Northern Electric would be a telephone line that you could go out and see with the naked eye, a telephone line over which persons such as you and I could talk to one another. Far be it for me to expose the situation, but I should like to quote from the board of transport commissioners. It appears from the evidence that the value of Bell Telephone Company's shareholdings in Northern Electric was $34 million. They said at that time they owned 90 per cent of the stock, and it has since been increased. If they had a $34 million investment in Northern Electric Company when they appeared before the board of transport commissioners a year ago, by adding 10 per cent we are within reason in saying that they must have a $38 million investment in Northern Electric now.

I mentioned that increasing the number of directors from 15 to 20 is probably necessary in order for Bell Telephone to strengthen the bond between Bell and Northern, because some of these directors would be interlocking directors. This investment of $38 million that the Bell Telephone Company has in Northern Electric shows up in their full beauty the two most valuable strands of copper wire in the Dominion of Canada. The evidence before the board of transport commissioners was to the effect that the Bell Telephone Company installed a telephone line for Northern Electric many years ago. After a year or so Northern Electric bought the telephone line from the Bell Telephone and thus become the proprietor of a telephone line.

Now, the charter of the Bell Telephone Company permits the company to buy any company that operates a telephone system. The interesting thing in the evidence was that there were only two strands in the telephone communication system which the Northern Electric Company operates in Montreal. What is further interesting is the fact that these two strands of copper wire are embedded in a major cable.

The Chairman: Order. The hon. member was good enough at the outset of his remarks to indicate that he intended to establish a connection or relationship between what he is saying now and the bill presently before the committee. At the beginning of his remarks I thought there was some relevancy in what he was saying, but it seems to me that at this point he is referring to the technical operation of a company and I wonder whether this can properly be considered as relevant to the clause before the committee.

Mr. Cowan: You ask me to show a connection between my remarks and the bill. Mr. Chairman, here is the connection—two strands of copper wire that I am sure the members of the committee cannot even see.

The Chairman: I believe the hon. member is familiar with the rule of the house which requires members to deliver an oral presentation and argument unsupported by exhibits. We know that in courts of law the putting forward of exhibits is acceptable because exhibits can be filed and examined. But there is no such provision in relation to debates in this house and I would ask the hon. member to refrain from using exhibits at this time.

Mr. Cowan: I appreciate your remarks, Mr. Chairman. I would not have thought of bringing in an exhibit were it not for the fact that many flags were introduced a while ago; they appeared on the desks of members for a while and were then voluntarily removed. However, I do not need a material exhibit to make my point—that in the middle of a large cable running from Northern Electric to the Bell Telephone Company building there are two thin strands of copper wire. They are tagged at either end with little tags to say that these two strands belong to Northern Electric. This is in accordance with testimony presented before the board of transport commissioners.

Hon. members may think these are valuable wires—two strands representing an investment worth $38 million. This works out at the rate of $5 million a mile per strand, I believe—I have not figured it out on paper. But the interesting thing is that you cannot talk from one end of the wire to the other in conversation. The wire carries the voice in only one direction—from the Northern Electric plant to the Bell Telephone plant. This appears in the testimony produced before the board of transport commissioners. Of course it may be that Northern Electric only needs to use this line to ask the Bell Telephone Company what it must do next. Then I suppose the Bell Telephone Company either sends a mes-

senger across to tell them what to do next or calls Northern Electric over the Bell Telephone system. But the capital ownership of Northern Electric by Bell is based on section 4 of a statute which gives the Bell Telephone Company the right to own a company which owns a telephone line and, as I have explained, Northern Electric owns a telephone line 19,000 feet long consisting of two strands of copper wire within a larger cable.

A little while ago the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Hahn) gave an illuminating address on the manner in which Canadian taxpaying companies engaged in the production of wires and telephone equipment are in open competition with the Northern Electric Company which does a $150 million a year business with the Bell Telephone Company. I might point out that the Bell Telephone Company, as a consequence of its compensatory advantages, was able to put in a tender to the C.B.C. 25 per cent lower than either the C.P.R. or the C.N.R. were able to offer after 30 years experience of operation. It is obvious that the C.N.R. and the C.P.R. should know what it costs to service 195 radio stations. But when the contract came up for tender two years ago the Bell Telephone Company was able to undercut the tenders submitted by both the railway companies. As the presidents of both of these vast organizations pointed out in a letter to the government of the day, it would be interesting to know if it is fair, in the communication business, that a competitor should be able to undercut tenders on a competitive basis while fattening its profits in unregulated fields.

There is a great deal of dissatisfaction at the present time at this arrangement by which the stock of the Northern Electric Company is 100 per cent held by the Bell Telephone Company. A hearing has been held before the board of transport commissioners and Mr. Venne, solicitor for the company, who appeared before the committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines mentioned that the board of transport commissioners had decided it was perfectly legal for the company to hold the stock. Mr. Chairman, the board of transport commissioners is not a court of law. Mr. Venne told the committee that the board was "a court of record—a court of law". But it is not; and Mr. P. C. Venne, Q.C., general counsel for the Bell Telephone Company, knows it better than we do. The board of transport commissioners is a regulatory body and, like other great empire builders in the vast reaches of government, it seeks perpetually to increase its empire. Under the terms of the Railway Act which established the board of transport commissioners the board is authorized to make rules, regulations, orders and decisions. But it has come to the point where the board of transport commissioners when it renders a decision or makes an order places on top of it, the word "judgment". Mr. Chairman, they may think they are judges, but they are not judges and these are not legal rulings. The board of transport commissioners makes decisions or determinations.

I should like to suggest in the interest of the voters in my riding, in the interests of Industrial Wire and Cable and in the interests of millions of others in Canada that a request be made to the Supreme Court of Canada for a review to be made of the relationship between these two companies which are so closely knit together, one of them under so-called public regulation and the other under no regulation at all—the Bell Telephone Company and Northern Electric. Is this a combine in restraint of trade? Is this arrangement in violation of the restrictive trade practices act? Many people are asking these questions.

We were told during the sittings of the committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines, that the total income of the Bell Telephone Company in 1962 amounted to $471 million. What amazed us was to hear—and I think this information was given to us somewhat unintentionally—that the company paid the American Telephone and Telegraph Corporation of the United States 1 per cent of its income every year for research. I put a specific question to the officers of the Bell Telephone Company. I asked whether they meant 1 per cent of the gross income or of the net income. And they said it was 1 per cent of the gross. Now, on a gross income of $471 million in 1962, 1 per cent comes to $4,710,000 a year. I think it was the hon. member for Villeneuve, speaking some weeks ago on this bill, who asked whether income tax was being paid to the Canadian government on all the moneys earned by Bell Telephone. It would be interesting to know whether any tax is paid on this $4,710,000 which is sent to the United States under the guise of funds for research. We were told there were 15,000 employees in the research department of the A. T. and T. and that the Bell Telephone Company of Canada has the right to draw on all the results of the studies made by these ladies and gentlemen in the United States. I wonder whether the Department of National Revenue checks to find out whether the A. T. and T. in fact spends $4,710,000 on research work

for the Bell Telephone Company of Canada. Perhaps they only spend $500,000 for research for the Bell Telephone Company. I would not know, never having been given an opportunity of looking into the books in that way. It is interesting in connection with that $4,710,000, that the Bell Telephone Company has a director representing the A.T.T. from the States, and we are pretty certain where the company is controlled despite all the wide publicity about 207,000 shareholders resident in Canada.

They told us in the committee meeting that maybe 300 people attend the annual meeting, and of course the voting is controlled by proxies; but it would be interesting to know what research the A.T.T. is going to do in the United States in connection with the false siren alarm that went off in Ottawa last Saturday. This siren system is operated by the Bell Telephone Company, and with all this money going to research one would have thought they would have found a way of overcoming shotgun pellets setting a city of 300,000 people on its ear, just because somebody was shooting starlings sitting on a telephone wire.

Are we getting value for the money we allow the Bell Telephone Company to send out of Canada for research in the United States on behalf of a Canadian company? We talk about the brain drain to the United States and about how there are few opportunities for our educated young men and women in Canada to engage in research. Why in the name of heaven can't this money be held back in Canada and research conducted in this dominion, or are they taking Canadians down into the United States to conduct research on money earned in Canada and shipped down to the United States, and no doubt classified as an expense to the company?

I am speaking on behalf of a fine company, Industrial Wire and Cable, which is engaged in a very competitive business. The hon. member for Broadview showed that a couple of weeks ago, and I believe it is entitled to every protection the government and the law can afford it. I do not think it should be forced to compete on an open market with a company subsidized to the extent of $150,000,000 a year in equipment purchases by the Bell Telephone Company, which does not go on the open market and ask for competitive prices.

I would suggest, before I make way for some other valuable contributions on this subject—because I know some are going to be made—the air will not be cleared until there has been an open reference to the Supreme Court of Canada for an investigation into the method of control of the Northern Electric Company by the Bell Telephone Company of Canada. When Industrial Wire and Cable tried to appeal the decision of the board of transport commissioners to the Supreme Court of Canada, they got a curt refusal, that as their application involved a mixture of law and fact the supreme court would not be able to review it. If Industrial Wire and Cable are not given the opportunity of paying for an appeal to the supreme court, then I say the government of the day should see that such a reference is made. A final decision must be made on this matter of interest to millions of Canadians, a matter that has interested them for many years and will continue to interest them until a final decision is made by the most competent of authorities, and not such a board as the board of transport commissioners.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Chairman, I have followed with great interest the speeches made in this debate today, and I am particularly interested in the reasons and the suppositions put forward for an increase in the number of directors of this company. On behalf of several members of my party, as well as for myself I would like to thank the mover of this bill for the courtesy he paid us in introducing us to a vice president of the Bell Telephone Company and discussing with us some of the problems we raised. Following that meeting the vice president of the company wrote me a letter saying that although he could not agree with all the matters raised he was pleased that the conversation remained on a friendly and cordial basis. That is true, but we are not really interested in the cordial and friendly basis. We are interested in the reasons for the increase in number of the board of directors.

The relationship between the Bell Telephone Company and the Northern Electric Company has created a great deal of controversy in the minds of many hon. members, especially the method used in acquiring Northern Electric Company. Many hon. members have asked questions about this, which the board of transport commissioners will have to answer. It is not quite correct, in my opinion, for the mover of the bill to say that the matter about the ownership of Northern Electric and the interalliance between the two companies could be raised by Industrial Wire and Cable whenever that company wished it to be raised. As I remember

it, this matter was asked to be deferred by the board itself, and the second part of the inquiry was left in abeyance and remains in abeyance. It would appear that because of this request there will have to be a further request from Industrial Wire and Cable before the matter is brought before the public once more.

I make no apology for saying my interest in this is more on the subscribers' side than the Northern Electric side of the question, but I do endorse the remarks of the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands who said Bell Telephone Company is a monopoly company, that it operates in a monopolistic field, that this field has to be a monopoly, and that we representing the people of Canada must show some interest in the relation of the Bell Telephone Company to its subscribers and to the interests of the country.

The siren alarm which was mentioned by the hon. member for York-Humber gives rise to one of the problems that the board of transport commissioners will have much difficulty in settling. I believe the Bell Telephone Company is away out of its jurisdiction in many fields in which it operates, and it is for this reason we think part of the board of directors must represent the public of Canada.

I was very pleased to hear the vice president of the company tell us that he expected at least one or two of the proposed new directors would be appointed from the university level, that they would be academic people chosen to give the board a broader public representation than it now has, but I discount his suggestion that this is to allow the vice presidents to take turns in going on the board of directors. I do not believe that is correct; I do not believe that is necessary, and I do not believe it would serve the interests of the company, of the subscribers, and more particularly of the shareholders to have additional directors appointed from the management side of the company.

I am sure the management and the board of directors have discussed this with each other. I am sure they are willing to allow the vice presidents to appear on the board of directors, with voice but without vote, and such nominees would appear in a managerial status.

I am interested in this matter because of the picture that is shown by the financial statements of the various companies held by Bell Telephone, and also because of the high rates charged to subscribers to the Bell Telephone system. An indication of this is the Montreal system where the private rate is $6.46. In Ottawa it is $5.46, and in Halifax the Maritime Telephone Company rate is $5.35. In Saskatchewan the system is operated by a provincial telephone exchange under the government and there the rate is only $3.90. In Regina, under the Saskatchewan provincial government the rate is $3.90. This may double in the next few weeks owing to the change of government, but at the time I obtained these figures it was $3.90. The Alberta government system is $3.50.

I do not want to go into all the ramifications of these figures, Mr. Chairman, but let no hon. member confuse himself into believing that it is cheaper to operate a rural telephone system than an urban telephone system. But the Bell Telephone urban systems are almost double the cost to the subscriber of the rural telephone systems. This is the reason we wish to have some control and why I wish to move an amendment. This amendment, in my mind, will allow you and I and the people of Canada to give the Bell Telephone Company, in an academic sense, the chance to have certain people on their board of directors, so as to give it the allure they wish the board to present. I move:

That clause 1 of the bill be amended by striking out lines 9 to 21 thereof and substituting therefor the following:

"8. The business of the company shall be managed by a board of not less than five nor more than twenty directors, as may from time to time be determined by resolution of the shareholders, and three such directors shall be appointed by the governor in council and each other such director, additional to these three, shall be the proprietor of at least ten shares in the capital stock of the company, or such other additional number of shares, not exceeding forty additional shares, as the shareholders shall by any resolution passed at any annual general meeting, or special general meeting, from time to time determine; and the said board of directors, save as in this section provided, shall be elected and hold office as hereinafter provided; and all the directors so appointed shall be Canadians resident in Canada and a majority, where more than two, of the directors so elected shall be residents of Canada".

We have discussed this matter, Mr. Chairman, with the vice president of the company. As the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands has pointed out, this gentleman said: "This is a very interesting idea but why pick on me? Why not pick on the Canadian Pacific Railway?" I suppose he chose the C.P.R. because it is larger than the Bell Telephone Company, is in the public domain and in a monopoly field as well. We believe that if what the sponsor has said is representative of the thinking of the majority of the board of directors who are asking parliament

to increase the number of directors, then we can supply what they seem to require and increase the board in a way which will give it the appearance of impartiality which I think the vice president indicated was desirable. This could be accomplished by letting the governor in council appoint three of the directors.

There are a number of ways of doing this. Originally I thought we should buy stock in the company; that perhaps the government should take it over as a crown corporation. However, I think this is a very mild way of exerting some authority which I think the board of transport commissioners has been unable to exert.

I sincerely believe that if we are wrong in our supposition that the Northern Electric Company is being used for ulterior purposes, if we are wrong in our belief that rural telephones are more expensive to operate than urban telephone exchanges, and if we are wrong in assuming that the rate in Ottawa should be lower than the rate in rural parts of Ontario and rural parts of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and the maritimes as well, then I believe that these representatives, the ombudsmen, really, of the federal government in this monopoly jurisdiction, will serve the Bell Telephone Company well. We certainly will not appoint low class people, but they will be ordinary people representative of the Canadian government who will act responsibly in representing the Bell Telephone, but who will act also to represent the people of Canada, the subscribers of the Bell Telephone Company and all other interested parties, including the competitors of this company in one of its fields.

The Chairman: Is the house ready for the question?

Mr. Regan: Mr. Chairman, I think this is a rather unusual and unique suggestion which has been made by the hon. member, and I think one which would require a certain amount of consideration on the part of many members who are present before we were in a position even to judge the merits involved. Certainly in this specific case suggested by the hon. member it would set a very sweeping precedent indeed, a precedent which would apply in the case of any privately owned utility which was subject to the jurisdiction of this house. I know the hon. member has given the matter a great deal of thought before moving the amendment today; of that we can be certain; but I am sure he would be ready to agree that he has left the members of this committee in the position that they have not had sufficient time even to examine the proposal. On this basis there can be no question but that before I would want to comment further I would hope that there would be the opportunity to examine in some detail the amendment which he has moved. May I call it six o'clock, Mr. Chairman?

The Chairman: It being six o'clock, shall I rise, report progress, and request leave to sit again at the next sitting of the house?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Progress reported.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTION TO BE DEBATED UNDER ADJOURNMENT MOTION

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to provisional standing order 39A, to inform the house that the question to be raised at 10.30 o'clock this evening is as follows: the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Gundlock), agriculture—request for indication of countries of origin of lamb imports.

The house will now resume the business interrupted at five o'clock.

SUPPLY

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

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE

1. Departmental administration, $2,099,000.

The 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.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcoux: Mr. Chairman, before I close those brief remarks, I should like to point out to the minister, as I did this afternoon, that the government is often weak enough to yield to repeated requests from pressure groups which pretend to exercise the privileges of democracy, but which often represent but a very slight percentage of their alleged supporters.

By means of blatant publicity, with the help of newspapers, radio and television, and

also as a result of polls conducted by people who handle election campaigns, such associations or pressure groups, who often represent only a very low percentage of the mass of private individuals who are supposed to be concerned, influence the government to such an extent that it will finally propose social legislation which, no matter how attractive it might be from a humanitarian viewpoint, proves disastrous from an economic and social point of view. Once again, I shall caution the minister against this excessive enthusiasm which could result from the application of a social measure. I feel that if the government spent more money for medical research on cancer, not only in connection with the use of tobacco but with regard to cancer itself, cardiovascular diseases and mental illness, it would render a much greater service to the people than if it decided to increase its contribution in the field of social security.

I should like to quote from memory the words of Mr. Claude Jourdain, former Liberal member for Gaspé North in the Quebec legislature. Speaking before the economic council of the Gaspé peninsula, he said that the government should reduce, if not abolish, all social security benefits, so that the people of his district—and I think this could be implemented on a national basis—would decide to earn their living by working instead of relying on state assistance. In addition, Mr. Jourdain said that such a measure would not increase the popularity of any political party but that, for the good of the citizens of his region, a political party just had to take a decision to that effect.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that the government should rather try to solve the unemployment problem, to abolish salary differentials in various regions, in short to help the Canadian citizens to earn their living by themselves instead of making them dependant on the state, because it is a well-known fact that everything that pertains to the state is much more costly than that which has nothing to do with it.

The minister also talked about a new organization set up by the Department of National Health and Welfare to deal with the marketing of new drugs.

At this stage, I should like to point out that the food and drugs committee did some most interesting work not because I was one of its members but because all the other members were most objective in the serious and precise questions they asked the representatives of various groups. In fact, I am sure that the committee's recommendations will be advantageous not only to the department but to every Canadian.

I should also like to say a word about amateur sport. I suppose the hon. member who will speak after me—the name of his riding has slipped my mind for the moment—will also discuss that point since he has been interested in amateur sport for years.

Once again, I regret that the administration of amateur sports comes under the Department of National Health and Welfare. However, since this division of the department is still at the organization stage we have no choice but to go along with it. I believe that the country, in general, should do even more than it does at present for amateur sports.

There are several good reasons to change such a policy. First of all, we know that amateur sport will go a long way to give a good physical education to our young people, to improve the physical fitness of the whole population and especially, to bolster the reputation of Canada at the international level in the field of sports.

When we see, for instance, that hockey clubs representing Canada at the Olympic games or in world tournaments are generally second class clubs, except last year, when a new system was given a try, it is really humiliating for Canada to realize that while our country has a monopoly, if we may say so, in regard to the quality of hockey at home, it is being defeated by much inferior countries on the international level, merely because the government did not want to take its responsibilities in that regard and did not make a sufficient financial contribution to certain teams that could have been worthy representatives.

Be that as it may, it is a pleasure to note the continuous progress made in the Department of National Health and Welfare. We hope that the department will not fall into the same traps as other countries, which turned out to be economically disastrous.

We hope that from now on and little by little, the Minister of National Health and Welfare will heed the advice of the various groups represented in this house who reflect Canadian public opinion, so that the legislation to be introduced by the Department of National Health and Welfare and by other departments will really promote the welfare of the Canadian people.

[*Text*]

Miss LaMarsh: Mr. Chairman, I hope hon. members of the committee will permit me to interject something at this time while there

are a number of members present in the chamber.

Earlier this afternoon many hon. members joined me in extending felicitations to my departmental secretary. Since that time I have learned that today is a very special day in the life of my senior deputy, the deputy minister of health, who has held that office for nearly 20 years. Since 1926 he has taken over a number of new ministers, three at least, and led them, if not down the garden path, at least up the path through the administration.

Dr. Donald Cameron is a man much beloved by those associated with him, not only by ministers but by very many members of parliament who over the years have had occasion to seek his advice and assistance. Today is his 65th birthday. Normally that would be the signal for his retirement, but he has been good enough to agree to serve Canada for at least one additional year. I am happy that this year saw the opening of the new building and I am happy that I have this opportunity on behalf of the thousands of people who work in the department of health and who have known him over the years to offer my felicitations to him. I am also happy, Mr. Chairman, to provide an opportunity at the close either of today's sitting or of the estimates, whichever first occurs, when many of his friends will be able to come to my office and to give him greetings. In concluding, I should like to offer to him a token of our esteem, even if the Sergeant-at-Arms may have it removed shortly thereafter. I apologize to him because for all I know perhaps it should be a Tory blue cornflower, but I should like him to accept this red rose.

Mr. Monteith: Mr. Chairman, may I be allowed to say a word at this stage of the proceedings. Everything the minister has said is entirely correct. Having practically lived with the gentleman in question for some six years I can vouch for everything the minister has said. I would refer particularly to the steadying influence he has exerted in the Department of National Health and Welfare over the years. I know we will all wish him the very best of everything in the future and we will have to wait and see, of course, what happens after his year's extension.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, we too would like to join in the expression of felicitations to Dr. Cameron. We are very pleased that the minister has drawn our attention to the fact that this is his birthday and we feel that in taking this unusual way of paying tribute to this deputy minister we are paying tribute to all members of the very efficient and hardworking staff of this department. Now that Miss Waters has been mentioned and now that Dr. Cameron has had a birthday, I hope that before the evening is over there will be something said about Joe Willard.

Mr. Patterson: Mr. Chairman, may I associate the members of this group with those who have offered greetings and felicitations on this very interesting occasion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of our group, I would like to join all the others in offering our most sincere congratulations to Dr. Cameron.

[*Text*]

Mr. Benidickson: Mr. Chairman, as the one in the chamber tonight who, with the exception perhaps of the President of the Privy Council, has sat longest in the house, may I say that this is a most felicitous occasion and I compliment the Minister of National Health and Welfare for the light touch with which she introduced this tribute to Dr. Cameron. Perhaps there is a ruse involved. The minister is creating such good will that I imagine my estimates will come up faster than I had anticipated.

Mr. Monteith: Too bad.

Mr. Benidickson: May I say that the hon. member for Perth and I have been associated with the deputy minister of health for a great number of years. I also had the honour of working with the new deputy minister of welfare when I was vice chairman of the joint committee that brought in a unanimous report recommending universal old age pensions. So it is a great delight to me to have been associated with these people.

I was also a member of the house when the first lady adviser to a minister of the department sat in the chair in front of the minister, as Miss Waters sits again tonight. Dr. Cameron and I have had a long and close association and I wish to extend birthday greetings to him and the wish that he may long serve the state. Many people have served the state after reaching the age of 65 and I hope he will have the opportunity to do so for some time in the future.

This department more or less developed during the course of my own career. The Hon. Brooke Claxton was its first minister. He was a superb organizer and I can say

to the parliamentary secretaries behind me that he developed his concept of the department when he was a parliamentary secretary. He persuaded the prime minister at that time that this department was an important and necessary bailiwick, and we thank those officials who in association with members of parliament have made the development of this department possible.

Mr. Roxburgh: Mr. Chairman, at this time I should like to say a few words about the physical fitness program. As we all know, the physical fitness program of the Department of National Health and Welfare has been the subject of criticism under both governments and I am afraid that I have been one of the main critics, as has the hon. member for Peel. However, in addition to offering a few suggestions at this time which I think are vital to the success of a physical fitness program I should also like to give a few bouquets.

First I want to congratulate the minister on the increase in the funds allocated to Olympic teams. This in itself has automatically caused more interest not only within the different organizations receiving the funds but also among the Canadian people themselves. The very fact of receiving these grants has lent an added incentive to the teams and organizations concerned. We all know there are different groups within any Olympic organization. Some are able to raise funds because they are a group that appeals to the public and they can get people to come out to see them perform. Others cannot. These grants will add to their incentive to work to raise funds to send their representatives to the Olympics.

Our Prime Minister, who we have to admit is a really true sportsman and athlete in every sense of the word, is to be commended highly for taking time out of his very busy schedule to attend athletic functions such as the Canadian Henley at St. Catharines and the Olympic track and field trials at St. Lambert, Quebec. There is little doubt in the minds of all of us, I am sure, that his presence at these functions must have not only added prestige to them but have contributed to the morale of the athletes participating in the events.

It was also rather gratifying to have the Minister of National Health and Welfare attend the Olympic games at Innsbruck, representing the government of Canada. I would not say that I agreed with everything she said after she came back, but the fact is that Canada had a fine representative there. I do not know whether this was the first time that Canada was represented at the Olympic games by such a person. At the Olympic games this fall in Tokyo the hon. member for York West, the one and only Red Kelly, is going to represent the Canadian government. As we all know, he is one of the most respected and outstanding young athletes today and I am sure all members will agree that Canada will be well and truly represented by him.

I would be very remiss indeed if I did not mention the wonderful Father Bauer at this time. Surely Canada must be very proud, not only of his work as a coach of our Olympic team but of the great respect he brought to himself, to his team and to the people of Canada as a result of the true sportsmanship shown by him during the hockey championships. Those were very trying circumstances, and Canada can be proud of the fact we had such a wonderful young gentleman handling our team.

I mentioned previously a little bit about grants. I just want to say this, that as important as grants are to our teams and to our athletic organizations, the most important feature by far—let us get this straight now—of any physical fitness program is the child, our youth in the country. Naturally, any physical fitness program that deals with children has to start in the school itself. I realize that schools mean education and education is a provincial matter. However I sincerely hope that perhaps as a result of the co-operation of the provinces we may be able to put a federal program into the schools right across Canada.

There is one thing however that we can do federally to get this physical fitness program off the ground. This is something that is absolutely necessary if any physical fitness program is to succeed. I refer to the need for facilities. If we have not got facilities, nothing can happen. Today, more than any time in our history, we need these facilities. We are living in an age entirely different from the past. Our boys and girls go to school in buses or drive their own cars. We are living in a different age under different conditions. We do need a physical fitness program more than ever. There are many areas in the different parts of Canada that are practically devoid of facilities, track and field, arenas, swimming pools and so forth.

The reference to swimming pools reminds me of a situation in the minister's constituency. I do not know whether or not she realizes it, but there is only one covered

swimming pool in the Niagara district to take care of something like 60,000 people. I am going to say this, that in West Germany, a country that was devastated during the war, they have a program which covers 15 years and is called the "golden plan". This program will provide a billion and a half dollars worth of facilities for the youth of that country. So we can go ahead and take this $5 million grant which, so far as I am concerned, is slowly being used up. This is merely a pittance to a country like Canada that has not felt the ravages of war. We could start off with $15 million or $25 million and it would be money well spent. Let me tell you that money spent on sports will return more than dollars and cents to the people and the communities of this nation. It will make returns in the form of good citizenship, and God only knows we need it these days.

I have just finished reading quite an interesting little book entitled "Soviet and Sport", by Dr. Henry W. Morton a member of the faculty of Queen's University. I have no intention of dealing with these matters because they would take up all my time; however, I should like to point out something. The U.S.S.R. has a seven year plan which will be completed in 1967. Do you know what is going to happen by that time? One out of every four people, a quarter of the population of the U.S.S.R., will belong to a sports organization. Remember, this quarter of the people of Russia will be the vital, youthful sector of that society, and that really means something. The Soviets do not look upon sport as a means for creating only physical fitness, health and stamina. They look upon it also as a means of ensuring the prestige of their country in the world today, in the sport world. Whether we like it or whether we do not, during peacetime we need this and our young people need it. They need sport; they need relaxation to burn up their energies. We are having enough trouble as it is and one reason for that is that we are not properly organized for sport activities in which the young people can take part.

I do not know whether you realize the important part our young athletes really play in bringing respect to Canada and Canadians throughout the world today. I do not know whether you realize it or not but you can be in Canada today and in Europe tomorrow. It was not always this way. Our soldiers were recognized in the first and second world wars; they really let the world know what Canada was. What about the big space between the two world wars? What about the big space following the last war? Tourists were not going over there then because they did not have the money they have today. There were a few members of the government and businessmen going over at that time, but how did Canada become the respected nation she is today? How did that old maple leaf become what it is and how was it kept in front of the people? I will tell you. Mr. Frank Sargent, past president of the Canadian amateur hockey association took a team on tour through Europe at that time. They went over by boat and spent some time in the countries of Europe. This is what the top government men, the top men in the cities and communities in which they played hockey said—just try and get this because I have never forgotten it: Outside of war, the only time we ever hear the name "Canada" mentioned is when your young athletes tour our country with their hockey teams and play their games in our cities.

I am going to say this, that sport is the greatest means for breaking down barriers; it is the common denominator that creates equality. It does not make any difference whether you are red or yellow or black; it does not make any difference whether you are Catholic, Jewish or Protestant, in these sport lanes you are as one. Let us never forget that. It does do something else, it makes you value one another. The value of sport cannot be added up in dollars and cents. I just want to bring one further thought to you about the Soviet union and sport. This is the most important thing so far as the U.S.S.R. is concerned, that sport organizations are used as the means of rallying the working men around the various party government and training organizations, and are automatically drawn into the social and political life of the nation. That is why they are doing it. That is why they have a quarter of their youth tied up in sports organizations. I will not go as far as to say the same should be done in Canada. But I do believe that physical fitness and sport should and could play a far greater role in the life of our nation.

Mr. Willoughby: I should like to add my personal congratulations and felicitations to Dr. Cameron on his sixty fifth anniversary. I should also like to add my personal suggestion to him, that in view of his fitness physically as well as mentally he should continue to offer his services to his country in some way and not allow the fact that he has reached this milestone to persuade him to retire to some position where he could not do anything either for himself or for his country

and where his qualities would deteriorate. I feel men of his experience are so valuable to their country that they should not allow such milestones as these to interfere with their future activities for our welfare.

I am happy to have this opportunity to make a few observations with regard to this important and interesting department. The department of health and welfare is probably the most important of all the departments of the federal government. Now that it has reached a wonderful position of being able to spend more than $2 billion annually, I think it is in the top bracket of all the government departments. As far as the estimates before us are concerned, I have no particular objection to the items which are included, or to the remarks which have been made by the minister. My complaint is directed, rather, to the omissions.

I do not wish to delay passage of these estimates unduly. Indeed I think they should be passed without much delay. I spoke in November of last year on the estimates of this department and at that time I stressed the great importance of medical research. This evening I wish to continue in that vein. I feel this is probably the most important field which lies before the department today. Indeed it is probably the most important question facing medical science in Canada today and I believe it offers an opportunity for the government to provide assistance so as not only to save money for the taxpayer but also to improve our scientific status as a nation. There have been suggestions that further grants will be made, and I am grateful for them. But I feel these improvements are only fractional. I believe, and I am sure the vast majority of the medical profession in Canada would agree with me, that as far as the government is concerned medical research is a neglected child in Canada. As I have already mentioned, this is a most vital need if medical science is to advance; it is vital, also, to the educational services of medicine.

I had hoped to speak on this subject when the estimates of the research council were before the committee for consideration, but unfortunately there was no opportunity to do so. I should like to suggest now that the subject of the research council is closely allied with the observations I am making this evening. The council has added to its budget the sum or $1.8 million. There is no question but that we are grateful for this addition. But I would draw this to the attention of the committee: $1.8 million is just the equivalent of the grants received from the United States which are being cancelled. So we are just where we began before this grant was made; there has really been no increase. Canada today needs to double this amount in order to be effective in this great field of medical research. I should like to suggest three pertinent questions to this committee. I should like to ask why Canadians in the upper income bracket frequently find it advisable to go to the United States institutions for medical treatment. I do not endorse this practice; I feel it is unnecessary. But it is a fact that it exists. I would even get down to a more personal question and ask why it is that members of this House of Commons go to the United States for medical care. It is unnecessary. We can do the same things here in Canada. But this is the situation which exists today. What happens when people go to the United States? In many cases they are treated by Canadians, men who trained at Canadian universities, graduated there and went to the United States to work. It reminds one of the well known story of the Scotsman who made his first business trip to London. When he returned to Glasgow they asked him how he got along with Englishmen, and he replied: Englishmen? I didn't see any Englishmen. I only talked with heads of firms.

Let me repeat, there are approximately 350 Canadian medical men who go to take up practice in the United States every year. They are replaced by about 100 who come here from Europe, so we have a deficit of 250 every year. These doctors go to the United States partly because of the climate and partly because of economic reasons. But I am glad to say that medical men in general are not influenced in going to the United States for economic reasons. They go there mostly because of the scientific advantages, and that is why we are experiencing this terrible drain of graduates from Canadian universities. We are spending money on training these people but they go to the United States where they are offered better facilities and very few of them ever return to Canada.

I should like to put on the record a report from New York which was published in the Toronto *Globe and Mail* on August 4 of this year under the name of Frederick Hodgson, and these are the views of Canadian scientists attending the sixth international congress of biochemistry. I will not detain the committee by putting the whole report on record, but this paragraph is of particular interest because it has a direct bearing on the subject I am dealing with tonight. This is what it says:

Unless Ottawa loosens the federal purse strings and pours more millions into basic scientific research, particularly into the biological and medical fields, there will be a mass migration of Canadian scientists to laboratories and universities in the United States.

I should like to quote now from Dr. John T. Edsall, head of the department of biochemistry at Harvard University, who backed up this prediction by saying:

This is not a brain drain engineered by the United States. It is an insane export of scientific manpower. If I can't get support for my work in my own country then I've got to go where I can get that support.

Canada is rich enough to stand on her own two feet scientifically.

He continued in the same vein:

Grants to research laboratories in Canada have been cut by about 20 per cent this year—

These are the American grants he is speaking of.

—with an additional cut of 40 per cent due in the next fiscal year.

He continued at great length, but I shall only burden you with one more quotation, in which he said he saw no other way to give Canada scientific independence than to get Canada to contribute more to scientific research. That is what we are facing in Canada today.

I also have here the report of the National Research Council of Canada for 1962-63. This year's report is not out yet, but here are a couple of sentences from the report of the vice president, Dr. R. F. Farquharson, who is well known to many hon. members:

Two great shortages currently exist in Canada's medical research program. One of these is the small number of full time appointments in Canadian medical schools, particularly in clinical departments. Because of its heavy teaching load, the small full time staff has inadequate time for research.

Further on he made this statement:

The other great shortage is of research laboratories. In all our universities there is a serious lack of space for the work that must be done. This shortage is becoming a critical factor actively interfering with further progress. It also aggravates the tendency for good people to seek positions outside the country.

This is a serious situation and I do not think we in the House of Commons are aware of the seriousness of it. Economically it is to our advantage to pay some attention to this matter. We have more medical schools than are actually necessary in Canada today, if we could keep our doctors at home. At the present time, without allowing for increased population, if we could keep our medical graduates at home we would not need any more medical schools. We have 12 of them but we lose 30 per cent of their graduates to the United States.

When health insurance is introduced there will be a greater demand than ever for medical graduates, and I know we will need more medical schools because of increased population but, as I say, we have enough now if we could keep the graduates in Canada. We would save ourselves the extra expense of more schools if we could keep our people from migrating, and the unfortunate thing is that in this migration we are losing our scientific leaders and many of our potential teachers. We are losing the individuals with inquiring minds, and they are leaving because of exasperation and frustration. They are leaving because of lack of facilities to carry on the work they want to do in Canada, and they are finding greater opportunities to develop their research tendencies in other countries.

I have another short quotation here, this one from Sir Howard Florey, delivering his David Rivett memorial lecture at the University of Melbourne:

There are, of course, personal rivalries between laboratories, between universities and between countries, but the desire to know, and the desire to know first, explains a great deal of the drive of scientists for ever better facilities and their increasing tendency to go to whatever country is prepared to offer them a satisfactory scientific life.

This is what is happening to Canada. Canada has reached a crisis in regard to its medical education. The time was when Canada led the world but today we are becoming a second or third rate medical country. The teachers with the exploring minds are going elsewhere. They go where they can get the top medical research facilities.

In the amount of money we devote for scientific research in medicine, how do we compare with the sums provided in other countries? Per capita and on a gross national basis for every $1 donated in the United States toward medical research Britain donates 20 cents and Canada 15 cents, and that 15 cents includes what we get from philanthropic sources. We cannot look with any pride on the fact that we donate only 15 cents per head as compared with $1 per head in the United States.

As a country we should realize that if we are to hold our place in the world we must donate what is relatively fair in proportion to our gross national product. The United States donates more than six times as much as we do in Canada, and therefore it is obvious

why Canadians will go to the United States for medical care. It is also obvious why our best scientists go to the United States, and it is obvious why our medical schools are tending to deteriorate.

Unfortunately those of our doctors who stay in Canada have to teach yesterday's medicine, and yesterday's medicine is not good enough for today, and it will be worse for tomorrow. We are simply failing to keep pace with world development. As I have said, our medical schools are becoming second and third rate. At one time, not many generations ago, they were the best medical schools in the world but now they are gradually deteriorating. We must do something about it, and we must do it now.

I congratulate the minister upon her announcement the other day of a fine contribution towards the extension of the medical research facilities in the University of British Columbia. I happen to be familiar with that undertaking, as I come from B.C. myself, and I congratulate the minister on the assistance being offered to Dr. J. McCreary, dean of medicine there. He is undertaking a wonderful experiment, and I understand she is also assisting medical education in other provinces. This is something which should be extended across the nation.

The Farquharson report, which was the result of an investigation of the situation not long ago, indicated we required not only grants for the salaries and for the upkeep of these institutions but that $37 million was required to construct proper facilities for research centres in hospitals and universities. That report, as I recall it, came in about two years ago, although I may be out a year or so. But the fact is that what was going to cost $37 million at that time will now cost $60 million, and the longer we put it off the greater will be the cost.

There is also a large amount of expenditure on the part of drug and pharmaceutical firms in Canada as well as their associated organizations in the United States. As a member of the committee of this house on food and drugs it was my privilege to visit some of the research laboratories in Canada, and I feel that we should all be appreciative of the work which these people are doing. They are doing fine work as far as research is concerned, and I think that if it is necessary for us to assist them in some way we should be prepared to do so. But we should under any circumstances be prepared to increase the amount of grants we are presently making to these objects. It is extremely important that we do so.

On a recent trip to Montreal the members of the food and drugs committee were allowed the privilege of visiting several laboratories. In this connection I should like to draw to the attention of this committee an article which happened to be on my desk this dinner recess, having come in in today's mail. I think it is rather interesting. It refers to a Dr. Hans Selye, a man of whom we in Canada should be very proud. He is doing wonderful work and is so engrossed in scientific research that no amount of money would influence him to go anywhere else. Part of this article reads as follows:

> In the face of strong opposition, Selye devoted himself to the task of finding the causes of this stress syndrome and, in moments of doubt, he gained added strength from the fact that one of the most noted Canadian scientists, Sir Frederick Banting, has been interested in his studies from the outset. As an adviser for the national research council, a government body, Banting visited university laboratories throughout the country and, when he came to Montreal, he often dropped into Selye's small, crammed laboratory and listened attentively to the young research worker. Banting was also responsible for Selye's first financial support, a modest grant of $500.
>
> "But this was not as important to me as the moral support and encouragement I derived from being taken seriously by the discoverer of insulin," Dr. Selye recalls. He continued his investigations and perseverance brought success.

Also while in Montreal we had the opportunity to visit the laboratory of Dr. Genest in the Hôtel Dieu, who is doing probably some of the world's greatest research into cardiovascular disease, particularly in regard to arteriosclerosis and high blood pressure. I am sure that everyone in the house should have the opportunity to visit his laboratory, because I never saw anything so disgraceful in my life. This gentleman is doing national work. His office is so crowded with books and diplomas that he hardly has a place to sit down, and his laboratory is equally overcrowded. He has visitors from all the large institutions in the United States, where they have all the facilities to work with, and who come to him because he is doing wonderful work under these adverse circumstances.

I say, Mr. Chairman, that we have to wake up and increase our grants toward medical research or we are not only going to lose our status in the medical world but also our scientists will be lost to the United States and things will get worse. We can save ourselves money if we take an interest in this subject and in those engaged on medical re-

search in our country. In this way we can re-establish ourselves to the position which is ours. I say that today we are in a period of explosive scientific development. Do you realize, Mr. Chairman, that 90 per cent of all the scientists who ever lived in the world are alive today? That is a very striking statement but I have that on very good authority. Scientific developments and knowledge are increasing so rapidly that they are going ahead at lightning speed, and wealthy countries like Canada—and we are a wealthy country—must develop our scientific resources or we are going to lose them. We have everything here to work with. I say let us save our scientists for Canada. Let us save our prestige in the field of medicine. Let us save our medical schools and develop and maintain adequate research facilities. Let us pay adequate salaries to those willing to dedicate their lives to medical research in the interests of the welfare of human beings, and let us wake up to our urgent responsibilities. I ask the government to act now because tomorrow may be too late. In the interests of science and national economy let us extend our medical research facilities so as to preserve not only our scientists but also probably postpone the immediate necessity for building more medical schools.

Mr. McMillan: Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the minister and others in congratulating the deputy minister. I might say that Welland had an earlier attraction for him as he came often in his earlier days, and won the hand of his better half, who is a very fine lady.

I want to say a few words tonight about the necessity for an increased grant to the health league of Canada. The health league of Canada has served the country for 45 years or more and as far as I know it was the only organization of that type in Canada. Other organizations have been formed since, but they have been segmentations of public spirited individuals who have joined together into associations, groups and the like, and devoted their work to a more specific aspect of health.

There are many things one could say about the health league of Canada. I think it is the only voluntary organization devoted mainly to the prevention of disease rather than to its cure. It is the only voluntary health organization in Canada with a charter which is concerned with an all-embracing interest in personal and community health. It is also the only organization in Canada with experience in established policies and it is prepared to advance, either singly or in co-operation with other health agencies, the promotion of any new and improved health technique, thereby helping to improve the health of our people. I would suggest that the health league of Canada stands as a sentry in our society in respect of anything that may become a challenge to the best health treatment we can give. I can give one example of this fact. In my home town a few years ago the local anti-fluoridationists combined to have fluorine eliminated from our water supply. A vote was held and it was retained. The health league gave a great deal of assistance in this fight by supplying data, material and a great deal of other help. We preserved the practice of adding fluorine to our water, and this has certainly been beneficial to the condition of our children's teeth, and will continue to be so in the future.

Dr. Gordon Bates, head of the health league of Canada was the one man in the forefront promoting pasteurization of milk in Canada, as a result of which I am sure many lives have been saved. Dr. Bates was also in the forefront promoting the immunization of our citizens, although I know that many others were involved. The health league has done a great deal in promoting fluoridation of communal water supplies through the publication of its magazine and in other ways. I read an article about ten days ago in a Toronto newspaper which quoted a dentist as saying that the savings to the people in the city of Toronto alone as a result of fluoridation will in the future be as high as $1,200,000 per annum.

Mr. Chairman, grants from the federal government to the health league of Canada were at one time $25,000, although this has now been cut to $15,000. Since the period of that reduction the expenses of the health league have doubled as a result of increased postage charges on periodicals, which the league distributes, as well as the cost of raw materials and printing.

The voluntary health committee of the Senate and the House of Commons has received a great deal of co-operation from the health league of Canada as a result of the provision of speakers here at luncheon meetings, many of whom a great number of the members of this house have heard. I am sure we have all learned a great deal about the health league. The hon. member for Simcoe East was chairman of that health committee under the previous government, and I have

filled that position during the last year or so. Our meetings have been held often and I am sure the members of that committee realize that with the increased need of assistance, the federal government grants to this health league are not sufficient. During successive years this committee has passed resolutions, which have been presented both to the previous minister of national health and welfare, and to the present minister, suggesting that this annual grant should be increased. I appeal to the present minister, who always has a keen sense in respect of the need to increase general health in our country, to give favourable consideration to the requests to increase this annual grant.

Mr. Howe (Hamilton South): Mr. Chairman, I should like to rise during what is left of this doctors' night in the House of Commons and make a few remarks. Before I do I should like to explain the exuberance of our party during the last few minutes. In the last few minutes we have learned that Mr. Renwick has just been conceded as the winner in the by-election in the Toronto Riverdale riding.

At this time, if there was no mention of the Hall commission report, I think we would be remiss. With all the medical-social recommendations that it contains, a person in my position is forced to endorse this report and advocate its full acceptance without, I hope, its being torn to shreds when it is produced as legislation in the house. The recommendations, including medical education and research facilities, relate to some of the most important needs of the present day. However, tonight I am not dealing with this subject, but rather I am going to discuss one of Canada's significant minority groups—that of the mentally retarded.

I appreciate the fact that the minister in her opening remarks mentioned the work the government is doing in this regard, but I consider it of sufficient importance to emphasize certain points. In Canada today there are more than 540,000 retarded persons, representing some 3 per cent of the population. Another 6.7 per cent of the population may be described as borderline. Of our retarded people, 116,000 are between the ages of 3 and 19.

Retarded persons may be divided into three classes. The first group comprises the 4 per cent who will never exceed the mental age of 4, and will always be dependant. The next group includes the 13 per cent who may achieve a mental age of 8, and can be trained to be partially self-sustaining. The largest group is the 83 per cent who may reach a mental age of 12, and can be educated to be totally self-supporting. Of the 116,000 mentally retarded children in Canada, 96 per cent, or 111,000, are trainable. Yet only about 10 per cent of them are presently receiving training.

Dr. Donald Zarfas of the children's psychiatric research institute in London has said that prevention of retardation involves "prevention of deterioration in the retardate by helping him to overcome his handicaps as much as possible by good training programs." Education of the retarded is an expensive proposition. The cost of full time schooling is 400 to 600 per cent higher than for normal children, because of the special equipment, facilities and time required. It is estimated that day schools for 95,000 pupils, and boarding schools for another 10,000 are now needed. We must also provide for some 31,000 school-age children from rural areas. The cost of such a program, properly executed, could come to many millions of dollars, but surely we are practising false economy if we fail to spend this money.

Of those retardates who receive training, 83 per cent can be expected to support themselves, and another 13 per cent to support themselves to some extent. Ideally, only 4 per cent of the mentally retarded should be fully dependant.

In failing to provide adequate training, we fail to equip the retarded to support themselves, and thus render them dependant on public or private funds. The cost of supporting a dependant person through his lifetime is far in excess of the cost of the education that could and should be provided for him. Officials of the Canadian association of social workers state that retardation, in children and adults, forms one of their major problems in welfare work.

Beyond education itself, many other services must be provided. Diagnostic services are all important, so that mental retardation can be detected early and proper treatment instituted.

Home visiting services, vocational training, job placement services and recreational facilities are needed. Institutions for those who cannot live in the community are essential. At present some 18,000 persons are accommodated in 13 government supported institutions, all overcrowded. Another 19,000 retarded persons are in mental institutions; a highly unsatisfactory situation.

In order to carry out all these essential steps, more doctors, psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers, nurses, occupational therapists and educationists are needed, and

provision must be made for their training. Canada's objectives should be those of the World Health Organization, expressed as follows:

> All children irrespective of whether or not they suffer from mental or physical handicap, should have every access to the best medical diagnosis and treatment, allied therapeutic services, nursing and social services, education, vocational preparation, and employment. They should be able to satisfy fully the needs of their own personalities and become, as far as possible, independent and useful members of the community.

Beyond the problem of care is the problem of research in prevention of retardation. Here again, money spent now will mean a public saving in future years. To quote the World Health Organization again:

> Every child has the right to expect the greatest possible protection against the occurrence of preventable physical or mental handicap before, during and after birth.

To date research has uncovered more than 100 causes of mental retardation. Other projects are under way to determine the early manifestations of retardation so that preventive measures or treatment may begin early. Psychological research is investigating the personality disorders that frequently accompany retardation, and research into the best methods of training and treatment is being conducted. In her maiden speech the hon. member for Saskatoon suggested research into sheltered employment situations for the mentally ill and such research should also be pursued for the retarded. This research is going on under the severe handicap of lack of funds. We must provide for an intensified research program if we expect to diminish the problem of the retarded.

The Hall commission report has included among its first priorities the recommendation that services to retarded children be made available under the mental health services and the health grant programs. I would most strongly urge that the government approach the October federal-provincial conference on retardation with these recommendations in mind. We can no longer afford to ignore the problem of the retarded. I should like to conclude my remarks by reading a short quotation:

> Each of us is made up of the same 98 cents worth of chemistry, give or take a few cents depending upon inflation. The difference lies in abilities, not in feelings. Our retarded children have the same feelings of joy, sorrow, pain and fear as others and a few more of frustration. Comprehension is slower but they still want to be included and treated just as their more fortunate sisters, brothers and friends are treated.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Latulippe: Mr. Chairman, at this stage of the business of the house, I would be remiss if I did not stand up for the family, for its welfare, its needs and those of every individual.

The right to live is a strictly personal one. Life belongs to a person. The human person alone lives and has needs connected with the reality of life—every day, every month, and throughout the year. All the needs of each human being, whether they be material, spiritual or intellectual, may, in the present order of things, be met by means of one and the same instrument called money, or currency.

The inevitable conclusion is that this vital right is connected with the individual, and must follow the individual, if he is capable to administer his own life, or be paid to the head of the family or the institution responsible for that individual, if he is a dependant. The vital right, even in this case, remains a personal one, connected with the human person.

We also must inevitably conclude that, in a country of 19,200,000 people, there are necessarily 19,200,000 rights to live, ensuring to each human being a certain amount of money or currency to procure the goods or services strictly necessary to enable him to live—whether material, intellectual or spiritual.

And we come to another irrefutable conclusion: that vital right is natural and anterior to, or independent from, the capacity for work of each person, for its urgency applies in the same way to children, old and handicapped people, to the invalids, the sick, the blind, the students, the widows and mothers of families who are unable to work outside to earn their living, because it is their responsibility to work at home, and look after their children—their students or any other adult dependants.

The inevitable conclusion is that vital personal right, which at first sight seems to be of social, personal and family interest, becomes of national interest as soon as it has to be paid for in money, in cash—because only the national government of Canada holds the supreme authority on everything that has to do with money, its administration, its issuing, its circulation, its distribution to 19,200,000 human beings, in 4,700,000 families with children or dependants and to all the legal institutions, private or public, which have received from the governments administration charters. Only human beings exist, have the right to live; only human beings have life

and the right to existence before all institutions, even before families.

Families and institutions are groups of men constituted by nature or society to facilitate the material, intellectual and spiritual life of human beings. Only men have the right to live and are entitled to the necessities of life and to the amount of money with which they can each day, each week, each month and each year, purchase the goods and services which are vital for their survival.

In my opinion, all those who hear this simple speech and all those who will read it will have to accept that unavoidable conclusion within the framework of our present system of government. Thus, the right to live is a matter which concerns the individual, the family, society and the nation.

Society is based on the person, and the person is the unit element of society. The family is already an institution, the first institution, the closest to the human being, the most responsible for the human being, from conception, birth, during infancy, adolescence, youth and even during middle age—for the weak, the sick or the cripple. If the family is first responsible for the human being, this responsibility is unavoidably exercised within organized society—and in this organization of the society, everything concerning money and its circulation is under the sole control of the Canadian government at Ottawa.

The inevitable conclusion is that the Canadian government at Ottawa is responsible for the vital rights of the individual within the boundaries of Canada, because only the Canadian government has full control and full authority over the whole monetary, economic and political machinery within the boundaries of Canada.

Mr. Chairman, I think a few words should be said here about the importance of family allowances in our national economy, especially as an important part of the purchasing power of families. In keeping with the axiom "equal work, equal pay", it happens that both the single man and the family head get the same salary for the same work, that is, the same purchasing power. Now, inasmuch as he has a wife and children, the expenses of the head of a family are higher and require more purchasing power than those of a bachelor.

Governments have already thought of compensating for that difference by providing for income tax exemptions and certain family allowances, which simply proves that we are merely asking for corrections and adjustments in the figures laid down in the existing legislation, in order to make such legislation more efficient, in keeping with the spirit which prevailed when it was discussed and passed.

The following table will show without the shadow of a doubt that this problem exists and that it must be solved immediately for the greater benefit of the whole national economy.

Today the number of workers has reached seven million people, half of whom are unmarried or married people without children. We see on one side:

3,500,000	fathers
3,500,000	mothers
7,000,000	children
1,000,000	students
15,000,000	consumers

And on the other:

3,500,000	unmarried people
3,500,000	consumers

As the average salary is approximately $4,200 a year, we see on one side 15 million consumers living off the salary of 3,500,000 heads of family, and on the other, 3,500,000 consumers living off the salary of 3,500,000 unmarried or married people without children when the two spouses are in a position to work to earn a salary, such being the case with 80 per cent of young couples and even of couples who have brought up their families.

To show to what extent income tax exemptions and family allowances are inadequate to compare the family budget with that of the single person, one has only to examine the specific case of the head of an average family of five persons including three children earning all together average wages of $80 per week, that is $4,200 per year. How much more money will family allowances and the difference in income tax bring to the head of that family than to the single person who also earns $4,200?

A single person who earns $4,200 pays $458 in income tax after claiming his $1,000 exemption. Net income: $3,742. The head of a family who earns $4,200 pays $117 in income tax, after claiming his $2,000 exemption for himself and his wife and his $1,150 exemption for his three children, a 19 year-old student, a 14 year-old and an eight year-old. The 14 year-old child receives an allowance of $8 per month or $96 per year; the eight year-old child receives an allowance of $6 per month, or $72 per year. When this amount is added to the income we get $4,368 in

wages and allowances. $4,368 less $117 income tax leaves a net income of $4,251.

The net income of a father of three children, 19, 14 and eight years old, is $4,251, after he has paid $117 in income tax, whereas a bachelor who also earns $4,200 has a net income of $3,742, after he has paid $458 in income tax.

The difference in income tax and allowances gives to this head of family a net surplus of $509 to support his wife and his three dependant children. He gets $509 more for four more persons. That is $127.25 per annum for each person, or about $10.60 a month.

That, Mr. Chairman, is the naked truth. That is what the Minister of Finance believes to be the expression of economic justice between the people of this country.

Such is, Mr. Chairman and hon. members, what we are tolerating, what is taking place under our responsibility, our supreme monetary, economical and political authority in our parliament as well as in our national life. I would much rather have concealed those details instead of publishing them, so as to avoid the humiliation which is ours for having tolerated such an unfair situation for so long, for having delayed so long the small adjustment that has been necessary in our family allowances since their establishment in 1944, so as to restore a proper balance among the citizens who are assuming greater family responsibilities for the benefit of this country.

What are we going to do, Mr. Chairman, faced with these hard facts, with the sufferings and distress of our courageous heads of families who are never any further advanced after toiling for so many years and continually depriving themselves?

The time has come to clear up a situation which can no longer be tolerated.

I appreciate that we were not sufficiently aware of the situation, just as I know that it was not through ill will that we have put up with such a monstrosity, as the granting of $10 a month for the welfare of the wives and children of our fellow citizens who work year in and year out in prosperous plants, offices, schools, universities and elsewhere for the progress of our country. I know that the pleasure and joy caused by progress in other fields of the national economy have taken the attention away from a still more important factor, that of the human being in his normal environment, his family.

I am quite aware of the fact that the success of companies and institutions is both useful and necessary. Indeed, we have dedicated the last 20 wonderful years, that is since 1944, to them but it is high time that we turn our attention with the same enthusiasm and with the same measure of success to the needs of human beings in our regular and honest families which are always a tribute to life, love and fecundity. Are life, love and fecundity to be encouraged, tolerated or criticized—in our capitalistic yet Christian society? Within the family, must life, love and fecundity be considered as economically important as they are in the production of goods and in the field of material and physical achievements?

So, there is an enormous gap between the purchasing power of the father of a family and that of a bachelor or of a childless married couple. Fifteen million people must get by with an approximate total income of $14,700 million while the other 3,500,000 have an equivalent amount to spend.

As taxes are in a large measure hidden in the purchase price of goods, the taxpayer who is obliged to spend all his salary to support himself, his wife and children, pays his income tax and also the taxes included in the items purchased out of his salary, so that he spends each year 100 per cent of his income on vital expenditures and taxes.

On the other hand, unmarried or married people without children can save and put aside part of their income on which they do not pay taxes at the time of purchase. There lies the fundamental unfairness, unfairness which is not compensated either by tax exemptions or small family allowances which are not high enough and which are not granted to all dependants.

That is what must be especially recognized in the unfairness of burdens people have to bear.

The man who has more children to support has less revenues to put a roof over their heads, to feed them and to pay for their clothes and education. The man who has more children has less money and pays more taxes towards society. That is what should be realized and admitted. That is where, in the final analysis, adjustments should be made. That is the solution we are offering here. And everybody would benefit, because an increased purchasing power, according to the number of children, would promote everywhere a better distribution of goods, production and professional services, and would help business, industry, agriculture and the whole economic activity of the small and medium firms. The large firms themselves would benefit by this increased economic

activity in every sphere of the national economy.

After having realized how little compensation tax exemptions and family allowances represent on the income of the family heads, in comparison to the single people, when they earn an average salary of $80 a week, or $4,200 a year, what should we think now of wage earners who earn less than $80 a week; many wage earners earn only $40 a week, or $2,000 a year?

How about the small wage earner who does not earn enough to have his name appear on the roll of income taxpayers?

How about the people who earn less than $1,000 a year, for themselves and their wives, less than $550 a year for their children aged 16 years or over, and less than $300 a year for their children under 16 years old?

Do you think that these are just a few unfortunate people who should be ignored when we consider the population as a whole? There again, we fail to envisage reality if we do not pay attention to this.

Whether or not this surprises you, there are two million taxpayers whose names do not appear on the list of income taxpayers, out of seven million citizens who compose our labour force. Five million only appear on the list of personal income taxpayers, as there are about 80,000 companies appearing on the list of profit-earning corporations.

You may consult your Canada Year Book 1963-64, page 991—and you will have an idea of the distribution of income between Canadian citizens taking part in production and the income derived from their work or their capital. You can take from it the following details which put the situation in a nutshell:

First, 20 per cent, that is, 1.5 million persons, earn $6,000 or more a year, or $120 a week; second, 50 per cent, that is, 3.5 million persons, earn from $1,000 to $6,000 a year, or from $20 to $120 a week; third, nearly 30 per cent, that is, two million Canadians, earn less than the income tax exemption which would apply to them and their families.

Those are statistics given by the government in Ottawa. Now, am I the only one to come to those conclusions? Professor O. J. Firestone, a well-known figure in administrative circles in Ottawa, a member of the royal commission on health services, a professor and vice dean of social sciences at the University of Ottawa, made the following statement during the masterful speech he just made in Manitoba before business and labour leaders:

> Canadians pay a great deal of attention to the 300,000 unemployed, while ignoring almost entirely the 3,800,000 Canadians who live in poverty, whether they are unemployed or not.
>
> And this, even though Canada ranks second in the world for the highest per capita income and alternates with Sweden between second and third place for the highest standard of living.
>
> Those 3,800,000 Canadians, one out of five, 20 per cent of the population, have an income lower than the minimum necessary to buy the necessaries of life.

This statement adds nothing new to the reality of economic imbalance, of the iniquitous distribution of income and burdens of society in our prosperous and progressive Canada. This statement adds nothing new, but confirms once again an unfortunate situation which must be corrected as soon as possible.

That statement was made by a university authority acknowledged and appreciated by our Ottawa authorities, by our political leaders, since Mr. O. J. Firestone was a member of the royal commission on health services in Canada, whose report was submitted to the governor general in council in Ottawa in April 1964.

Do those statistics and reports not suggest that we do not live any better in Canada than in underdeveloped countries? Not any better than in South Africa? Not any better than in India, where there are 300 people per square mile, against six people per square mile here in Canada?

I feel it is high time to put an end to this unbearable situation which most members of this house deplore, even if the 26 powerful ministers go on ignoring it and pretending not to admit the real facts.

What did Mr. Mackenzie King, prime minister of Canada, say in 1944, during the debates in the House of Commons which preceded the passing of the Family Allowances Act? Our ministers might still in 1964 hear the words of that former Liberal prime minister, who can reproach them for having misunderstood his lesson and the spirit of the legislation sponsored on that occasion. Here is this statement which has been considered so important that it is reported in a work published by the International Labour Review, Vol. LXXV, No. 3, March 1957:

> Out of the citizens forming the labour force, 48 per cent are bachelors, 39 per cent of those who are married or widowers have no children under 16, and 40 per cent of those who have children under 16 have only one child.

It must be specified that 84 per cent of children under 16 are dependants of a fraction of only 19 per cent of the labour force.

To train the next generation is the responsibility of less than one fifth of the labour force and it is only fair that the expenses incurred be supported by all.

There might be an excuse if the general condition of the national economy required such a strict and faulty distribution of production and wealth. But no, this country of ours, Canada, is considered as the second nation in the world. But no, the following statistics will make it clear that if some people lack the necessaries of life, others enjoy prosperity and the security which it gives, while piling up surpluses, profits and capital that can be envied by the most ambitious capitalists in Canada and even in the world.

Here is, for instance, a few samples of the general prosperity in Canada with regard to great factors of the national economy and their constant progress between 1944 and 1964. Let us take the year 1944 because it coincides with a general survey of finance and banking that year and with the establishment of family allowances which have remained at the 1944 level while all other sectors increased three, four, five, six, eight or nine times.

Let us have a good look in order to see where and how the Canadian economy may be improved.

The principal ministers are responsible for this situation.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) has control over all the administration of the country and its citizens.

The Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau) has to keep watch mainly on economic justice, which concerns all citizens in the most sensitive material and physical areas: money, cash, the vital minimum purchasing power.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) controls all the monetary, economic and political machinery and procedures for levying taxes on incomes and profits. It is incumbent on him, especially, and on others also, to analyse the incomes, expenses and profits among citizens, families and institutions.

The Secretary of State (Mr. Lamontagne) keeps an eye on all the relations between the population and the ministers, and above all, he is an economist and understands professionally the significance of the primary financial needs, of the vital strict minimum for each citizen, as an individual, in the family circle and in the framework of the private and public institutions.

The Minister of Industry (Mr. Drury) knows very well that the whole of the production is intended for consumption and not for warehouses or capitalization. He knows also that the total purchasing power distributed among labour and among capital following production, directly affects only 7,000,000 citizens in Canada and leaves without income the 12,200,000 dependant citizens: children, students or adults unable to earn a living on account of age, illness or unemployment.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp) knows quite well that trade is going at a slow pace, because there is unemployment and even poverty, even among families where the head is working at a single man's salary. Equal work, equal pay.

Every line of business would be more prosperous and more efficient if each citizen were to receive as a matter of right a minimum living allowance, over and above his wages as head of family which he receives in return for his labour.

Those six ministers must examine this proposal and consider that it is a problem for which they are personally responsible. All 26 ministers would readily approve any decision thus taken. The Minister of National Health and Welfare would only have to distribute $30 instead of $6 and $8.

I understand that to bring up family allowances to the level of the cost of living in all economy sectors, they should be raised to $30 monthly.

[*Text*]

The Deputy Chairman: I must advise the hon. member that his time has expired.

Mr. Turner: Mr. Chairman, I do not need to remind the minister, charming as she always is, and especially at this time of the evening, that her department began in one room in 1944 under the administration of the late Brooke Claxton. I begin what remarks I have to contribute this evening by paying tribute to the late Brooke Claxton, and I want to say, as one of his successors in the riding of St. Lawrence-St. George in Montreal, which he represented for 14 years from 1940 until his retirement from politics in 1954, how pleased I am and how pleased the people of his former constituency, and indeed the population of the metropolis of Canada generally are that the new imposing building of the Department of National Health and Welfare, which is to be dedicated and opened on October 7, is to be named the Brooke Claxton building.

I am sure there is no one in the chamber, no matter what corner he sits in, who would fail to agree with me that Hon. Brooke Claxton was a great, industrious, tireless and dedicated Canadian, and that he left his mark upon our country. Further I want to tell the minister how much his family appreciate her courtesy in inviting John Claxton, his son, to officiate at the opening of the building.

I also rise this evening to make a plea to the minister, also to the Minister of Labour, and indeed to the government, to institute a national survey on the needs of the older people in Canada. As a start I might cite the senator from Toronto Spadina, who is the chairman of the committee of the other place on aging, that the most unorganized, helpless and forgotten section of any age group in Canada comprises the older citizens of 65 years and over.

Ideally the harvest of old age, if health is not impaired, should be freedom from worry, full enjoyment of well earned leisure, and opportunities to derive pleasure from hobbies and other pastimes; but I submit, Mr. Chairman, that we in Canada do not know how many of our older citizens are enjoying or sharing this harvest.

In the public mind individuals seem to be relegated to the old age group when they reach the age of 65 because it is the age when most of them retire. The age of retirement, because of the onrush of automation and the need to accelerate the turnover of the work force, is bound to be lowered and more and more of the population will be classified as retired. Today nearly 8 per cent of Canadians are 65 years of age or over, and this figure of approximately 1½ million people includes nearly one million who are recipients of the old age pension.

In an effort to acquire information on our older citizens a special committee of the other place has been sitting for many months. In that period it has received and studied briefs from many organizations, and on reading these briefs, as I am sure many hon. members have done, I have found much useful information. But almost all of the information which has come to light has dealt with the problem from an over-all group and general standpoint. It has not dealt with the specific problems of individuals who fall within the category of those who have left the work force and those who have retired. The report of that committee shows that there have been questions and answers about the possibility of establishing a federal department of aging, which would conceivably take over in this area part of the work now shared by the Department of Labour, the minister's Department of National Health and Welfare, the Department of Veterans Affairs and to a certain extent other departments.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Turner: Perhaps knowing the—

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Just one brief question. I do not want to delay his talk in any way but I do want to understand it. Do I follow him correctly when I understand him to be saying that he agrees with me that the old age pension should be paid to those 65 years of age instead of 70? Is that the point he is getting at in his brief remarks so far?

Mr. Turner: Mr. Chairman, I want to be as friendly as I can to the hon. member when I suggest to him that not only has he not listened to what I am attempting to say, but he has not yet quite seized the point. I want to urge upon him—

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Maybe I am a slight bit ahead of the hon. member, but that is what I gathered from his remarks and from reading between the lines of what he said.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. The hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George has the floor.

Mr. Turner: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to get into an argument with the hon. member whose contribution I listened to the other evening; I only hope that someone again pages him to the telephone this evening. Not only can the hon. member not read between the lines correctly, but at times I am not sure whether he can read the actual lines themselves. I would just ask him to bear with me on this particular problem.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): If I might intervene once more, I know—

Mr. Turner: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Horner (Acadia): —he does not wish to leave any incorrect impressions with me in his talk this evening.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. The hon. member is out of order. The hon. member for St. Lawrence-St George has the floor.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member does not want to leave any incorrect impression with me I am sure that one more brief question would set me clear.

The Deputy Chairman: Order.

Mr. Turner: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Horner (Acadia): One brief question.

Mr. Turner: Mr. Chairman, I would ask you to impose order on a rather exuberant member here.

I might say that not only were these questions directed to co-ordination by way of a federal department of aging, but provincial governments have been active in this field, as well as welfare agencies. Hundreds of senior citizens across the country have formed clubs and groups in the different provinces to organize recreational activities for older people. From experience in my own riding I would say that churches of various denominations have also done what they can for older citizens. I might mention that the Canadian welfare council is organizing a national conference on aging which is to be held in 1966.

While all of these efforts are most commendable and deserving of the highest praise, has this whole problem, I ask you, Mr. Chairman, been viewed in a proper perspective? Co-ordination of effort seems to be a desirable objective but it cannot be achieved until all parties concerned know what are the problems of the older persons as individuals—and I repeat individuals—and not as a group. There are hundreds and hundreds of reports, I am sure, in the minister's filing cabinets and in cabinets across the country, all of them dealing with some segment of the problems of the older citizens, but they are all written from the group standpoint.

We know, for instance, that it is almost impossible for a person who is 65 years of age or over to get employment. We also know that there are many reports prepared on the prospects of employment for older persons, but who knows how many of these persons need employment? Therefore, I am saying that specific information is needed rather than the generalities which have so far been compiled. This information must be available in Canada, either through governments or agencies, before we can make progressive headway with a solution to this problem. Such information would be invaluable if it were available, not only to the minister's department but to other agencies of government, and certainly for the purpose of the forthcoming national conference on aging; and it is essential if we are to achieve any concrete results.

Now, what are the problems of these older citizens? It is easy to provide or to suggest an all-inclusive or blanket answer, but I submit this would be inadequate because of the numbers, variety and complexity of our older people. If I can refer to the transcript of the Senate committee on aging, the Nuffield survey of old age conducted in Britain stated the position simply as this at page 59 of the report, that "all old people do not like the same things". In our studies in this country so far we have not been able to find factual material assembled on a national basis which collates and evaluates these problems. Therefore I submit that the only way to find out and to get a truly national picture is to ask the older people themselves, and it is for this reason that I suggest to the minister and to this committee that she inaugurate a national survey of the needs of the older people.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what am I proposing? I am proposing a nation-wide survey of Canadians who are 65 years of age and over. Why am I proposing this survey? I am proposing this so that the minister can find out what the problems are concerning these men and women in this age group. What are some of the problems? Financial insecurity and housing are two. If I might refer to the transcript again of the Senate committee on aging, it is reported at page 59 that:

> A study of housing for older people which is now in progress under Canadian welfare council auspices may be available in a few months, so I shall not deal further with low rental, self-contained accommodation which may be built, but I must emphasize the importance of suitable location.

Other problems are easy to find, and I am sure hon. members have had them brought to their attention in their capacity as members of parliament. There is for example the cost of illness, cost of drugs, cost of hospitalization, the need to augment income, inability to get employment. Despite the fact that he or she has arrived at the age of 60 or 65 years, a man or woman is still able and willing to work and deserves work. The reduced purchasing power of pensions is another problem. Then there is the domestic problem which arises after retirement. Any wife in such circumstances can testify to the difference in the domestic scene when a man who has been working for 40 or 45 years is suddenly compelled to spend most of his time at home. In addition, because there is a surplus of leisure time there is often an addiction to alcohol.

From what I have been able to learn during my brief experience in my constituency, it is suggested there is a difficulty among older women in readjustment when the retired husband spends all or most of his time at

home. There is an interference and dislocation of established normal habits in the home. There is resentment toward the restriction of personal freedom enjoyed before the husband retired. There is difficulty experienced in respect of the cost of accommodation and the inability to obtain employment. There are many problems affecting widows particularly, including the financial, hospitalization and the cost of drugs.

Mr. Chairman, you might ask me, as well might the minister and her advisers who look at me with some interest and perhaps some scepticism, what would be the value of such a survey? It would reveal on a national instead of a local or regional basis, what are the major and common problems among Canadians 65 years old and over. I submit with great sincerity to the minister that such a survey would result in the assembly of valuable and accurate statistical information. Such information could be the foundation on which the federal government could formulate a policy to deal with these problems. Has such a survey been made on a national basis, Mr. Chairman? To the best of my knowledge no such survey has been made.

I should like to quote from the evidence of Mrs. Jean Good, who appeared before the Senate committee on aging. At page 67 of that evidence, in answer to Senator Grosart, who asked the same question I have posed now, she said:

> I really do not know. This, as you mentioned, sir, requires investigation in Canada. We do not know enough about the cost of living.

Then Senator Roebuck said:

> What we should really be doing is searching around for what we can do or what we can recommend to be done, including an increase in the pension and everything else that might help the lot of the older citizen.

Then Senator Grosart again says:

> I think we should get at the facts.

Mr. Chairman, how would a survey be conducted? It could be conducted of course by co-ordinating other government agencies, and it might well be done under private auspices. I can anticipate the arguments of the advisers to the minister who are sitting before her. I know they would say at the moment that there is a committee in the other place in respect of aging; but the honourable senators who have sat on that committee, and the witnesses who have appeared before it, stated that the main problem was in assessing the needs of the aging. Assessing the needs of our so-called older citizens is difficult because of the lack of concrete information and facts. Of course the minister's advisers may well say, we are holding a national conference on aging in 1966, and that will take care of the problem. Surely this national convention will not prove to be of much value, or of as much value as it could have, unless it is able to operate on the basis of concrete information assembled between now and that time. I would therefore in this brief intervention urge the minister and her advisers, in co-operation perhaps with the Department of Labour, to institute on a national basis a survey of the older people of this country, to ascertain from their own mouths what their problems and needs are, and not impose upon them suggestions preconceived by experts, and preconceived by professions which deal, admittedly in a dedicated way, with their problems. We should ascertain in this way from their own mouths the hopes, frustrations and expectations of these citizens.

I am sure the minister has had this quotation of that great prime minister of Great Britain, Mr. Disraeli, drawn to her attention. He said, let us hope that the heritage of old age is not despair. This problem will become more and more direct, and it will be incumbent upon the minister as she proceeds with her duties to solve it. I urge her to give consideration to the suggestions I have made this evening.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Mr. Chairman, before the hon. member for Huron speaks I wonder whether I may be permitted to ask the hon. member who has just sat down one question? I asked him a question earlier in respect of reducing the pensionable age from 70 to 65, and he replied in the negative. I will put my question in this way. Can I then assume that he is against reducing the eligible age for old age pensions, or security, from 70 to 65? I should like the hon. member to put his position in this respect on record, and stop riding the fence.

Mr. Turner: I should like to thank the hon. member for his usual succinct question, and say to him that my reply to his earlier question was neither in the affirmative nor in the negative.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): You are riding the fence, then.

Mr. Turner: I would urge the hon. member to wait for the institution of the Canada pension plan, which I am sure will solve this difficulty to his satisfaction and mine.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): When will it be instituted? I should like to ask one more question,

Mr. Chairman. The hon. member is a good friend of mine, and I know he does not want to contribute in any way to a lengthy sitting or debate here in the house, but can he assure this house that the pension plan will be brought before us next week or sooner, or can he assure us that it will be presented on Monday, as I gather he indicated in his remarks?

Mr. Turner: I can assure the hon. member in answer to that question that the government will introduce this legislation with due haste. I can give no assurance about the treatment it will receive from the other side of this house.

Mr. Cardiff: Mr. Chairman, I should like to speak for a short time in respect of this item because I was a member of the committee which Hon. Waldo Monteith chaired.

Mr. Chairman, I think I am as good an example of health as anyone in the house, taking my age into consideration. I know some of the officials who are sitting before the minister at this moment and would like to make special reference to the lady who several years ago was private secretary to the then minister of defence Hon. T. L. Ralston.

At that time I had the privilege of being one of the junior members of this house and that was, as you will remember, during wartime. I went to Colonel Ralston's office in an attempt to get a boy released from the army. He was a married man, but because he was married after the deadline he was considered by the army to be single, and was drafted. This man had 250 acres of land and stock to look after. There was no one on his farm except his wife and his aged father to do the chores, and this was in February, during the winter. His wife and father asked me to try to get him released from the army so that he could look after his farm. I asked them whether this boy had asked for a postponement of his draft and they informed me that he had not, on the basis of information supplied by a neighbour to the effect that he would not be drafted because he was married. In any event he was drafted into the army and his father was attempting to do the chores on his own farm and on his son's farm.

As I suggested, I approached Colonel Ralston's office and found that he was not in Ottawa. I might say that Colonel Ralston was one of the finest members of parliament I have ever met. Colonel Ralston's secretary, the lady presently sitting before the Minister of National Health and Welfare, informed me that she could not get this young man out of the army, and that he was to be moved from Camp Borden to Red Deer, Alberta. I told her that he might just as well be released now before being moved to Red Deer, because I intended to get him out of the army and there would be the extra cost involved of bringing him back. She said: "What will I do"? I said, "Call the official and try to get him out". She did. They did not believe me. They sent an official down to the farm to see if I was telling the truth, and I was. He was given six months leave and was never back in the army again. That was an example of a good secretary.

I had a letter today from two elderly people between 65 and 70 years of age asking me if there was any chance of the government lowering the age to 65. They do not have much means of support and are not able to work. They were wondering if the age limit could be lowered to 65 and asked me to do all I could to have that done. They also asked whether the pension could not be raised from $75 to $100 a month because they said they have to pay rent and have very little means. I am passing this on the minister without making any comment whether it should or should not be done.

In the first instance however the old age pension was never intended to keep people alive but rather as assistance to them. In this day and age people seem to spend their money as they make it, and when they grow old and are not able to work they fall back on the mercy of the government. I do not know what we are going to do about this situation because it involves circumstances over which we have no control.

I want to speak for a moment about the Canada pension plan. As hon. members know, a Canada pension plan is to be brought forward. We have been trying for some time to have it introduced into the house but up to now we have not been very successful. The other day I was reminiscing in my office and I composed a little poem. I am sure the minister will not object to my reading it because it contains nothing detrimental to her.

Judy tried as best she could
With a pension plan she understood.
But when Pearson and Gordon got through with her script
Poor Judy's plan started to slip.
They mauled it around from pillar to post
'Til there's nothing left but a ghastly ghost.
They're on their fourth translated test
And it seems to me even worse than the rest.
The only hope I see for success
Is let the opposition bring in a test.

They've been a wonderful help in the past
And there isn't a doubt their plan would last.

I am only trying to help the minister. I always like to help ministers because I find that when I am in the opposition it is much better to try to get along with the ministers than to quarrel with them, and you get more satisfaction that way. Having nothing more to say I will be glad to sit down if there is another speaker to take up the time of the house from now until 10.30.

Mr. Slogan: Mr. Chairman, I hope I may be allowed a moment of jubilation at this time, as was the hon. member for Hamilton South when he informed the house that their party had been conceded victory in Toronto Riverdale, because I understand our party has been conceded victory in Windsor Sandwich, my birthplace.

Mr. Baldwin: That is good for the health of the nation.

Mr. Slogan: The only question at this time, of course, is where is the Liberal party headed, because they are the only ones who seem to have lost out.

The Chairman: Order. May I suggest that the hon. member revert to the business under consideration.

Mr. Slogan: Mr. Chairman, I should like to say that I was referring, of course, to the health of the Liberal party. I should like to congratulate the minister and all members of her staff. I congratulate the minister because I think she did a much better job in presenting her estimates today than she did in presenting her first version of the Canada pension plan. I suppose this only goes to show that one matures in office and that the minister and others on the front benches across the way perhaps realize now that they have no divine right to rule and that probably a bit of diplomacy is better than the tactics they followed in the past.

I should also like to congratulate the minister on the fact that she will be occupying new quarters shortly. I suppose we might refer to her as the penthouse queen because I understand she will be occupying the penthouse in this wonderful new building with a view of both Ontario and Quebec. Added to the fact that she already drives a Thunderbird, this is certainly a sign of affluence.

I do not want to say very much about the many items in these estimates. I associate myself with previous speakers who have spoken on specific subjects such as mental retardation, the aged, and physical fitness and sports. I am sure both the minister and I should lend our support to the physical fitness program because we are good examples of poor physical fitness. I should like to congratulate my confrere, the hon. member for Kamloops, on his speech regarding research grants in medicine.

I should like to say a word about the food and drugs committee of which I have been a member. I think the committee is doing valuable work and in my view Dr. Morrell and his staff are doing a wonderful job under somewhat trying circumstances. I hope the minister will pay heed to the recommendations which the committee will make with regard to increasing his staff and having to do with the conditions under which they work. As a personal observation I would say that although the food and drug directorate is doing a very good job, it seems to me their efforts are not as widespread as they might be and are not reaching those who could have a direct effect on the economics of prescription drugs. I refer to the individual doctor, dentist, veterinarian or druggist. To this end I have suggested in the committee that some improvements in the labelling and grading of drugs be made and I hope these suggestions will be reflected in the committee's report and that the minister will take some action on them.

I was one of those who supported youth allowances. I understand that some parents are under the impression that the cheques will be sent directly to the children. I would ask the minister to make clear to the house exactly what the mechanics of the administration of youth allowances will be and whether the amounts payable will become part of the family allowance cheques or whether separate cheques will be sent to the young people individually. It seems to me that if these cheques are sent to the young people individually the administration of the allowances will cost a great deal more, and I certainly see no reason why they should be handled in this way.

I should also like to congratulate the northern health services officials. In the northern part of my riding we have a number of health clinics which provide health services to the Indians and the local people. We also have two new hospitals in my riding. One is the fine new hospital at the new Whiteshell atomic energy research centre in Manitoba and the other is the new wing of the hospital at Pine Falls, built at a cost of half a million dollars. It is interesting that in this new wing Indian health services are being integrated with the general hospital

facilities in the community. I am proud to say that the people in the Pine Falls community have accepted this integration and perhaps this is a good portent for success in the future.

I want to congratulate the minister on her stand against smoking. As a member of the dental profession who has to clean people's teeth I want to wish her every success in this campaign against smoking. I might mention that at the recent convention of the Canadian dental association the minister's stand against smoking was endorsed and, as I say, we wish her every success in this undertaking.

My main purpose in speaking tonight, and I make no apology for it, is to bring to the attention of the house and the government some factors relating to dentistry as they apply to the federal government and the people of Canada. I make no apology for this because I did not hear anything in the minister's introductory remark about this subject, nor have I heard any of the various speakers mention the subject in discussing these estimates. I think the importance of dentistry to the community at large might be better appreciated if people realized that approximately 33 per cent of the amount of money spent on health services in Canada is spent on dental services. The latest figures which I have are for the year 1962 and they indicate that Canadians spent for these services some $395.2 million, and for dental services $132.4 million. This is a very significant sum of money. I mention it, Mr. Chairman, only because I want to relate this sum of money which, as I say, amounts to something like 33 per cent of the amount spent for health care services by the Canadian people to the amount of money allocated by the department to dental health programs and dental research.

I should like to say that only about 1 or 2 per cent of the amount of money allocated by the federal government under national health grants allocated to dental research. It seems to me that this is a negligible amount. In fact, in the last three years this amount has been decreasing. The percentage of money allocated for dental research as related to the expenditures on all health research in 1961-62 amounted to 1.79 per cent; in 1962-63, 1.42 per cent; 1963-64, 1.14 per cent. In the last three years, therefore, it can be seen there has been a steady decline in the relative amount of money that has been allocated by the federal government to dental research. The amount in dollars and cents was, in 1961-62, $67,911; 1962-63, $50,312; 1963-64, $48,009. We might compare this with the amount that was allocated in 1959-60 which was $164,264.

I note that the Canadian Dental Association has made representations to the minister in this matter, and I hope that before we leave the first item the minister will give us some indication of the action her department has taken toward alleviating the scarcity of funds for dental research. As I say, the Canadian dental association has made representations and I am sure the minister will realize it is urgent that this amount of money be increased. I should like to refer to the brief presented to the royal commission on health services by the Canadian dental association. In the introductory portion of the brief the association asserts, with regard to dental disease, that the unnecessary tragedy of dental diseases is one of Canada's greatest health problems. Dental diseases are largely preventive, yet they are virtually universal. Almost everyone needs dental care yet in any given year only one third of the population visits a dentist. At another point the brief states that, by their very nature, dental diseases defy defeat without widespread application of preventive medicine.

This brings me now to the fact that we need to spend a great deal more money on research in developing further preventive measures because we are dealing with a disease which is largely preventable. I am reminded of my second pet subject, that is fluoridation. Fluoridation, as a public health measure, is probably the least expensive that is practised in this country. I think it costs around 12 cents per year per person to fluoridate the water in any fair sized community. This is indeed a very small amount of money when we consider the amount of money I have already mentioned as being spent on dental health services in the country. This is one dental health preventive measure which I think should commend itself to the government. It is a field in which I feel the government should take leadership. As I said, dental diseases are largely preventable. Statistics have shown that among the children of dentists, dental caries are some 40 per cent to 50 per cent less than in the population as a whole. This I believe is attributable to better health knowledge and education. I feel that before the government rushes into medicare or rushes into the socialization of dentistry and medicine, they should assume responsibility in the fields where responsibility lies on their shoulders, that is in the field of dental education and medical education as well as the prevention field.

I feel that the federal government has been very remiss in this field. I believe that there is a great responsibility which they have failed to discharge. Before I conclude my remarks tomorrow I will show the government that it is incumbent upon them to assume a larger responsibility in this field.

May I call it 10.30 o'clock sir?

Mr. Monteith: I was just wondering if it might be agreeable to the house if the hon. member were allowed to continue his remarks this evening? I think we would be pleased to continue with the estimates of this department and try to conclude them this evening if that is agreeable to other members.

Mr. Knowles: We do not mind sitting for a little while, certainly to hear the rest of the hon. member's speech. However, there are some other members who wish to speak on this first item.

Progress reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Churchill: I should like to ask the house leader about the business for tomorrow.

Mr. Favreau: Tomorrow we intend to complete the discussion of the estimates of the Department of National Health and Welfare after which we will take up the estimates of the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys, to be followed by those of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration.

At 10.33 p.m. the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to special order.

APPENDIX

LETTERS TO PROVINCES RESPECTING CONTRACTING-OUT ARRANGEMENTS

A copy of letter sent to all provinces except Quebec.

Ottawa, August 15, 1964.

My dear Premier:

I refer to the discussions on contracting-out arrangements for conditional grant and shared cost programs which took place in Ottawa on June 8 and 9. These discussions were, as you know, initiated at the request of the Quebec government, pursuant to the decision of the federal-provincial conference held in Quebec city from March 31 to April 2, 1964.

At the June meeting, our representatives sought to find an approach which would fulfil two conditions: first, it would be equally available to all provinces; and second, it would not interfere with provinces maintaining the existing arrangements for conditional grant and shared cost programs.

I should now like to review with you the conclusions we have reached subsequent to these consultations. I believe that these provide a satisfactory basis for the agreement which it is proposed to make with the Quebec government. We are prepared to make an arrangement on a similar basis with any province which so wishes.

It has been mutually agreed that it would be desirable to provide initially for an interim or transitional arrangement. Under such an interim arrangement, the province would maintain its present obligations in respect of programs which would be eligible for contracting-out. It would, in particular, continue to provide the services envisaged in them and to furnish to the federal government an accounting of the expenditures incurred under the programs. On the other hand, the federal contribution would, depending on the nature and size of each program, take the form either of equalized personal income tax abatements subject to adjustments, or of cash payments. The length of the interim period would vary depending also on the circumstances of each program. More permanent contracting-out arrangements would be the subject of further negotiations at the appropriate time, taking into account, among other factors, the experience acquired during the interim period and such recommendations as the tax structure committee might formulate in the meantime on the subject of conditional grant and shared cost programs. Such arrangements might well prove to be part of a new approach to fiscal arrangements commencing in 1967.

The programs which it is proposed should be eligible for contracting-out fall into two categories. The first includes continuing programs which are concerned primarily with social objectives. Excluded from this category are programs involving non-recurring projects, such as capital, research and demonstration projects. The second category includes a group of programs which are expected to be of limited duration.

It has been recognized from the beginning that the contracting-out arrangements that might be agreed between the federal and Quebec governments should be such as to be readily applicable to any province that might wish to avail itself of them. It was agreed furthermore that a contracting-out province would, during the interim period and subsequently, continue to participate in federal-provincial bodies and meetings established for the purposes of consultation and co-ordination in fields of activity where contracting-out would apply.

As regards the compensation, it was established that it would, normally, take the form of equalized personal income tax abatements in the case of well established programs which could be expected to continue indefinitely, and the form of cash payments in the case of smaller programs which might not be expected to continue indefinitely.

More specifically, it is proposed that:

A. Among the programs to which contracting-out would not apply are the following:

1. Capital programs: (a) Trans-Canada highway; (b) Railway grade crossing; (c) Vocational training, capital assistance; (d) ARDA; (e) Municipal winter works.

2. Current programs: (a) Grants to 4-H clubs; (b) Grants to special fairs; (c) compensation for animal disease losses; (d) crop insurance; (e) Farm labour agreement; (f) Health grants (research and demonstration projects; (g) Public health research grant; (h) Training of unemployed; (i) Training in

co-operation with industry; (j) Fisheries industries development.

3. Emergency measures.

4. Centennial of confederation.

B. The following continuing programs, which involve primarily social objectives, would be suitable for contracting-out in return for a total compensation as indicated in the form of abatement of the federal income tax by a specified percentage, together with equalization to equate the yield of each percentage point to the average of the two provinces where it is highest. If programs involving a single abatement point were the only ones to which contracting-out applied, compensation could take the form of a lump sum payment. In all cases the compensation would be subject to adjustments to bring the compensation to equal actual audited expenditures, and on the understanding that all the other conditions of the program would be maintained during the interim period:

(a) Hospital insurance: interim period until December 31, 1970; compensation to amount to 14 points;

(b) Old age assistance, blind persons allowances, disabled persons allowances, unemployment assistance; compensation for the three categorical welfare programs to amount to 2 points; the "base load" or welfare portion of unemployment assistance to be represented by an equalized abatement of 2 points on personal income tax, and remaining or unemployment portion to continue on present basis; length of the interim period for four welfare programs to be governed by the timing of the establishment by the federal government of an integrated program of public assistance and, in any event, not to go beyond March 31, 1970;

(c) Vocational training: Student aid, vocational high school training, technician training, trade and occupational training (except those elements of the program which are agreed to be concerned with members of the labour force receiving further training), training of disabled, correspondence courses, training of technical teachers; interim period until March 31, 1967; compensation to amount to 1 point;

(d) Health grants (excluding research and demonstration projects): general public health, tuberculosis control, mental health, professional training, cancer control, medical rehabilitation and crippled children, child and maternal health, disability advisory services, Blind pensioners treatment; interim period until March 31, 1967; compensation to amount to 1 point.

C. The following programs would be suitable for contracting-out for cash compensation on the understanding that a contracting-out province would agree to continue to carry on a program of this nature during the interim period, and that the federal government would reserve the right to terminate the program in respect of which contracting-out is arranged at the expiration of the interim period:

(a) Agricultural lime assistance (March 31, 1967); (b) Premium on pure bred sires (March 31, 1967); (c) Forestry agreements (March 31, 1967); (d) Hospital construction (March 31, 1968); (e) Campgrounds and picnic areas (March 31, 1967); (f) Roads to resources (Payment of remaining entitlement under the program.

It is the intention of the federal government to introduce legislation to implement the above proposals as early as possible after the resumption of parliament in the autumn of this year. If your government has in mind the conclusion of arrangements along the lines we expect to be entering into with Quebec, I should appreciate it if you could let me know at your earliest convenience.

In developing these proposals, Mr. Premier, my colleagues and I have sought to find a formula which will meet, as far as possible, the various views which were expressed at the federal-provincial conference last March. For a province which wishes, in the exercise of its constitutional powers, to contract-out of all of the continuing programs I have referred to above one alternative is provided. For the province which wishes to receive lump sum payments for certain specific programs another alternative is provided. By means of this approach we hope a formula has been developed, to prevail during the period that our tax structure committee is at work, which is responsive to the necessities of Canadian federalism today and which, at the same time, will give the tax structure committee the maximum scope for its deliberations about longer-term arrangements.

Yours sincerely,
L. B. PEARSON

A copy of letter sent to Quebec.

Ottawa, August 15, 1964.

The Honourable Jean Lesage, P.C., M.L.A.,
Prime Minister of Quebec,
Quebec, P.Q.

My dear Prime Minister:

I refer to the discussions on contracting-out arrangements for conditional grant and

shared cost programs which took place in Ottawa on June 8 and 9, 1964, pursuant to the decision of the federal-provincial conference held in Quebec city from March 31 to April 2, 1964. I should like now to review with you the conclusions which emerged from these discussions in respect of the programs in which Quebec is at present participating. These conclusions are acceptable to me and my colleagues, and I submit them to you for your consideration and concurrence.

Our two governments are agreed, I believe, that it would be desirable to provide initially for an interim or transitional arrangement. Under such an interim arrangement, the province would maintain its present obligations in respect of programs which would be eligible for contracting-out. It would, in particular, continue to provide the services envisaged in them and to furnish to the federal government an accounting of the expenditures incurred under the programs. On the other hand, the federal contribution would, depending on the nature and size of each program, take the form either of equalized personal income tax abatements, subject to adjustments, or of cash payments. The length of the interim period would vary depending also on the circumstances of each program. More permanent contracting-out arrangements would be the subject of further negotiations at the appropriate time, taking into account, among other factors, the experience acquired during the interim period and such recommendations as the tax structure committee might formulate in the meantime on the subject of conditional grant and shared cost programmes. Such arrangements might well prove to be part of a new approach to fiscal arrangements commencing in 1967.

The programs which the representatives of our two governments agreed would be eligible for contracting-out fall into two categories, it seems to me. The first includes continuing programs which are concerned primarily with social objectives. Excluded from this category are programs involving non-recurring projects, such as capital, research, and demonstration projects. The second category includes a group of programs which are expected to be of limited duration.

It has been recognized from the beginning that the contracting-out arrangements that might be agreed between the federal and Quebec governments should be such as to be readily applicable to any province that might wish to avail itself of them. It was agreed furthermore that a contracting-out province would, during the interim period and subsequently, continue to participate in federal-provincial bodies and meetings established for the purposes of consultation and co-ordination in fields of activity where contracting-out would apply.

As regards the compensation, it was established that it would normally take the form of equalized personal income tax abatements in the case of well established programs which could be expected to continue indefinitely, and the form of cash payments in the case of smaller programs which might not be expected to continue indefinitely.

More specifically, it is proposed that:

A. Among the programs to which contracting-out would not apply are the following:

1. Capital programs: (a) Trans-Canada highway; (b) Railway grade crossing; (c) Vocational training, capital assistance; (d) ARDA; (e) Municipal winter works.

2. Current programs: (a) Grants to 4-H clubs; (b) Grants to special fairs; (c) Compensation for animal diseases losses; (d) Crop insurance; (e) Farm labour agreement; (f) Health grants (research and demonstration projects); (g) Public health research grant; (h) Training of unemployed; (i) Training in co-operation with industry; (j) Fisheries industries development.

3. Emergency measures.

4. Centennial of confederation.

B. The following continuing programs, which involve primarily social objectives, would be suitable for contracting-out in return for compensation as indicated in the form of abatement of the federal income tax by a specified percentage, together with equalization to equate the yield of each percentage point to the average of the two provinces where it is highest. If programs involving a single abatement point were the only ones to which contracting-out applied, compensation could take the form of a lump sum payment. In all cases the compensation would be subject to adjustments to bring the compensation to equal actual audited expenditures, and on the understanding that all the other conditions of the programs would be maintained during the interim period:

(a) Hospital insurance: interim period until December 31, 1970; compensation to amount to 14 points;

(b) Old age assistance, blind persons allowances, disabled persons allowances, unemployment assistance: compensation for the

three categorical welfare programs to amount to 2 points; the "base load" or welfare portion of unemployment assistance to be represented by an equalized abatement of 2 points on personal income tax, and remaining or unemployment portion to continue on present basis; length of the interim period for four welfare programs to be governed by the timing of the establishment by the federal government of an integrated program of public assistance and, in any event, not to go beyond March 31, 1970;

(c) Vocational training: student aid, vocational high school training, technician training, trade and occupational training (except those elements of the program which are agreed to be concerned with members of the labour force receiving further training), training of disabled, correspondence courses, training of technical teachers: interim period until March 31, 1967; compensation to amount to 1 point;

(d) Health grants (excluding research and demonstration projects): General public health, tuberculosis control, mental health, professional training, cancer control, medical rehabilitation and crippled children, child and maternal health, disability advisory services, blind pensioners treatment: interim period until March 31, 1967; compensation to amount to 1 point.

C. The following programs would be suitable for contracting-out for cash compensation on the understanding that the province would agree to continue to carry on a program of this nature during the interim period, and that the federal government would reserve the right to terminate the program in respect of which contracting-out is arranged at the expiration of the interim period:

(a) Agricultural lime assistance (March 31, 1967) (b) Premium on pure bred sires (March 31, 1967) (c) Forestry agreements (March 31, 1967) (d) Hospital construction (March 31, 1968) (e) Camp grounds and picnic areas (March 31, 1967) (f) Roads to resources (payment of remaining entitlement under the program).

It is the intention of the federal government to introduce legislation to implement the above proposals as early as possible after the resumption of parliament in the autumn of this year. I should therefore be grateful if you would confirm your concurrence in them at your earliest convenience. It would be the intention of the government in the legislation both to authorize the interim agreement and to make the necessary changes in the income tax acts.

May I say, Mr. Prime Minister, that in discussing the above proposals with your representatives, we have sought to find a formula which will meet, as far as possible, the various views which were expressed at the federal-provincial conference last March. As a result of our discussions, it will be possible for a province which wishes, in the exercise of its constitutional powers, to contract-out of all of the continuing programs I have referred to above. For the province which wishes to receive lump sum payments for only a limited number of programs another alternative is provided.

We trust that the formula we have developed, to prevail during the period which our tax structure committee is at work, will be found to be responsive to the necessities of Canadian federalism today and will, at the same time, give the tax structure committee the maximum scope for its deliberations concerning longer-term arrangements.

Yours sincerely,
L. B. PEARSON

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, September 11, 1964

The house met at 10.30 a.m.

IMMIGRATION

STATEMENT ON CHINESE STATUS ADJUSTMENT AND AMNESTY PROGRAM

Hon. René Tremblay (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, further to my recent statement in the house regarding Chinese immigration, and because of certain references outside the house to this subject, some questions have arisen as to the detailed application of the points I set forth.

I had spoken of a proposed termination date for status adjustment statements offered by Chinese immigrants who had committed immigration offences. It had been planned to terminate the effective date of such statements as of September 1, 1964, but subsequently I extended the time until further notice. Since my observations in the house on this subject on August 14, more than 2,500 Chinese have come forward to offer status adjustment statements.

My references at that time to the status adjustment statements had led to questions about the Chinese amnesty program, which is related to the status adjustment matter but is by no means the same thing. Status adjustment statements comprise the vehicle or the means by which certain Chinese have been able to avail themselves of the amnesty. To remove any grounds for misunderstanding I wish to explain the precise nature of the Chinese amnesty as it has been applied during the past several years.

On June 9, 1960 the government announced an amnesty effective July 1, 1960, covering illegal Chinese immigrants in Canada and also those who entered posing as Canadian citizens. It was clearly stated that the amnesty did not apply to those who had engaged in illegal immigration for a profit, or to those who helped others than their own relatives to enter Canada illegally.

On November 16, 1962 the minister of citizenship and immigration announced that much simplified procedures were being instituted to enable Chinese to make voluntary statements more readily. He reiterated that only those who entered before July 1, 1960 were eligible to take advantage of the amnesty. He warned that Chinese making false affidavits would be prosecuted and would be debarred from sponsoring relatives or other intending immigrants to Canada.

It will be evident that the amnesty of 1960 applied only to those offences committed before July 1, 1960. However, successive ministers have been relatively lenient with Chinese whose immigration offences occurred since 1960, even if they did not fall within the 1960 amnesty program. This period of tolerance has lasted more than four years, and I am sure all hon. members will agree that it cannot continue unduly long without seriously weakening the application of, and the respect for, our laws.

While the government has not authorized a new amnesty program, as such, beyond that of 1960, I wish to say to those Chinese who have entered Canada illegally or committed immigration offences between July 1, 1960, and September 1, 1964 that I intend to continue to be as understanding as has been the case during the past four years. I invite Chinese affected to continue to come forward to complete voluntary statements. All cases of offenders, whether they become known through these voluntary statements or otherwise, will be sympathetically reviewed. However, the government must reserve the right to prosecute for serious offences committed during this period, such as those involving immigration agents and racketeers.

I have covered the authorized procedures affecting those committing immigration offences before 1960 who may take advantage of the 1960 amnesty. I have gone on to review the situation of those affected by offences committed between July, 1960 and September, 1964 who, with the exceptions noted, will be treated tolerantly and sympathetically. For those Chinese entering illegally or committing immigration offences from September 1, 1964 onward, I must state now that their cases will be treated precisely as would those of any other racial group, and the immigration laws must be fully applicable to them.

Voluntary statements will continue to be received in the meantime from Chinese com-

mitting immigration offences prior to September 1, 1964 who wish to regularize their status in Canada, but a date to conclude receipt of such statements must be determined before too long. Appropriate notice will be given when such a termination date is decided upon.

Mr. Eric A. Winkler (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, we are pleased to hear the statement of the minister as it applies to the people concerned. We were surprised, of course, by the announcement that was made by the Postmaster General in Vancouver some time prior to this statement this morning, as reported by the Canadian Press in yesterday's Ottawa *Citizen*. The statement made by the Postmaster General in Vancouver is reported in this dispatch in part as follows:

> This means that even "ship-jumping sailors or those who came in with forged passports or other means" will be granted amnesty if they step forward and declare their status—

I am wondering whether this will apply to other nationalities, particularly in the case of people who have made application for Canadian citizenship and who are in the country on non-permanent visas, against whom orders to return to their native lands have been registered. Will this include that group of people, or how far is this going to extend?

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to commend the minister for the statement he has made with regard to the amnesty being extended beyond September 1. I agree with the minister, and I think the proposal he has outlined is the most satisfactory way to handle the situation. I should like to express the hope, however, that when the minister decides to terminate this arrangement and set a deadline there will be at least a month or six weeks' notice given so we will not have a rush at the last minute, or people claiming they were not informed of the fact that there was a cut-off date. Perhaps if notice were given 30 days ahead of the actual deadline it would be most helpful.

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the point just raised I should like to say that in fact there was no announcement or statement made by the Postmaster General in Vancouver. Since I was going to be in Vancouver for our summer vacation over the Labour day week end, and having received a number of telephone calls, telegrams and inquiries as to the significance of the statement made by my colleague the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration on August 19, I agreed to meet while in Vancouver with representatives of the Chinese Canadian community and more particularly with the Chinese language press on Saturday afternoon of last week to answer any questions they might wish to put to me arising out of the minister's statement of August 19. This I did, and the question about ship jumpers came up during the discussion.

[*Later:*]

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (Queens-Lunenburg): Mr. Speaker, I have a further question for the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. I am sure all of us were interested in his statement this morning regarding the granting of a general amnesty to the Chinese. The hon. member for Grey-Bruce posed a direct question to the minister with regard to those of other nationalities who may be in this country under similar circumstances, and the minister has not answered that question. Will a general amnesty be granted to other nationals who are in this country under the same conditions as the Chinese?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Speaker, I would point out that the decision of the government was not to extend the amnesty period, since this tolerance policy had been established under the previous government. This amnesty period only applied to people who came to Canada prior to 1960. In any case, the extension of this amnesty period or tolerance, as it is called, had been decided upon by successive ministers under the former government, including Mr. Bell, and was continued under the present Liberal government by Hon. Mr. Favreau and myself, and September 1, 1964, marked the end of that tolerance period. Consequently, this government did not take any step or decision to extend the amnesty period in the case of Chinese, since the amnesty was already in existence prior to 1960 and, in any case, a tolerance existed under the former government as well as under this government. This period of amnesty ended on September 1, 1964.

To give a more direct answer to the hon. member, I will say that the government has no intention to extend to other groups in Canada the policy applied to the Chinese under the former government.

[*Text*]

[*Later:*]

Mr. Barry Mather (New Westminster): I have a question for the Minister of Citizen-

ship and Immigration which is related somewhat to the questions asked of him earlier. I wonder if his attention has been called to a decision of the United Church of Canada yesterday to request a basic review of Canada's immigration policy. If so, will he say whether he will consider acceding to that request?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tremblay: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of that suggestion. I will study it and will then be in a position to give my views to the hon. member.

[*Text*]

DOMINION-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

CONTINUATION OF PRESENT PROVISIONS RESPECTING SHARED PROGRAMS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Prime Minister a question about the letter to the provinces he tabled yesterday with regard to opting out of federal-provincial programs. I am not so much concerned about the smaller programs, but I am concerned about major programs such as hospital insurance, old age assistance, blind persons allowances and disabled persons allowances. I should like to ask the Prime Minister a question with regard to these words in his letter to the prime minister of Quebec, as found on page 7875 of *Hansard*:

> ...and on the understanding that all the other conditions of the programs would be maintained during the interim period.

Does this mean the house can be assured that the reciprocity provision will be continued and that uniformity with respect to eligibility will be continued in all these programs?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, that is my understanding, but this is a very important matter and I should like to look into it and confirm that understanding Monday.

Mr. Douglas: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will there definitely be legislation to deal with this matter this fall; and can the Prime Minister also tell the house later, if not now, what is the total amount of money involved in these transfers and in this opting out provision?

Mr. Pearson: With respect to the first question, we hope there will be legislation dealing with this matter this autumn. In reply to the second part of the question, I do not have the figure here but I will be glad to get it.

GRAIN

MOOSE JAW, SASK.—OPERATION OF GRAIN DRYING FACILITIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. E. Pascoe (Moose Jaw-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture, who has jurisdiction over the board of grain commissioners. Wheat board quotations indicate a big price spread between dry and tough and damp grain. There will be a large amount of tough and damp grain in the west because of rain and snow on the prairies, also resulting from the new limitations on grain moisture content.

There is a large government elevator at Moose Jaw, Saskatchewan, with modern equipment for drying grain. Will the minister take steps to arrange for the operation of the elevator's grain drying facilities at full capacity so the tough and damp grain can be put into condition for marketing or storing?

Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture): I will be pleased to bring the hon. member's request to the attention of the board of grain commissioners.

INQUIRY AS TO DELIVERY QUOTAS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Lawrence Watson (Assiniboia): I have a question for the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Can the hon. gentleman tell the house the reason for the delay in having all delivery points in western Canada placed on an initial 1 bushel quota, and can he inform us when the Canadian wheat board expects to have all points in western Canada on a 1 bushel quota or better?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): The wheat board is already moving ahead rapidly in the opening up of quotas. I am not in a position to say when a 1 bushel quota will be established everywhere, but I have been in touch with the board—indeed, a member of the board is here today—and I will be discussing the suggestion made by the hon. member.

Mr. Watson (Assiniboia): Will the minister inform the house, after he has talked with officials of the board, when it is expected that a 1 bushel quota will be established?

Mr. Sharp: I will try to make a statement as soon as possible after I have some information to provide to the house.

Inquiries of the Ministry

INDUSTRY

NUMBER OF INFORMATION OFFICERS TO BE ENGAGED BY DEPARTMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington South): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry. Would the minister care to confirm or deny that his department has hired or will be hiring 35 information officers, thereby establishing a ratio of one information officer to 18 officials?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): I can deny that the Department of Industry will be hiring 35 information officers. There is no such establishment provided, planned or approved.

Mr. Hales: May I ask a supplementary question. How many information officers does the department propose to hire?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, I have not got the exact figures before me this morning. I will be glad to make a statement on this on Monday.

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South): May I ask a supplementary question of the Minister of Industry. I understood the minister to say in reply to the first question that there was no establishment for information officers. Then in reply to the supplementary question he said he would be glad to make a statement on this subject. I should like the minister to clear up this point. If there is no establishment how can he make a statement on the subject?

Mr. Drury: I am sorry if I did not make myself clear. I said there was no establishment for 35 information officers.

QUEBEC—DISCUSSIONS RESPECTING ESTABLISHMENT OF AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRIES

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lake St. John): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Industry?

The director of Quebec's General Investment Corporation, Mr. Gérard Filion, who is now in Paris to arrange for the Peugeot firm to settle here soon, has stated that such a probable and possible move is hindered by the tariff concessions granted to that firm on parts it would have to import into Canada to assemble automobiles.

Is the minister in a position to tell us if his department or the Department of Finance intend to grant that firm the same tariff concessions that were granted to the Volvo firm when it settled in Halifax?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can confirm that the government is willing to grant the company represented by Mr. Filion tariff concessions equivalent to those granted the Volvo company.

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

Could the minister say whether other automobile manufacturers who are against the coming of that French company to Canada and to Quebec especially have brought pressure to bear? Have Chrysler, Ford or General Motors objected to the granting of tariff concessions to that company?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, I must explain that the proposed concessions will be of a temporary nature only. Consequently, Chrysler, Ford and General Motors would not be justified in asking for the same concessions since they have been in Canada for a long time.

[*Text*]

FINANCE

MISCALCULATION OF FEDERAL REVENUES BY MINISTER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): I have a question for the Acting Minister of Finance based on a report as to the present revenue position of the government. Can the minister indicate whether current figures suggest that the Minister of Finance, in his last budget, miscalculated the revenue that would be received by the government?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Acting Minister of Finance): I have read the articles referred to by the hon. member. I know the house will be happy to learn that the Minister of Finance has miscalculated the revenues, because the country is even more prosperous than he had expected at the time the budget was brought down.

Mr. Crouse: You inherited a very good economy.

Mr. Sharp: May I add, however, that the degree of improvement in the revenue position which is suggested in the articles, particularly the one in the *Financial Post,* is much exaggerated.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

LA MACAZA, QUE.—TREATMENT OF PEACE DEMONSTRATORS BY R.C.A.F. POLICE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. William Dean Howe (Hamilton South): Mr. Speaker, I would like to redirect a question to the Associate Minister of National Defence. Is the minister now in a position to answer the question I asked yesterday regarding the actions of the R.C.A.F. police at La Macaza?

Hon. Lucien Cardin (Associate Minister of National Defence): Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I want to thank the hon. member for having sent me a copy of the newspaper article on which he apparently based his question.

I have had an opportunity to get a report on the allegations contained in the news article, and I can inform the hon. member that the allegations are false. The demonstrators attempted to block the main entrance to R.C.A.F. station La Macaza and, in order to allow vehicles to enter the station, some of these demonstrators, having refused to permit free passage of the vehicles, were removed by R.C.A.F. personnel, with a minimum of force, to the side of the road. I understand the R.C.A.F. personnel involved showed great patience and restraint in carrying out their duty, and under the circumstances I do not feel that an apology is necessary.

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON REORGANIZATION OF MILITIA

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): I should like to ask the Associate Minister of National Defence whether he is prepared to make a statement to the house concerning the proposed reorganization of the Canadian militia. Will the minister indicate to the house what units of the Canadian militia are to be discontinued?

Hon. Lucien Cardin (Associate Minister of National Defence): It was made clear, Mr. Speaker, both to the house and to the committee, that the department is now studying the reorganization of the militia and that early in October a full statement will be made on that subject.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary question could I ask the Associate Minister of National Defence to inform the house whether the Winnipeg Rifles will be continued in the militia, or will it be one of the battalions which are to be disbanded?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Cardin: Mr. Speaker, I do not think I should start going over the list of the militia units which are to be retained and those which are to be withdrawn. I think the best thing to do is to wait until I can make a complete statement on this matter in October.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

INDIA—INQUIRY AS TO INCREASED FOOD SHIPMENTS FROM CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Yesterday the United States department of agriculture announced it will be sending a team of technicians to India to assist in stepping up what they call their food for peace program, to reach delivery of 600,000 tons per month to that country. In view of the fact that on several occasions the minister has announced that Canada intends to increase her foreign aid contribution to something like $40 million a year, is he prepared to make an announcement soon since there is obviously an urgent need for increased food shipments to that part of the world?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, the government has already announced a very substantial increase in shipments of food under our aid program. I think this announcement was made either by the Secretary of State for External Affairs or myself, or by both of us. We have been in touch with the Indian authorities, and we have made it quite clear that if, for example, some additional shipments of grain from Canada would be helpful in this emergency we would be happy to supply them.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): As a supplementary question, if any assistance is given to India would this be in addition to the commitments we have already made under the Colombo plan?

Mr. Sharp: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Shipments under the Colombo plan are now proceeding, and what we are talking about is additional shipments if the government of India requests them. I did not want to suggest in anything I said that India would necessarily ask for it. To date the Indian government has made no request. But we are in touch to make sure that if there is any way in which we can be helpful we stand ready to be helpful.

Inquiries of the Ministry

CASTLEGAR, B.C.—INVITATION TO PRIME MINISTER AND U.S. PRESIDENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): I wish to address a question to the Prime Minister, based on a telegram I have just received. I will read the telegram before asking the question.

Since the Prime Minister of Canada and the President of the United States will be viewing the Columbia river basin by air on Wednesday next and since Castlegar has an airport within three miles of the high Arrow which has been the most controversial of these sites, we the council of the village of Castlegar would be pleased through you to extend to them an invitation to land here and view the dam site at first hand and we would be honoured and pleased to make all arrangements.

My question is, will the Prime Minister accept this invitation and opportunity to meet some of the residents of the Arrow lakes on this occasion?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Nothing would give me greater pleasure, but I doubt whether the timetable for next Wednesday would permit it. We would only be in or over British Columbia for a very few hours. Incidentally, I should like to extend a very warm invitation to the hon. gentleman to be with us on this occasion.

MALAYSIA—INQUIRY AS TO COMMONWEALTH ASSISTANCE

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): I should like to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs, who I am sure does not wish to be neglected during the question period, whether he has an answer to my question of yesterday concerning the aid being given to Malaysia by other commonwealth countries.

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I am sure that in asking this question the hon. gentleman was moved only by altruistic motives, and I greatly appreciate this. I have looked at the response I made, and I think it is a complete answer. However, when the commission from Malaysia now touring the United States comes here there may be something further to add.

Mr. Churchill: The minister has not yet answered a question I have now asked for the third time. What aid is being given to Malaysia by commonwealth countries other than Canada? Must I rely for information on articles appearing in the *Globe and Mail* or in the London *Times*, on which the hon. gentleman cast some doubt the other day? Could we not have an authoritative statement from him?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I do not think the hon. gentleman need rely on anything other than the reply I gave him, a reply which I think should stand.

POWER

NEW BRUNSWICK—POSSIBLE DELAY IN GRANT FOR MACTAQUAC DEVELOPMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland): Last Friday I addressed a question to the Prime Minister with regard to a $20 million grant to be made available to the government of New Brunswick for the development of the Mactaquac power project on the Saint John river. I wonder whether the right hon. gentleman is now in a position to answer that question.

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I am afraid I am not. I mentioned this matter to my hon. friend the Minister of Transport, who I understand was to make a reply, but he is not in his place today. I will try to deal with this on Monday.

DRUGS

PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION REPRESENTATION ON BODIES CONSIDERING PROFESSIONAL MATTERS

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): May I take this opportunity to reply to a question asked on Tuesday by the hon. member for Moose Mountain concerning consultation between the Canadian pharmaceutical association and the government. Such consultation will be particularly useful in connection with the consideration of the report of the royal commission on health services, which is presently being studied. In this connection the government has already received an assurance of co-operation from a number of professional associations, including the one referred to. The government will, of course, consult fully with these agencies, and desires to consult fully with them on matters of concern to their members. It is anticipated that this consultation will be on a continuing and periodic basis, but the administrative pattern for such consultation has not yet been finally determined.

HOUSING

SPECULATIVE LOANS UNDER WINTER INCENTIVE PROGRAM

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington South): I should like to direct a question to the Postmaster General, who answers in the house with respect to the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. Will direct loans on speculative housing be made available through the corporation this fall? If they will not, the winter incentive home building program will not be assisted very much.

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): I am glad to be able to inform the hon. member and other members of the house that in connection with the winter incentive housing program, arrangements will be made similar to those made last year, for substantially the same period of time, with regard to speculative loans.

EDUCATION

MANITOBA—APPLICATION FORMS FOR STUDENT LOANS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. In his absence I would direct it either to the acting minister or to the parliamentary secretary. Is the government aware of the fact that within the province of Manitoba the forms being provided for students wishing to apply for loans under the federal government's student loan plan are those previously used by the Manitoba government itself? And is the hon. gentleman aware that these forms call for information not provided for in the government's own legislation, for example an affidavit by parents stating their financial position, and so on? I wonder whether this matter could be looked into over the week end in the hope that if something is being done which is not in accord with the understanding which was reached, it may be corrected.

Mr. L. T. Pennell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): I will be glad to take the question as notice and bring it to the attention of the minister, who will be returning shortly.

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): In view of a report in the Toronto *Daily Star* last night that the student loan program, at least in Ontario, is bogged down by red tape, I wonder whether the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Finance would look into this situation, too, over the week end so these roadblocks, if they do exist, can be cleared out of the way.

Mr. Pennell: I will be pleased to accept the suggestion of the hon. member and to bring this matter also to the attention of the minister.

INCREASED ASSISTANCE TO UNIVERSITY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): I have a question for the Prime Minister. Having regard to the extreme crowding of university facilities due to the current soaring enrolment figures, can the right hon. gentleman inform the house when the increased assistance to university construction programs announced during his speech on the Brandon College campus on March 7, 1963 will be implemented?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker. As soon as I am able to say something on this important matter I will be glad to do so, but I cannot be specific at the moment.

DEFENCE PRODUCTION

TENDERS FOR REPAIRS TO H.M.C.S. "PROVIDER"

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister in charge of defence production or the Associate Minister of National Defence if either of them has received protests from the Halifax-Dartmouth and district labour council regarding the fact that H.M.C.S. *Provider* is not going to be repaired in the Halifax docks, and what action is being taken with regard to these protests?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, I did receive such a telegram. While the repairs to *Provider* had been sought by competitive tenders, the tender of the Halifax shipyard was somewhat higher than that of the Saint John dockyard, and as a consequence the contract has been awarded to the Saint John Drydock Company rather than to Halifax. I should point out that in the telegram, of which I think the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam has a copy, it is stated that the only

difference between the two tenders was the sum of $150. In fact this is not quite precise; in addition to the $150 difference there was a further qualification contained in the Halifax shipyard bid which put it out of court.

MAINTENANCE AND CONVERSION OF SHIPS ON PACIFIC COAST

On the orders of the day:

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday last the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich asked whether the government would continue the policy that ships operating on the Pacific coast would be maintained and converted there. There is currently a review being made of government needs for the acquisition and conversion of shipping of all sorts, but in the meantime it is safe to say that ships which are based on one or other of the coasts and which will continue to operate on the same coast will be maintained on the coast on which they are based and on which they will continue to operate.

AIRPORTS

HAMILTON, ONT.—AVAILABILITY OF FEDERAL FUNDS FOR DEVELOPMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. William Dean Howe (Hamilton South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport but in his absence perhaps the Prime Minister could answer it. Yesterday officials from the Hamilton city council were in Ottawa to meet with the officials of the Department of Transport with regard to Mount Hope airport. Could the minister tell the house what was the outcome of the discussions which were held?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I wish I could answer that question, but I am not in a position to do so. I will try to get an answer for Monday.

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reid Scott (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. In view of the result in the Toronto Riverdale election yesterday, which removed one of the candidates for the leadership of the Ontario Liberal party from the race, could the Prime Minister confirm or deny the very prevalent rumour in Ontario that he has given his official blessing to the hon. member for Renfrew South?

[Mr. Drury.]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

INQUIRY AS TO HOLIDAYS FOR STAFF

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the President of the Privy Council. In view of the fact that there seems to be general agreement that with the amount of business before us the house must carry on, is it not possible for a quick decision to be made so that members of the House of Commons staff might get their holidays? By "a quick decision" I mean letting some of them, on a staggered basis, start getting holidays this very week end.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, this question is getting active consideration. Many members of the staff of the House of Commons are presently on holiday. The problem has to be worked out, bearing in mind that if the house is sitting certain services are required, but I can assure the hon. member that the subject is getting very active consideration.

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Did I hear the President of the Privy Council say that some of the sessional staff, or those who are regarded as sessional staff, of the House of Commons are presently on holidays?

Mr. McIlraith: No, Mr. Speaker, I did not use the word "sessional".

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

HAL BANKS—REPORTED PRESENCE IN LONDON, ENGLAND

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Raymond Langlois (Mégantic): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Justice. Is it a fact that Mr. Hal Banks is now in London to see the Canadian high commissioner, Mr. Chevrier, a former minister of justice of this country?

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

STAMP ISSUE COMMEMORATING PRE-CONFEDERATION MEETINGS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Joseph Slogan (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Postmaster General. I wonder whether the Postmaster General could explain to the house the symbolism in the new stamp which is being issued by his department commemorating the 1864 meetings, and specifically could

he explain the fact that the three maple leaves on an earlier stamp have been replaced by one maple leaf?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, they have not been replaced. Consequently I am afraid I do not understand the hon. gentleman's question.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON EXTENSION OF WINTER WORKS PROGRAM

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Guy Marcoux (Quebec-Montmorency): Mr. Speaker, my question was meant for the Minister of Labour but, in his absence, I shall put it to his parliamentary secretary.

It has to do with the statement the minister made last Friday in regard to the extension of certain winter works periods. Could the parliamentary secretary ask the minister to give us a more specific statement a little later on, so we may know exactly what conditions are to be met and whether it will be up to the provinces or the federal government to decide whether there will be such extensions?

[*Text*]

Mr. J. A. Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour): I would be delighted to do so, Mr. Speaker.

SUPPLY

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

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE

1. Departmental administration, $2,099,000.

Mr. Slogan: Mr. Chairman, at the adjournment yesterday I was making some remarks regarding the dental health of Canadians. I think it is significant that about one quarter of the 200 or so recommendations in the Hall report deal with the dental health of Canadians. I think this again points up the importance of the subject. I had pointed out that dental diseases are almost universal, but at the same time they are largely preventable. However, because of the apathy of the public and the complacency of governments we are a nation of dental cripples. I could quote examples of the incidence of dental diseases among children but I hardly think I need do so. The tragedy of the situation is that those preventive measures which could be undertaken by the government at a very nominal cost are not being undertaken. Therefore a great deal of responsibility for the situation must rest on the shoulders of the government.

I must congratulate the minister on answering one of my questions, after many futile attempts, concerning fluoridation; but although the government was willing to put the facts before the people it has consistently refused to recommend this measure to the people, even though the Hall royal commission has recommended that in view of the reduction in dental disease to be expected from the fluoridation program, every community water system in Canada be equipped to provide the proper level of fluoride.

At the last meeting of the Canadian Dental Association a resolution was adopted recommending fluoridation to the people of Canada. The report released at the time of the meeting showed that 92 per cent more Canadians were using fluoridated water in 1963 than in 1962, a total of almost four million, or one in five. I think this number should be substantially increased, and there are three areas in which a great deal could be done. One area, of course, is research, and I dealt with that yesterday to a large extent and showed that the amount of money allocated to dental research in national health grants is approximately 1 per cent to 2 per cent and has been steadily declining over the last three years.

A program to educate the public in this field should also be considered, and, I must congratulate the toothpaste companies for their television advertisements, because they are bringing to the attention of the people the need for oral hygiene; and through improved oral hygiene alone the number of dental cavities can be cut in half. The government should assure responsibility in this regard. The department is putting out some pamphlets which I think are very good, but there should be more of them and they should be more widely distributed.

There is another subject I should like to touch upon, and that is prepaid dental plans. The dental associations across this country are studying the feasibility of prepaid dental health insurance, and are doing this largely on their own. It should be incumbent upon this government to allocate funds for studies in respect of the feasibility of dental health insurance, in so far as it differs from medical health insurance and insurance principles.

There are a number of questions I should like to ask the minister and I hope she will provide us with some answers, particularly in respect to questions and recommendations

about the administration within her own department. First of all I should like to ask again whether any step is being taken by the department to establish a specific dental health grant under the system of national health grants. When these grants were initially made I know that in the province of Manitoba they had to be taken from the maternal health plan. That was some time ago, but as time has passed every segment receiving these grants has been taxed to the full, and the segments which are receiving the grants are no longer willing to give some of this money to the dental field. Therefore it is absolutely necessary that a specific dental health grant be made. The minister has received specific representations from the Canadian Dental Association in respect of this matter, and I should like her to give an answer before we pass her first item, outlining her plans in this regard.

Another matter which I should like to draw to her attention relates to the various dental branches in other departments of the government, such as the Department of Veterans Affairs, which looks after the dental health of the R.C.M.P. and veterans; the Department of Justice, which looks after the dental health of inmates in penitentiaries, and the northern health services dental branch. It is time all dental services within the government, other than military, should be consolidated under one dental head.

I think that would bring about something that is very badly needed, and I refer to a uniform fee schedule. Each department has a different set of forms to be filled out and a different fee schedule, and many of the forms are extremely complicated. Everytime an R.C.M.P. officer goes to his dentist, the dentist has to fill out a long form listing all the dental work that has ever been done on that officer's teeth. If that officer comes in every six months and only has one or two fillings, this necessitates a great deal of work and a waste of time. Those are some of the things I think the department should look into in an attempt to simplify the procedures and eliminate some of the red tape that imposes such a burden on the practitioner.

I should like to make another recommendation to the minister concerning her department which is in keeping with a recommendation made by the Canadian Dental Association to the Hall commission, that steps be taken to see that the remuneration of professional people in government service is equivalent to that which they would receive in the private sector of the economy. Unless this is done it is hardly possible that we will fill the quotas we have for professional people in government, and certainly the conditions will not attract the best people but more likely the worst.

[Mr. Slogan.]

I think the people of Canada deserve something better. I think those individuals who undertake to dedicate themselves to public health in Canada, and accept government jobs, deserve better remuneration. At the same time I should like to recommend that members of the dental and medical professions should receive the same remuneration, because I see no reason why the dental field should be a step down the ladder.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest the minister should give autonomy to the dental branch so that in the final analysis decisions regarding dentistry will come from the dental division and not have to go through a medical man. Perhaps the lack of autonomy in that field is the reason dentistry has been allocated such a low position in government service.

As I have already said, I should like to know what thought the minister has given to allocating money for the establishment of pilot projects in respect of prepaid dental plans rather than the profession assuming the whole responsibility. The Hall commission report contains almost 50 recommendations in respect of what governments can do in the field of dental health, and in order to facilitate the passage of the minister's estimates I should like some information about what the government is doing in the way of grants for dental education, the establishment of new dental schools and other similar things. Perhaps it is of interest to note that Canada is fourteenth among 19 nations of the world as far as our population-dentist ratio is concerned. The government does have some responsibility in this regard.

Before concluding it might be of interest to hon. members to know that in 1926 the percentage of the consumer health dollar that was allocated to dental services was 11.7 per cent; 1929 it was 12.1 per cent; in 1934 it was 8.7 per cent; in 1945 it was 10.9 per cent and in 1961 it was 7.4 per cent. Relative to the total spent on health services the amount of money that is being spent on dentistry by the people of Canada today is lower than it has been for a great number of years. It might also be of interest to know —and this is one of the brighter sides—that although the ratio of dentists to population is expected to improve slightly over the next ten years and then become worse again, if

we take the output productivity of dentists in 1931 as 100 per cent, in 1961 it had reached 281 per cent. At the same time the productivity of physicians and priests reached 175 per cent. Although because of increased technical knowledge and improved facilities in dental offices the productivity is increasing, it is not increasing fast enough to meet the growing needs of Canadians.

I have asked the minister several specific questions, and I am willing to sit down at this time in the hope that some answers will be provided before the first item is passed so I will not have to ask these questions again as the individual items are reached.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take too much of the committee's time, but there is a matter which I should like to place before the minister. It is probably not one which requires immediate attention, but I think it might well be given some consideration leading, I hope, to appropriate action at some time in the future.

May I at this time congratulate the minister on the reasonableness of her presentation. As a member of the legal profession and a very competent counsel, I understand, she has probably learned in the past the distinction between browbeating a witness—although, mind you, sometimes this may be necessary—and persuading, influencing and beguiling a jury. If she and her colleagues continue to regard the opposition as a jury I think we will make better progress.

I have here a press release issued in July by the world health organization dealing with what I consider to be one of the most serious problems to be faced not only by the civilized and free areas of the world but by the communist areas and the developing regions of the globe. I think it is rather interesting to examine the personnel who constituted this committee of the world health organization. It was headed by Dr. John A. Logan of the United States. The vice chairman was a woman, Dr. A. S. Perotskaja of the U.S.S.R. The rapporteur was Mr. P. C. Bose of India. The committee also included one representative each from Chile, the Netherlands, France, the United Kingdom and Tunisia. The release is titled "The Population Implosion". The head note is very simple and reads as follows:

> The sudden unprecedented pouring of rural people into urban areas in the developing countries may reach catastrophic dimensions within the next 10 or 20 years. In the developed countries, the congestion of people, industries, houses, vehicles in tentacular cities is causing alarm. The implosive pressures—to use an engineering term—are growing every day.
>
> To explore these questions the world health organization recently convened its first expert committee on environmental health aspects of metropolitan planning. This article follows the lines of the experts' discussions—

I am going to put a few of their observations on the record. These are not colourful, glowing, dramatic words. They are dry, even dreary, but they are very meaningful and most important. While I have no doubt much of this material is within the knowledge of the minister and her department, at the same time I think it does no harm to make this information public and to couple with it a suggestion I propose to make at the conclusion of my remarks.

To begin with, the release repeats a fact we well know but too often forget. It points out that before the year 2,000 the world's population is expected to double and to exceed six billion people. Then it goes on to say:

> The rush of people from country to town will continue, for agriculture will become much more efficient than it is now and by the end of the century perhaps only 10 per cent of the population will be working on the farm.

This means that almost all of the additional three billion people who will be populating the globe by that time will be living in cities. This will cause problems, and not the least of them will be health problems.

> Already today the cities of the world present health problems of staggering dimensions. How healthy will they be in future? The tremendous increase in urban population clearly justifies the warning that after the question of keeping world peace metropolitan planning is probably the most serious single problem faced by man in the second half of the 20th century.

If the population of the world does double and if what is set out here is correct—I certainly agree with it—we will find that instead of the population of cities of say two million doubling to four million, their population will triple or quadruple. Cities of six million people will become cities of 24 million. Cities with one and a half or two million people will become cities of seven or eight million people. The problems we now have will increase in direct ratio to the increase in population.

> In the United States two thirds of the population now live in large metropolitan areas and the suburbs of the cities are sprawling six times as fast as the city cores. In the developed parts of the world the housing shortage is not as great as it was immediately after the war but none of the countries can afford to relinquish their intensive efforts. In the developing parts of the world shanty

towns, bidonvilles, slums, squatter settlements are mushrooming. In the built areas overcrowding is acute.

The release goes on to say:

Urbanization has two sides: opportunities for higher standards of living, for better education and housing, for more public health and more social satisfactions; on the negative side, however, there is encroachment on the available land, water and air, and amid multiple threats to health there is the general degradation of man's physical and social environment. The downward trend is easily recognized: overcrowding; building congestion; proliferation of slums; water shortage; inadequate waste disposal; pollution of water, land, air; noise, accidents, delinquency, crime, disease.

These are compendious words but these are all matters in respect of which legislative action is going to have to be taken at the municipal, provincial and federal levels, and I think it does no harm to draw these issues to the attention of the committee at this time.

Here, for example, are some very simple figures indicating what the increase in population will mean. For every new 1,000 people in a United States metropolitan area the following additional facilities are needed: 4.8 elementary school rooms and 3.6 high school rooms; 8.8 acres of land for schools, parks and play areas; an additional 100,000 gallons of water per day; 1.8 new policemen and 1.5 new firemen; one new hospital bed—this is something which certainly must concern the future planning of the Department of National Health and Welfare—1,000 new library books and a fraction of a jail cell, as well as more streets, more surfaces for the municipality to keep clean, more solid wastes to clear away, more sewage to treat, more storm water to cope with and so on.

One of the most interesting suggestions contained in the press release has to do with air pollution. We have heard a lot about water pollution and about the open sewers which our rivers are becoming. I now quote from the press release:

The simplest and most dramatic effect of air pollution is the increased number of deaths during periods of smog or other serious pollution. Mortality is greatest among the old and the infirm. But there is no doubt that air pollution plays a part in respiratory and other diseases.

According to the W.H.O. experts on metropolitan planning, one of the main causes of "unbalance" of the modern metropolis is without doubt the motor car.

We are all familiar with the condition brought about by motor car fumes in the city of Los Angeles. We hope it will not spread to our country, but the way to see that it does not is to plan well in advance.

Some suggestions are made with regard to steps to be taken to combat air pollution:

Satellite towns in which no pollution-producing fuels are used; green belts and wide open spaces to dilute and disperse pollution; central plants to provide heat and hot water to whole districts; less traffic flow in metropolitan areas; appropriate devices for automobile engines to minimize pollution.

In the Soviet union some attention has been given to this problem, and it is very interesting to note this comment in the press release:

In the Soviet union, standards in this matter have been adopted for new urban development. All industrial undertakings are divided into five classes according to the harmful substances discharged. For the "most harmful" class, factories must be separated from residential areas by a protective zone of greenery ranging from 1,000 to 3,000 metres depending on local weather conditions, etc. For the class at the other end of the scale, the figures are 50 to 150 metres.

There is this very interesting comment, and it is a statement which has been applied and accepted with regard to water:

Air should be regarded as a world resource to be conserved and utilized forever. The laissez faire policy of treating the sky as an open sewer is doomed to lead to disaster.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take the time to go into this press release any further. I am advised by the officials of the world health organization that a statement will be made available in due course and will be in our parliamentary library.

My experience has been that the period of gestation which leads to reforms and measures to combat problems of this magnitude is very lengthy. It may be 10, 15 or 20 years, but the gathering storm which is going to break upon the world in the form of the increase in population is something which must be dealt with at the legislative level as well as at the planning level. As I say, I assume and I hope this is a matter which the officials of the minister's department do take into consideration.

I make this simple suggestion now, and it is not one I expect to be implemented at this or even the next session. The minister should give consideration to discussing the prospect of establishing a joint committee of the Senate and House of Commons to deal with the problems of overcrowding, particularly as they relate to the varied and multiple matters over which she presides as minister of this department. A committee of this kind would, I assume, not conclude its deliberations in any great hurry. I would think that a period of years, perhaps two or three, might well elapse before the committee could report. I am sure the publicity achieved as a result of making an inquiry through a

parliamentary committee of this kind would be a noticeable advantage that could not be derived in any other way.

I am going to conclude by urging the minister to make a note of this, if she has not already done so, as well as of the statement which will be made available in due course by the world health organization committee which deals with this very serious problem. It is one which will inevitably come upon us. It is my honest opinion that the establishment of an all-party joint committee to look into the problems with which we will be dealing in the near future is something which would be of major benefit to this country, and which would lend distinction to her administration of this department.

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to comment on the nursing situation in the hospitals of this country, in view of the fact that we are dealing with item No. 1 of the Department of National Health and Welfare. I make particular reference to the item on page 286 of the estimates, contribution to the provinces under agreements entered into pursuant to the Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act, $420 million. I have no criticism whatever to make of the amount of money involved in this item; in fact I am happy to see that the increase over a year ago is $35 million.

Last night the hon. member for Kamloops very definitely and explicitly put his finger on a great problem in this country of ours; that is, the continuing shortage of doctors. He emphasized that steps must be taken to meet this situation, which is becoming dangerous for the country as a whole. He also, out of his vast knowledge of the subject, dealt with the lack of money for medical research. The hon. member for Springfield was kind enough to speak on some of the problems connected with dentistry. I should like to refer to the nursing situation, which I believe is of more serious import to this nation than the shortage of doctors or the shortage of funds for medical research. However, I wish to congratulate the government upon the fact that this government has implemented the system of shift differential rates of pay for nurses in hospitals under the Department of Veterans Affairs.

This action by the Department of Veterans Affairs means that in every such hospital in the country the federal government is now paying a shift differential to the staff, including nurses. The nurses who work the evening shift are paid more money than those who work the day shift, and those who work the night shift are paid more money than those who work the evening shift. This government, and particularly the Minister of National Health and Welfare, are to be congratulated upon the fact that they have willingly paid, as did the previous administration under the hon. member for Perth, their share of the shift differentials to all hospital employees in the provinces of Quebec and Saskatchewan, and to all hospital employees except nurses in the province of British Columbia.

Now, I should like the hospital staffs of the dominion to realize that the federal government, under both the previous administration and this administration, has shown by its actions that it is not averse to paying shift differentials in all hospitals of the dominion. The federal government is paying approximately one third of the cost of the operation of all hospitals in the nation, and that is a very healthy contribution. I admire the present Secretary of State for External Affairs for many, many things. I first met him in 1922, and I have had a close and intimate contact with him over the intervening 42 years. I sincerely believe that the most outstanding act in his life was the introduction of this hospitalization act on a national basis. I am not suggesting that the Liberal government of 1956 initiated this type of welfare service. I know that two provinces in western Canada had experimented with it and had shown it could be done. However, the present Secretary of State for External Affairs is the man who made it possible to extend this type of hospital care from one end of the country to the other with the first act in 1956.

When the hospital staffs of the nation realize that the federal government, both the previous administration and this administration, is willingly paying one third of the cost of shift differentials, I feel that the staffs of those hospitals in the seven provinces not now paying shift differentials will demand that the provincial authorities institute shift differentials for these employees. I spoke on this subject two years ago when I was in opposition and we were considering the estimates of this department. I spoke on the subject a year ago, and I would go into it in detail once more except that I should like to see the estimates of the government passed as speedily as possible.

I did emphasize on both occasions when I spoke on this matter that I was advocating not only the payment of shift differentials for hospital staffs, but the payment of

day premium rates of pay for those who are forced to work on Saturdays, Sundays, or statutory holidays. I produced many figures to show that the payment of day premium rates of pay is in practical operation in the printing trades in Canada, the one business about which I know most. If they can pay day premium rates for working Saturdays, Sundays and holidays, surely the governments of the ten provinces and the dominion can do the same thing.

I hold in my hand a contract between the Canadian union of operating engineers and one of the Toronto hospitals. This contract is up for renegotiation, as it expires next month, but the interesting thing about this contract is that it provides for day premium rates of pay to the engineer staff for holiday work. The particular clause dealing with it reads this way:

> Paid Holidays
>
> The following holidays are recognized by the employer: New Year's day, Dominion day, Thanksgiving day, Good Friday, Civic holiday, Christmas day, Victoria day, Labour day.
>
> All employees in this bargaining unit shall be given the above holidays off, with pay at their normal rates. However, should they be required to work on one of the above holidays, they shall be paid a day's pay plus time and one half their normal rate of pay.

I read this one contract between a labour union and a Canadian hospital simply as an example of what prevails in a fair number of hospitals today, that is, a day premium rate of pay for holidays; and the federal government is paying one third of that cost. Of course I believe that when the federal government is willing to pay one third of the cost of the day premium rates of pay for holidays, Sundays and Saturdays, it should pay a day premium rate to employees under its direct control and paid directly by cheques of the government of Canada.

In connection with this contract I have in my hand it is interesting to note that since the engineers are now paid a day premium rate of pay for national holidays, one of the items on which they wish to negotiate is a change in article 10:

> All hours worked on Saturday or Sunday shall be paid at the rate of time and one half.

I am not in a position to state whether this request of the union of operating engineers will be granted by the employing hospital whose contract I hold in my hand at this time, but it is going to be difficult to tell employees of the hospital that they should not be paid time and one half for Saturday and Sunday work when you are already paying them at two and a half times the rate of pay for statutory holidays.

The reason I emphasize day premium rates of pay so seriously is because I believe if they were being paid in all hospitals of the country at the present time we would be able to attract into the nursing stream a tremendous number of married women who are qualified nurses, but who will not leave their homes on week ends for the present rates of pay. It is pretty universal across the country that nurses working on Saturdays, Sundays and holidays draw only the regular rates of pay that people get for working on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday or any other day of the week.

While many of these rates of pay today are almost munificent, it is a different matter when you ask a married woman to desert her home on the week end, perhaps for the only three days of the week her husband is there, and when the children are home from school and require a little more attention than when they are at classes. In that case, when a married woman thinks of the regular rate of pay for Saturdays and Sundays she is going to weigh it against the disadvantage of leaving her home. But if married nurses were paid a day premium rate of pay on Saturdays, Sundays and holidays I am certain there would be a great influx of married nurses back to the hospitals.

I have emphasized in the two previous comments I made on this situation—and I wish to say there was not a doctor in the house on either side of the aisle who did not come to me and say I was putting my finger on a matter of paramount importance to the nation—that if we paid day premium rates of pay over week ends and national holidays, I am confident we could increase the care rendered by the hospitals by 25 per cent, and we would not have to lay out any extra capital money in grants.

I stress the figure of 25 per cent on this basis, that many, many hospitals practically close on Friday at noon and do not get back into full operation until Monday morning. Doctors, particularly surgeons, do not want to operate over week ends when they know the staff is going to be considerably reduced. As I said before, and I repeat, somebody will immediately rise and point out that all the beds are occupied over week ends so how would you increase the production of a hospital—if I may use that word—by 25 per cent when all the beds are occupied over the week ends?

I say that many patients lying in hospitals on Fridays could be sent home if there were other patients coming in for necessary surgery; but since the staffs of the hospitals—I refer particularly to nursing staffs—are reduced at the week ends, surgeons do not like to operate on Fridays, and patients who might go home on Friday are told "Well, Sunday afternoon will be a nice time because your family will be free. Your husband can come and look after you," or if it is a man they say his wife can come for him. In this way these patients are convalescent from Friday afternoon to Sunday evening and the hospital collects the normal day's rate from the provincial authority because the bed is being occupied, but it is not being occupied to the greatest possible advantage.

If we were paying day premium rates of pay and the hospitals had full staffs seven days a week, including Saturdays, Sundays and holidays, I am confident the admitting committees of the hospitals would clear out of the hospitals on Fridays many people who remain in them as convalescents; surgeons would be able to operate on Saturdays, Sundays and holidays, and you would get 25 per cent more production out of the hospitals without increasing your capital grants or increasing the size of the hospitals.

I have to pay a little tribute here—and I have to say "little" because I am a Liberal—to Hon. Matthew Dymond, the minister of health for the province of Ontario who, since we are both Presbyterians, is a very good friend of mine. Some years ago he told me about a hospital in Ontario wanting a tremendous grant for a great big addition. Its management said it was overcrowded; if it did not get a big addition all hell would break loose, and there would be disease and epidemics in the town. Dr. Dymond, who was a practising physician in the town of Port Perry and the city of Oshawa, listened to their argument for increasing the number of operating suites in the hospital, and he told them "Before I can give any answer to your request I would like you to supply me with a schedule of your operations in the surgical suites."

This hospital had four surgeries, and when he got the timetables of the operations performed in those suites over the previous two or three years he discovered something he had already suspected, that they were operating from seven o'clock in the morning until about one o'clock in the afternoon, and the only operations that went on in the four surgeries in the afternoons and evenings, and on Sundays and holidays, were emergencies.

Dr. Matthew Dymond said to these people who wanted to increase the number of their surgeries and the size of their hospital, "Why don't you operate more in the afternoons?" The doctor who replied said, "You can't operate in the afternoon. You operate in the morning because the patient has been well rested, the diet has been looked after, and his stomach is clear." Dr. Dymond then said, "If you had an automobile collision and eight people required emergency surgery at four o'clock in the afternoon, surely you would not schedule their operations for the next morning? If you can operate on emergency cases no matter at what hour they occur, why can't you operate on ordinary civilian patients in the afternoons?" As a result of his definite stand on this matter the hospital in question rescheduled its surgical suites, and he found that with that rescheduling he could give it a grant of one quarter of what it wanted to increase the number of its beds. But they got no grant to increase the size of their surgical suites.

I tell that story to show that hospital facilities could be used to a greater extent if more thought were given to the conduct of hospital affairs. I say again that if we had day premium rates of pay in hospitals, the effective capacity of our present institutions could be increased by 25 per cent.

No doubt we will hear a lot of talk about the provincial by-election yesterday in Riverdale, Ontario. I hope I am not out of order when I point out that the government of the province is Conservative. It appears from the early returns that the New Democratic party has won the riding, with the Liberal candidate second and the Conservative third. I make this statement as a resident of metropolitan Toronto, that the biggest influence in that by-election was the half empty Riverdale hospital which stands right in the middle of the riding.

Here is a hospital with more than 808 beds. Some 450 of them are empty, and they have been empty for more than a year, due to the lack of nursing staff. Officials in Toronto have gone to Great Britain; they have spent a good deal of money and effort to recruit staff there. But because of the rates of pay now prevailing in Canada they have not been able to attract sufficient nurses from Britain to staff that hospital. The rates of pay offered by the province are not sufficient to attract married nurses to return to hospital work, and many of the nurses who staff our institutions today are married women. As a result this hospital

stands half empty, though it is possibly the most modern hospital in the Dominion of Canada today.

This, to me, indicates some weakness in hospital administration by the departments—and when I use the plural I am referring to both the federal and the provincial governments—with regard to the method of payment for nursing services. It seems odd to me this government, of which I am a supporter, is able to pay one third of the cost of day premium rates of pay for such employees as engineering and mechanical workers, and can pay shift differential rates to hospital staffs under the jurisdiction of the Department of Veterans Affairs, while declining to pay such rates to nurses directly under the control of the Department of National Health and Welfare.

The Department of Veterans Affairs has hospitals in all ten provinces, in which shift differentials are being paid. This is a wonderful example. Hospital staffs are well aware what is going on in these institutions. They are aware what is going on in Quebec, where these differentials have been paid for 15 years, as well as of the situation in Saskatchewan where they are also being paid. I would strongly urge the minister, who I know takes a great and intelligent interest in the work of her department, to consider seriously in the course of the spending of these estimates, an arrangement to provide for shift differential rates of pay and day premium rates of pay for all hospital personnel under her direct supervision. This would be an example to all those responsible for the administration of hospitals in those seven provinces whose governments do not admit that payment on this basis is the modern, 1964 approach to the labour question of today.

It is fortunate that the minister is a qualified lawyer in her own right. There is a small problem which I have discussed privately with officials of the government and of the Department of National Health and Welfare, and I think it is one which should be brought out on the national scene, if the radio and the press will publicize it. It has to do with the fact that government payments, such as old age pensions, cannot be attached by those to whom a recipient may owe money. I would not recommend that any great change should be made in this regard. I believe that people receiving what they call pension cheques, old age assistance cheques, should be protected. If they were not protected as they are at present I am sure many unscrupulous organizations would deprive them of their funds in a hurry.

[Mr. Cowan.]

However, workers in the hospital field come across a ridiculous situation. Among those who enter hospitals as patients are many over 70 years of age who we know are in receipt of old age assistance allowances. They are maintained at government expense because they do not have the benefit of a hospitalization plan and because their children refuse to pay expenses incurred by the hospitals in which their parents are lying.

There are times when I wonder whether I am fortunate to be engaged in hospital work on a voluntary basis, I become so incensed at some of the things which occur. On the other hand, of course, there are rewards; for instance, the kindness you see extended by hospital employees to the patients who come through the doors. But I know nothing which upsets me more than the unwillingness of many children, some of them in high places, to pay for the hospitalization of their parents, particularly when they are over 70 years of age. I know hospitals in Ontario which are caring for patients over 70 years of age who do not have the benefit of hospitalization plans, and when they ask the children if they will get their parents to sign over the old age pension cheques to help pay for the hospitalization costs, those children laugh in their faces. I would point out again that these cheques for $75 a month cannot be attached by legal action, or diverted in any way. The families get the money and spent it as they like.

The minister is, I know, deeply interested in every aspect of the work of her department. As I say, she takes an intelligent interest in its administration. In addition she is a lawyer in her own right. I would ask her now, on behalf of the hospitals of Ontario, to exercise her undoubted talent and ability in seeking to have some change made so as to deal with the situation I have described. When one government department makes a payment to a recipient who is entitled to it, surely another government department should be able to secure that money in order to defray an expense incurred by a recipient lying in a government paid hospital bed.

On the whole I have nothing but commendation for the minister and for the department, but these are thoughts which in my opinion should be brought forward. In conclusion I repeat my suggestion that the minister give serious consideration to instituting a system of shift differential rates of pay and day premium rates of pay in order to ease the shortage of hospital beds, especially by

encouraging married nurses to return to the stream of hospital service.

Mr. Rapp: I should like to direct some questions to the minister of health and welfare concerning matters in which many of the towns in my constituency are extremely interested. Strictly speaking they relate more to the estimates of the privy council, because these are matters pertaining to grants by the centennial commission. But many of the people I represent would be interested to know whether hospitals can be built with the assistance of centenary grants. In many cases it would be most beneficial to those concerned, if this could be done, and I wonder if the minister is in a position to tell me whether these grants can be used for the purpose they have in mind so that a lasting monument may exist after these grants have been allocated. The reason they are so interested is that usually these hospital grants are not sufficient to permit some of these towns to build hospitals which are large enough to serve the rural areas. I should like the minister to give me an explanation in reply to my question.

Mr. Francis: Mr. Chairman, I should like to make some brief comments on two points. For some nine years I had the privilege of working in the department under the two predecessors of the present minister, the hon. member for Perth, who is in the house, and the hon. member for Essex East. I know that in the development of this department, which development is evidenced every year in the estimates which come before the house, there has been a broad measure of bipartisan agreement on the general objectives and work of the department. Many words of tribute, all of them well deserved, have been paid in the course of this debate to the deputy ministers, especially Dr. Cameron, Dr. Willard, and to Miss Waters, the very conscientious and capable secretary whose services will be very greatly missed.

I feel that at this point there are two matters worthy of consideration. First is the question of social and economic research. A good deal has been said about the need for medical research and the development of research in connection with physical fitness, dentistry and other aspects of the department. The Department of National Health and Welfare has developed a very capable staff over a period of years, who have consistently interested themselves in the general problems of the cost of health services and in investigating in depth the programs developed by the department. The dominion bureau of statistics through the health and welfare division publishes annual statistical reports which are available and distributed as part of its functions. I hope the department will not lose sight of the need for strengthening and developing of this type of staff.

At the time when the previous administration, I think quite properly, attempted to form a general assessment of the health picture and prepare material which would given some general, long term guide lines, it was decided that a royal commission would be the form of investigation and a separate staff, including those qualified in social and economic research, were engaged for this project. The results of the commission's work are very interesting. They have taken a very broad sweep of the spectrum of health services. They have also stated very clearly the aims and objectives for improving the nation's health in a most commendable fashion.

Those who have worked in this field realize the very sensitive problems in relation to the professions concerned, and no objectives in the health field can be secured without the active co-operation of the Canadian medical profession and other responsible groups. I hope the department will continue to follow the policy of retaining key members of its staff who are trained and qualified in this area, and will resort to the policy of hiring outside consultants for outside jobs only on special occasions. There is this continuous field staff available within the department for special assignments in relation to other areas of research, and this must be constantly kept in mind. I hope the proper emphasis on this type of research will also be maintained.

The second comment I want to make, Mr. Chairman, relates to the whole question of shared cost programs. This department is one which has applied the principle of shared cost programs as much as any department of government. There are others which have done so, but in terms of financial magnitude a program like hospital insurance looms very large. The correspondence tabled yesterday in this house by the Prime Minister deals with specific proposals on the subject to the provincial authorities. The Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act was put on the books in 1956 when the hon. member for Essex East was minister, although the agreements were signed and implemented by the succeeding administration. I might mention that one of the things I have retained and will always regard with affection is a

photograph of the hon. member for Perth on the occasion of the signing of the first hospital insurance agreement with the province of Ontario.

Certainly the development of this program has been accompanied by many other events which I think are of fundamental value to the Canadian people. For example, there is the promotion of standard hospital accounting; promotion of standard statistical reporting procedures; the full participation through the dominion council of health at regular meetings of all the provincial authorities. When I hear spokesmen from the province of Quebec, both my colleagues in my own party and hon. members in other parts of the house, saying that Quebec is not a province like the others, nowhere was this more brought home than at these meetings at which spokesmen for this province also spoke up for people who were French speaking, and for institutions in other provinces similar to those in their own.

I would be less than frank, Mr. Chairman, if I did not say to this committee that I would be concerned about the effect of contracting out procedures if this had the result of removing a voice from the conference table. The regular conference table meetings which have taken place, at which the voice of the province of Quebec was frequently more than just a voice for its own province, are of great importance. If the effect of contracting out were to create two Canadas, one of which would be operating under a different set of rules from a federal authority, I think this would be a very serious matter and might have consequences which perhaps have not been fully considered to date for the long term development and implementation of programs.

There are many other aspects of this matter, and when the appropriate legislation is placed before the house dealing with tax abatement procedures and percentages I hope at that time to make further comments. However, I do feel that the department is to be commended for the work it has done in the development of these co-operative federal-provincial programs. In this regard the term we like to use is "nation-wide", not "national" or "uniform" in any centralized sense. But they should be uniform in the sense that every one has certain basic objectives, and that they get together at the conference table once every six or three months to review the administration of the programs, the gaps in the programs, the difficulties in the programs, and make recommendations on necessary amendments to regulations—as they are in most cases—which could be enacted by order in council. This is a flexible procedure which could be maintained and was the very essence of many of the shared cost programs. I would hope there would not be any doctrinaire or rigid approach to the question which would destroy the flexibility, the sensitivity and the truly Canadian spirit which has been built into these federal-provincial co-operative relationships.

I repeat, I should not let this opportunity pass without indicating my concern over the possible destruction of relationships which have been very carefully built up over a long period of time. I have taken as only one example hospital insurance and health grants, which come immediately to mind, although many other programs on the welfare side are also involved in this package. I would think the minister, her officials and the staff of the department have given us a very good example of the way in which, freed from party slogans and the general ideas with which we become so often emotionally concerned, federal-provincial co-operation can be achieved, and I think the staff of her department are to be commended in this regard.

Mr. Herridge: Mr. Chairman, I should like to take this opportunity to make a few remarks about these very important estimates. First of all I wish to congratulate the minister for her diligence and the concern she has for her department, and I think all of us in fairness will admit that she has had a very trying and difficult period to go through in connection with the Canada pension plan, with all its complications and ramifications. Regardless of the delays in the past and the changes that have been required because of provincial demands, we all know her heart is in the right place, and we look forward to dealing with this plan in the very near future.

Mr. Chairman, I also thank her for her willingness to listen to the representatives of organizations, whether national or local, who have come to Ottawa. I think this is very fortunate indeed, because even those individuals at the centre of things can learn from those on the fringe of affairs, as it were, particularly with respect to problems concerning this department.

I should also like to pay tribute to her staff. I get along very well with the staff of the Department of National Health and Welfare because, as you know, it is not the responsibility of that department to promote

dams on the Arrow lake, and that makes some difference. During the 19 years I have been in this house I have always found the officials of every branch of this department willing to give every consideration to any problem brought to their attention, and to carry out inquiries and give explanations that were necessary.

May I state that I wholeheartedly support the remarks that have been made by previous speakers representing this party in the debate on these estimates, particularly in respect of the Canada pension plan and the report of the royal commission on health services. There is no need for me to repeat what has been so well said by previous speakers, except to emphasize my complete endorsation of their stand on these particular issues.

However, I do wish to bring to the attention of the minister one omission that has been brought to my attention in respect of the report of the royal commission on health services. This omission has been drawn to my attention by representatives of organizations in my constituency as well as by various other individuals. There are apparently no recommendations in that report in relation to continuing care facilities for older persons. I have discussed this question with the minister and with a number of individuals who are very interested in this situation. Women's organizations are particularly interested in this subject, and the problem is of great concern to small communities because of the direct association with the need for satisfactory after-care facilities and nursing homes.

I am not going to take the time of the house to make extended representations, though I had intended to speak at some length on this subject, but I can draw the attention of the minister and hon. members of this house to the general feeling that exists in my constituency, at least, by quoting from an editorial which appeared in the Trail *Daily Times* of August 14, 1964 under the heading "Aid for Continuing Care". Mr. Chairman, this newspaper strongly supports the Progressive Conservative party and takes a great deal of pleasure in ribbing the hon. member for Kootenay West whenever it has the opportunity. However, I agree with what is said in this editorial on this subject, and I should like to quote it. It states:

> The report of the dominion royal commission on health services, commonly known as the Hall royal commission report, has a deficiency that is of serious local consequence.
>
> It omits to provide for dominion participation in what are known as "continuing care facilities," in other words, nursing home type establishments.
>
> This absence has jeopardized Rotary club plans to construct and operate such an institution as a sort of adjunct to the Trail-Tadanac hospital.

This would also apply to other hospitals. The editorial then continues as follows:

> Months ago, health minister Eric Martin rejected a private enterprise proposal to build and operate a nursing home in Glenmerry. He came out strongly in support of the Rotary project because, he said, the Hall royal commission could be expected to recommend dominion participation in such public projects. The availability of dominion operating funds would enable the provincial government to place nursing homes on a per diem basis, similar to that obtaining in hospitals, thus effecting important economies for patients of modest resources.
>
> This week, Mr. Martin sent the *Times* a copy of the text of representations the B.C. government has made to Ottawa in connection with the Hall report, and in it he says this:
>
> "British Columbia deplores the fact that the report's recommendations do not encompass the field of continuing care for persons suffering from protracted illness and who require nursing care and periodic medical care over a long period of time.
>
> Just as the provision of facilities and services for the care and treatment of persons who are acutely ill is of vital importance, and the development of convalescent and rehabilitative programs is also of great value, so too is the provision of long term care of major importance and worthy of being an integral part of any universal health services program.
>
> Therefore...British Columbia urges the government of Canada to include under the provisions of the Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act coverage for those persons receiving care in approved continuing care facilities."

I support that article in principle, although I must say that in view of the fact the government of British Columbia is about to loan the province of Quebec $100 million I cannot see how it can be short of funds to do this work in the immediate future.

Over a period of nearly 20 years I have had the pleasure of being either the president or a director of a community hospital, and as a result of that experience I know of the need for these facilities. Certain limited facilities are provided, but they are far too costly for many older persons. Just prior to my return to Ottawa I was speaking with a lady who told me of a friend of hers who had gone into a nursing home which charged $350 to $400 per month. She had stayed there until she had exhausted the $8,000 she had in the bank, which represented her life's savings. Then, of course, she had to leave the nursing home to be cared for by another friend who was willing to look after her on the basis of some assistance from her old age security.

There is a great need in this respect, and I do urge the minister to give some consideration to the situation. I understand consideration is being given by a number of

national organizations, as well as by the minister and her officials. I think we should be able to find a solution to this problem, financial and otherwise, as a result of co-operation between federal and provincial governments which are willing to do their share and accept their responsibilities.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to bring one further matter to the attention of the minister in connection with this report. During my recent visit to my constituency I received a number of representations urging that the art of chiropractic be included on an equal basis with other health professions in any health program to be introduced. When I was a member of the British Columbia provincial legislature there was a discussion in this regard during a proposed amendment to the workmen's compensation act. Prior to this discussion the art of chiropractic was not included under the act. As a result of representations from various organizations in British Columbia the regulations under the workmen's compensation act were amended so that industrial casualties who were recommended by doctors could receive assistance from chiropractors. I will now read a card which was sent to me by a very well known citizen of the Arrow lakes:

> It appears that the near future will see some form of government participation in a health care program. Chiropractic is a separate and distinct health service, not provided by any other profession. It is a health service which is required and used by many citizens of British Columbia. I therefore strongly urge that you, as my elected representative, endeavour to ensure that chiropractic is included on an equal basis with the other healing professions in any health program to be introduced.

I support that proposal from my personal experience and personal knowledge of what has been done with the proper use of the art of chiropractic, and I urge the minister to give consideration to this request.

I wish to support wholeheartedly the remarks made by the hon. member for Hamilton South with respect to the necessity for greater consideration of the needs of the mentally retarded and mentally ill in Canada. We must realize that the member for Hamilton South speaks with knowledge and from experience. Unfortunately I had to be absent from the house when he spoke, but I read his speech this morning. I think it was excellent, and I wish to endorse what he said in this respect. I do so wholeheartedly because I represent a riding in which the people themselves have tried to do something in this regard through the organization of the Kootenay society for handicapped children originated first by Dr. Endicott, a very well known doctor associated with the clinic at Trail, who has given years of service to this organization.

He had occasion recently to come to Ottawa. His colleagues were very anxious, as he himself was, that he should have the opportunity to meet the minister and discuss with her their experience with some of these problems locally. On behalf of the Kootenay society for handicapped children I want to express very sincere appreciation for the time the minister spent discussing this matter with their representative, Dr. Endicott, when we all know that she was particularly busy on the day in question. Dr. Endicott was very pleased, and he returned and made a report. I wish to read now from the minutes of a meeting of the board of governors of the Kootenay society for handicapped children held on June 21, 1964:

> Dr. Endicott reported that he had visited Miss Judy LaMarsh in May. He stated that he had told her that the estimated cost of the complete plans for the Dr. Endicott home would be $500,000 and gave her a copy of the brief, on which he had made some marginal notes. He stated that there would be a dominion-provincial conference in Ottawa in October and that Miss LaMarsh particularly wanted "lay" people to attend, people from local societies and associations. She wanted the experts to be balanced by plain interested people. Dr. Endicott recommended that we send a delegate, which would cost about $400—$500.

They intend to do this, and this is the sort of approach I like in problems of this kind. I think ministers and officials of departments can learn from local people. I have had a few experiences involving one or two departments of the government when on occasion I have met an official who gives the impression that he is sitting on the right hand of the Almighty. I am very glad to say I have not had this experience with the Department of National Health and Welfare.

Dr. Endicott makes some suggestions which I want to bring to the attention of the committee because I think they indicate a lengthy study of the question. In writing to me about this matter he says:

> As you know, we have analysed the problem as offering five possible solutions. The favoured one at present and the one supported by present federal grants is encouragement of retention in the parental home. This is the "experimental legislation" you presented to a meeting of our society in Trail some years ago. The expectation at that time, certainly by provincial officials, was that there would be an exodus from Woodlands of dependants whose parents would want their child and the grant. This did not occur. The second expectation has been disappointing also in so far as the waiting

list for admission to Woodlands has not decreased but is now almost three times greater, about 875 to 300.

There are 875 retarded children waiting to get into Woodlands in British Columbia, while at the same time the government of that province lends $100 million to the province of Quebec and tells people generally that they have not got the funds to care for these children.

Mr. Cowan: Quebec's needs may be greater.

Mr. Herridge: Dr. Endicott continues:

A second solution is the large centralized institution of which Woodlands is an example. This solution suffers from a number of difficulties, the most important of which is to maintain public and parental interest and responsibility toward the dependant population of the institution. A degree of improvement has been accomplished locally in New Westminster but for the Kootenays this is a major difficulty. In addition, being a government institution it is too impersonal, too large and afflicted with high costs. This is the solution we have been attemtping to modify or change over the years.

He continues:

A third solution is to find foster homes. This is difficult to start with and lacks continuity to such a degree that servicing by social workers or voluntary personnel becomes well nigh impossible. In addition, rapid changes of home environment are distressing to the dependant individual and contribute to emotional instability which makes the problem of care particularly difficult in the mentally retarded adult.

This is what we have now come to call the Thatcher home solution of problems related to retarded or mentally undeveloped children.

A fourth solution has been tried many times. That is imposition of responsibility, with or without financial reward, onto a sibling, usually in my experience a daughter. I have yet to see it devoid of bitterness no matter how well intentioned the person might be at first. The interference with the personal life, the attitude of the partner in the marriage and the effect on the children in the sibling's family makes this almost inevitable. The eagerness of any person so threatened to find alternatives convinces me that it is not an acceptable solution in general.

Then he goes on to deal with the Kootenay society for handicapped children:

We offer a community based facility governed by a local voluntary organization capable of maintaining community and parental interest and responsibility for the dependant individuals. It would provide a facility for temporary care in case of family crisis such as illness of the mother. The main factor is continuity. This is offered by Woodlands or by siblings but cannot be achieved by any other method except the one our society offers. At some point in history the parental care breaks down, be it late or early. This second home, community based, with parental participation is potentially a reasonably more satisfactory solution. By making parents and community responsible for operative costs it can be made competitively economical.

He goes on to deal with the necessity for co-operation by governments. I am very taken with the attitude of the officers of this society and their approach to the problem. I think it is along these lines that we are going to find a solution and meet this increasingly recognized need.

Before I conclude I wish to bring to the attention of the minister that during the past year, as usual since the Disabled Persons Act has been in force, I have met a number of persons who have made application for the allowance and been refused. I simply cannot understand why these applications have been refused. I have talked to some local doctors in Trail, Castlegar, Nelson, Nakusp and other areas in my constituency. Whenever one of these cases has been brought to their attention they have said also that they could not understand why the application was refused, because the person in question was completely unemployable. I understand the regulations are such that if they can look after themselves to some extent they are not considered eligible for the allowance.

I have discussed this question with doctors. I have discussed it with persons directly concerned. I have discussed it with the chairman of the disabled allowance board in Vancouver, that is the provincial authority. I have read the regulations, and I can see that the interpretation of the act is the main reason for the failure to grant the allowance when it seems obvious to any lay person that it is necessary. I can see before me now a young man in Castlegar who is completely disabled and who will never be able to earn a living at any ordinary occupation, yet he was rejected. I know of a lady in Nelson who is in similar circumstances and whose application was rejected just two or three months ago.

I do urge that there be some reconsideration of this situation and that if necessary amendments to the Disabled Persons Act should be introduced. I am sure the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre will agree with me that when this act was passed we were all under the impression that the act was going to cover the various types of cases I have been discussing. I am sure other members have had similar experiences. I believe this is a very serious situation. We boast about our production, our wealth, our economic activity and our prosperity. I say this in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that any nation that cannot properly look after its young people, its dis-

abled people and its senior citizens, and provide these essential services, has not yet evolved into what I would consider a Christion civilization.

Mr. Otto: Mr. Chairman, I am sure you will indulge me for a minute or two. I have no criticism of the minister; I think she has been doing a fine job, but it would be out character for me to praise her too highly. I was much impressed with the speech made by the hon. member for York-Humber, although frankly I do not entirely agree with him that rates of pay are the solution to the nursing problem, nor would I like to think that mothers and wives who want to spend time on the week ends with their families and who would not go back to the hospital for $12 may go back for $20. I should like to say that if anyone in this house wants information about hospital administration, he would do well to spend an hour with the hon. member for York-Humber.

However, since the hon. member for York-Humber is a director of one, he does not want to get tough with hospitals. I should like to say to the minister that since she pays a good portion of the piper's fee, although she may not be able to call the tune I think her department should at least have the right to find out how that tune is being played, especially in so far as hospital administration is concerned. The hon. member for York-Humber mentioned that the hospitals are almost closed on week ends. We know this is true. However, there are other questions the minister might investigate, such as the allocation of beds to doctors; the qualifications that doctors must have in order to be on staff; the fact that a doctor, being on the staff of one hospital, cannot practice in another hospital, in fact cannot even walk in the door, though we presume he is a graduate doctor. These are things that are costing us money. Not only are they costing us money but they contribute to the maladministration of hospitals and the great shortage of beds. In fact, what is the civilian administration of a hospital? I do not even know if the term has any definition. Each hospital seems to be administered by itself. These are the things into which we have a right to inquire.

I should like to ask the minister to consider one other point which perhaps is timely now if the minister is considering the introduction of some sort of medical plan five years hence. She is a member of the legal profession, and I use the word "profession" only loosely because it is a legal business. I have a feeling that the medical profession is no longer a profession but a medical business. I should like to ask her to concentrate on the problem we are going to face about five years from now when we try to introduce a medical plan, namely the shortage of doctors. Since we will be facing a very united group, I ask the treasury benches now if it would not be advisable for the government to consider training doctors at the government's expense. We should train as many doctors as could qualify by giving them scholarships. Then when we do think of introducing a medical plan there will be no shortage of doctors but rather a superfluity of doctors. Under those circumstances I doubt very much whether the medical profession would consider going on strike, as they have done in other places and at other times. We would be able to call upon a much larger group to staff these hospitals and look after the administration of a medical plan.

Miss LaMarsh: Perhaps before the item carries I might attempt to answer a few of the questions which have been asked, at least in a cursory way. If I might start with the last speaker and his most interesting suggestion that if there is any conflict between the government and the medical profession which the government feels it cannot resolve successfully by winning over the doctors we should then circumvent the profession by establishing our own doctors, I would say to the hon. member that the government has not any intention of doing this. The Hall report has recommended that there be a very substantial increase in the federal government's participation in the provision of facilities to teach doctors, and that a great many more doctors should be produced. To this question the department is giving most sympathetic attention.

My honourable and esteemed friend from Kootenay West has dealt with a number of matters. He requested that I forgive him for having to leave for another appointment, and said he would read my remarks in *Hansard*. He spoke of the program which is being developed, and particularly the conference on retardation that will be held next month. He mentioned the special interest that his constituents have in the construction of new and specialized facilities for retardeds. He mentioned also his interest on behalf of a constituent in the inclusion of chiropractic services at the time any medical health plan is instituted. I should like to say that representatives of the chiropractic profession have frequently waited upon me since I have been

in office, and I have listened at length and with sympathy to the representations which they have made. Other interested people, notably the hon. member for Red Deer whose profession this is, have also made recommendations in this regard.

My hon. friend from Kootenay West also raised a problem concerning nursing homes and chronic hospitals, and inquired why it was that the Hall commission apparently did not deal with this particular problem. I would point out that there is a difference between the two types of facilities, and chronic hospitals come within federal government participation if included in the hospitalization scheme by the appropriate province. The differentiation between that type of facility and a nursing home, which is more appropriately a welfare facility, is probably the reason the health commission felt it should not deal with the matter as coming within the scope of its inquiry. It is a difficult area, and one in which there is an increasing interest on behalf of the aged.

My own interest in nursing homes has been increased by a number of representations I have had from hon. members and interested laymen, and this is a subject of study by the department, not only in connection with the type of facility—not strictly a nursing home but a chronic hospital—which is referred to in the Hall report. I can only say to my hon. friend that any announcement regarding support would be a matter of new government policy and cannot be made at this time.

The hon. member for Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale rather caught me by surprise in asking whether hospitals may be built with centennial grants. I can only say to the hon. member it is an interesting question the answer to which I do not know, and I shall have to refer him to those who are responsible when their estimates come before us; or perhaps he might direct an inquiry to them.

There was a most interesting contribution by the hon. member for Peace River, who was looking ahead, and perhaps not so far ahead as many may think, into the question of the population explosion and the pollution of air and water. It may be he is not aware of the fact that in my department there is an environmental health branch whose responsibilities encompass very close liaison and collaboration with the provinces on the matter of air and water pollution.

The hon. member suggested the setting up of a joint committee of both houses to deal with the problems which will arise from overcrowding. His suggestion is one of great interest, although the question of overpopulation and overcrowding appears to have less application to this country than to most of the other developed countries of the world. Notwithstanding that, there can be no doubt that Canadians must take an interest in this as a world health problem which in the future, if not at home, from abroad will press upon their consciousness in the matter of food supply and other aspects. A cursory examination of a week's newspaper will find all kinds of groups, religious groups, lay groups, medical groups, showing increased agitation on the question of population explosion. I am very grateful for the comments made by the hon. member for Peace River which I shall take to heart and consider although, as he suggested, it may be some time before he sees any fruition from his suggestion.

The hon. member for Springfield, in his contribution last night and again today, as a dentist reflected his interest in things dental. He asked whether any steps were being taken to establish a specific dental health grant. I must say that at this time it is not in the contemplation of the department, although he knows there is assistance from health grants for particular dental projects. He also mentioned the matter of fluoridation, and suggested the federal government should be giving advice and direction in this regard.

He is aware, since it was elicited in response to a question put to my parliamentary secretary in my absence, of the department's view with respect to fluoridation. Oddly enough, fluoridation is a matter which evokes a tremendous emotional response. However, it is not a matter in which the federal government has any primary responsibilities, although we have undertaken studies on it. This is, as in smoking, a matter in which we can advise and consult with provincial governments, whose primary responsibility it is; and indeed in the matter of fluoridating water supplies this remains a question of local preference. However, the department has made clear its attitude with respect to the benefits to be gained from fluoridating water supplies.

A number of questions were asked last evening by the former minister, dealing with the appointment of a national welfare council for which legislation was provided during his term in office. It is anticipated that this council will be appointed later this fall. He also raised the question of whether the province of Saskatchewan had made any suggestion about a new relief program. I should like to say, as I said earlier, that this was

discussed at the dominion-provincial conference of welfare ministers a couple of months ago, and I understand it is likely to be a matter of discussion if not for a future dominion conference of premiers at least for the conference of welfare ministers which will be reconvened later this fall. I think the hon. member for Perth is aware, as I am, from newspaper reports that this was a matter for discussion among the premiers when they met at Banff a month or two ago.

At the conference of welfare ministers which I called and attended a month or so ago, a great variety of views were expressed. I do not know what position will be taken by Saskatchewan or any other province at the time of the next meeting, but I shall undertake to report to the House of Commons if there is any conclusion drawn as a result of those discussions.

Some questions were also asked by the hon. member for Perth about cost sharing arrangements with the provinces and the letters dealing with contracting out, which the Prime Minister tabled yesterday. I am sure the hon. member has now had an opportunity to read those letters in yesterday's *Hansard* and to hear the Prime Minister's answers earlier today during the question period, when he said this legislation will be forthcoming very soon. At that stage he will be able to question the matter at greater length.

I was grateful for the intervention by the hon. member for Carleton who, in the house, has shown a continuing interest in the department in which he worked for such a long period of time. I note with interest his remarks about the health grants and welfare grants, and his disinclination to see a change effected by contracting out.

Last night an hon. member suggested that family and youth allowances should be paid together. I thought I made this matter clear when the youth allowance legislation was passed in July. However, I should like to point out first that there is a considerable difference in approach as between the two pieces of legislation and there would be a considerable administrative difficulty; for, as is known, family allowance cheques are paid each month. This will not be the case with youth allowance cheques, particularly during the summer months, because July and August amounts will be paid in September when it is ascertained that a student has returned to school. It will be seen that there would be numerous adjustments back and forth if these were coupled in one cheque; therefore it is not anticipated that they will be paid in one cheque. I may say, if anyone is concerned that this would cause an increase in the number of employees in my department, that the family allowances division is responsible for these allowances and their payment. The number of individuals we have had to add to the staff to deal with these allowances is fewer than the number we would have been obliged to add were we paying the allowances in one cheque. This is because of the necessity of making adjustments in September of each year.

Mr. Slogan: What happens when a term begins, say, in the middle of a month? Do they receive $10 for that month, or is a *pro rata* payment made?

Miss LaMarsh: They get the whole amount.

Mr. Slogan: Are these cheques sent to the parents?

Miss LaMarsh: To the parents. I have forgotten the date. I am not sure whether the hon. member for Springfield was here when this was discussed in committee in the house. There was a lively discussion at that time and many questions were dealt with. I would ask the hon. member to look at *Hansard* for that day. A great many questions dealing with the regulations were answered at that time, and I believe they will prove more useful in answering questions from correspondents and constituents than is normally the case.

During this discussion there has been a continuing refrain asking the government to spend more money. A number of hon. members have recommended that more money should be spent on family allowances, old age security, research of various kinds including medical research, fitness facilities and so on. As almost every item was dealt with in a general way, requests were made that more money should be spent. I should be happy to meet these requests, but last evening, while I was sitting here, I tried to figure out what sum of money would be required to meet the requests which have been made up to that point and I confess I was not able to come up with anything I would feel justified in placing before the Minister of Finance, particularly in one year. I would point out that there has already been a large increase in the estimates of this department.

Mr. Willoughby: I feel—and I thought I made this clear last night—that to spend money in the direction I indicated would be a form of economy. Increased expenditures on research would encourage more

people to enter medical schools and remain in Canada. The situation under the present system is like pouring water into a sieve—the more you pour, the more goes out at the other end. I suggest the economy of our country would be better served if we spent more money on making it worth while, by improving research facilities, for these people to remain in Canada, and I urge the minister to do her best to take up with her colleagues in the government the idea of increasing the amount available for research here.

Miss LaMarsh: I noted with interest the remarks of the hon. member last evening with respect to this matter. As he is aware, this is one of the questions dealt with by the Hall commission and it is consequently one of the subjects under active study by the 14 committees within the department.

Mr. Scott: I should like to know what the government has been doing, or what measures it has under consideration, with regard to the high cost of drugs and medicines, particularly as it affects senior citizens. Most members of this committee have voluminous files of information concerning the tremendous profits the drug companies are making, and are concerned with the exploitation of the public in the prescription field. Action taken in this area would not involve any additional expenditure by the government. For example, if a crown corporation could market some of these drugs a great deal of the profiteering could be eliminated and the moneys now being paid to the drug companies could be put to better use.

Miss LaMarsh: Here again, specific recommendations are made in the Hall report regarding the provision of drugs. The suggestion is that drugs should be included in a comprehensive program, $1 being charged to the individual and the rest of the cost being absorbed by the federal government. The whole question of the cost of drugs is thus within the purview of the studies new being conducted. The fact that so many of these questions have been considered by the commission indicates the complexity of the Hall report and the problems raised in dealing with it. The range of subjects to be considered is extremely wide and hon. members will appreciate that in seeking to establish government policy one has to be concerned about priorities. I feel sure all members would agree that it would not be the proper course to begin to act piecemeal without reference to other actions which might be taken. Perhaps this is an unfortunate time at which to consider the estimates of the department, having regard to the fact that we are now studying the Hall report. I mentioned specifically in my opening remarks that there is nothing in present estimates arising from the first volume of that report. Nevertheless I think every member, or at least every other member, made some reference to it, though these matters might more satisfactorily be discussed later this year, or next year.

Mr. Olson: Would the minister agree with me that the $1 proposed to be charged for drugs could be considered in the same vein as co-insurance?

Miss LaMarsh: I think I could. It should be noted, however, that in the Hall commission report three or four different approaches are made to cost sharing. The one mentioned by the hon. member is one of two or three different techniques which can be used to deter people from using a service, or to make people more aware of their responsibility toward a service, or simply as a means of raising some of the money needed. The mere title "co-insurance" does not indicate what the purpose of the technique is. That is one of the interesting things about the Hall report; there is no consistent line taken that financing should be accomplished in a certain way. A number of techniques are suggested for various parts of the service. This is another field in which a decision will have to be made by the government. Should one charge the person who is well, or the person who is sick in hospital? I know the hon. member is interested in this question. I know he believes there is a disagreement in principle arising from the term itself. It arises, I would say, from his feeling on philosophic grounds that when one is sick he should not be charged, but that prepayment should be made as a kind of insurance so as to carry the cost at a time when one's resources are not depleted by illness. I believe this is a difference in philosophy rather than a difference in terms.

Mr. Slogan: Could I ask the minister whether she could inform me what amount in this year's estimates is allocated to dental research? I mentioned earlier that over each of the past three years, although the national health grants have been increased the amount allocated to dental research has decreased. I was wondering whether the minister could give me an idea whether the amount is being increased this year or whether it is continuing to decrease.

Perhaps at the same time the minister could answer my other question regarding the earmarking of specific dental health grants. This matter has been under consideration in the department for some time and I should like to know if a decision has been reached.

Miss LaMarsh: Mr. Chairman, I am not able to give a specific amount as being allocated to dental research this year because it depends on what projects come in from the provinces and are approved. There is some $15,017,000 this year allocated to health grants, which include dental grants. I am sorry my hon. friend was not here when I began my remarks because his question about the provision of a special dental grant I did answer.

Mr. Slogan: In the negative?

Miss LaMarsh: Yes.

I think I have dealt, Mr. Chairman, with all outstanding questions. I have attempted to make notes of them and to refer to them as they came up. There was also a question asked by the hon. member for York-Humber about nurses' wages. I know he appreciates that wages are a matter which lies between the hospital boards and the nurses they hire. We pay about 50 per cent of the cost of administration of hospitals. If higher wages are involved we still pay that amount. Our only direct responsibility of course for wages is with regard to nurses we employ ourselves. I am not wholly persuaded that the spirit of Florence Nightingale is so distant that $20 will bring a nurse in to work on Sundays whereas $12 will not, but I will look into that matter.

I might also mention that this year, because of the increase in the amount of hospital insurance, we have set up a group to deal directly with the provinces in an attempt to keep the cost under control in all provinces. That was done at their request following the last meeting of provincial ministers of health and the advisory council of health. This group will, among other things, be looking into the cost on a provincial basis of nursing services as well as other services.

If there is something I have forgotten to refer to I would be very happy to attempt to answer it. I hope all hon. members of the committee will feel that no attempt is being made to throttle them or to keep them from speaking either at length or cursorily. Such matters as the survey of the aged to which the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George referred last night are most interesting ideas and will give food for much thought within the department. However, the main estimates and supplementary estimates of the department were subjected to two or three days scrutiny previously, and the whole of yesterday as well, and it is hoped that by now I will have satisfied all hon. members of the committee and that we should be able to proceed through the estimates.

Mr. Scott: Could I ask a question? The minister knows that over the last six or nine months we have been discussing in this house the policy of the government on hospital grants. I do not want to go through all the material which is on record but I would ask whether the government is reviewing this policy. The problem, as the minister probably knows, is that the gap between federal and provincial grants and the actual cost of hospital operation is very substantial, one which many municipalities feel they are unable to shoulder. I am wondering what the minister is doing or is thinking in this regard. Is there a reappraisal of the size of the grant structure, and can we look for any upward revision during the next year?

Miss LaMarsh: I think I answered that question previously, Mr. Chairman. This matter was discussed before the meeting of the ministers of health and also before the premiers meeting, and there was far from unanimity on any question of increasing the grants. I must say to my hon. friend that I do not intend to hold out any particular hope to him that there will be any increase in any of the grants. This is not in line with the thinking of the department or of the government at this time because it does tend to create an imbalance. Since the construction of health facilities is one of the first things which will have to be done before any contemplation of a national health scheme, the protection of the department is given to the over-all construction of such projects as medical schools and other facilities to see what if any additional help is required from the federal government.

No consideration is being given to increasing the grant per bed of the ordinary hospital. I think I have told my hon. friend before, but if not I should like to now, that there are really three provinces particularly short of hospital beds—the province of Nova Scotia, and the provinces of Quebec and Ontario. That is rather astonishing when you consider that the two richest provinces are Ontario and Quebec. The amounts which were allocated by the previous government to hospital construction run until 1968. How-

ever, some provinces, such as the province of Nova Scotia, have already allocated all their moneys, which means that as new needs arise in individual communities there is no more federal money to allocate. Requests have recently been made for specific sums to be allocated to these three provinces in particular, but it should be appreciated that if this were done it would hardly appear fair to the other provinces.

Toronto is a special problem where, as was pointed out by the hon. member for York-Humber, there are hospitals such as the one in Riverdale; and certainly the hon. member and his party are doubtless very glad, in a sense, that this was not made an issue in the recent election, although perhaps more attention will be directed toward it now. But because metropolitan Toronto, under the chairmanship of Mr. Gardner went out of the hospital construction field and did not give any grant when the grant was increased in 1958, there has been a lag in Toronto. It would hardly seem fair if the rest of the taxpayers across the country were asked to make up for this lag, which was caused by the metropolitan government of that time.

Really it is a pretty sterile exercise to worry about who is responsible for this or for that, and why it is that we do not have these facilities. It really does not matter why we do not have them; the fact is that we do not have them when we need them. There is no question about the provincial department of health of Ontario facing a grave problem at the moment, because it is not. While the provincial minister of health said that there was a surplus of beds in Ontario, the unfortunate thing is that this surplus was not in the same place that there was a surplus of patients who need those beds, and you just cannot move a bed from North Bay down to Toronto when you need it. The difficulty is the possibility of overbuilding, and overbuilding at a time when building costs are very expensive in certain places.

When you are faced with a situation such as that in respect of the Riverdale hospital, which is constructed in a place where the need for beds has been apparent but you cannot staff it, you only increase the difficulty by following that suggested course. I think my hon. friend knows that my department and the Department of Veterans Affairs are as gravely upset as he about the current situation in Toronto, as well as the situation in certain areas of Nova Scotia. As I said earlier, while I cannot indicate at this time what our answer will be, it does not appear to be of the order of increasing the dollars for bed grants.

Mr. Scott: I thank the hon. minister for her explanation and I am glad to hear there is some consideration being given to finding a solution to this problem on a long term basis. I think we are all naïve if we feel the health plan and its provisions are going to be implemented in the near future. What concerns me is what are we going to do today to provide short term relief.

I have in mind the hospitals in the Scarborough area in respect of which my doctor friends tell me there are something like 22 children's beds for a population, under 15 years of age, of 90,000, and that if they had a hospital today with 100 beds for children it would be staffed and filled by midnight with only very urgent cases.

It is certainly logically correct to say that some over-all plan has to be developed and facilities have to be provided prior to the implementation of a health scheme, but is the department not prepared to attempt to do something to give some relief in the intervening years? I have mentioned this problem in respect of children, and we are trying in Scarborough to build additions to the hospitals, but the cost is very high. I regret that we cannot look for any assistance from the federal government. Would the government contemplate matching the provincial grant, which I think in Ontario is now about $5,500 as contrasted with $3,000 on the part of the federal government? After all, without being too political, we have been promised health insurance for 45 years and are still anxiously awaiting it. I am not suggesting that it will be held up for another 45 years, but there are many problems involved and it will be some time yet before it is implemented. I am sorry to hear that we cannot look for any short run assistance at all from the federal government through the minister's department.

Miss LaMarsh: As I pointed out, such assistance will come through co-operation between the veterans affairs department and the authorities in Toronto. I think one should also bear in mind that the provincial government made an announcement after a discussion with us and without any recriminations against the federal government, because it realized this is its own responsibility, rather than a federal responsibility, for long term low cost loans to individual hospital boards.

My hon. friend is a good enough lawyer to realize that one of the difficulties is that of ascertaining when it is fair to make special

grants, or pour special money into certain areas and at the same time withhold it from everywhere else, and of ascertaining when such a thing is not justifiable. Certainly taking an area with the highest level of income in the whole country and attempting to justify the necessity of more federal money for that area, while at the same time not giving more to other parts of the country, is a proposition which, if I adopted it, my hon. friend would be the first to attack in this house. I should like to make it very clear that there is no suggestion at the moment for emergency grants of any kind increasing the present grants to that area. We are working with the provincial departments of health in order to help in any way that is fair and possible so they can meet their responsibilities in this regard.

Mr. Slogan: I have a question I should like to ask the minister. I have brought this matter to the attention of the department, and I should like to know whether the minister can tell me that it has been solved or, if not, consideration is being given. The question relates to Indian and northern health services. As I understand the situation, when an Indian leaves a reservation and stays away for 12 months he is no longer eligible for medical services. I grew up on the old St. Peters Indian reserve from which the Indians were moved to Hodgson reserve, although a number did not want to go and remained on the old lands. These Indians are still treaty Indians living on their original lands; however, they are not eligible for medical services. Some of them have come to me and, rather than get them involved in a lot of red tape, I have provided services gratis, although I do not think that is a fair situation. The Indians who leave the reservations do so in an attempt to integrate with society, but once they leave the reserve they no longer have the privileges extended to the Indians who stay on the reserves. I think these people are particularly deserving in this respect, and that this practice is grossly discriminatory against them. Is the minister aware of this situation, and can she do something about it?

Miss LaMarsh: Mr. Chairman, I should be very pleased if my hon. friend would send me a note in this regard, and I will look into the situation.

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Chairman, approximately 20 minutes ago, the minister in reply to some comments made by the hon. member for Danforth referred to the shortage of beds in certain areas of the country, and pointed out that there was a woeful shortage in Nova Scotia, Quebec and Ontario, and that this was a peculiar situation in view of Quebec and Ontario being the two richest provinces in Canada. At that time I looked around this chamber and counted seven hon. members from the province of Quebec, not those who are presently here, and I was surprised that not one of those members took objection. I am wondering now how long equalization payments will continue to be made to Quebec.

Mr. Scott: Answer yes or no.

Item agreed to.

Health services—

15. To authorize hospital construction grants to the provinces, the Northwest Territories and the Yukon Territory upon the terms and in the amounts detailed in the estimates and under terms and conditions approved by the governor in council including authority, notwithstanding section 30 of the Financial Administration Act, to make commitments for the current year not to exceed a total amount of $29,666,575, $20,000,000.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Chairman, I waited until you called vote No. 15 before speaking because there is a statutory provision of course for contributions to the provinces under agreements entered into pursuant to the Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act, chapter 28. Perhaps the Minister of National Health and Welfare is becoming a little weary of the representations being made to her about the discriminatory action against the province of Alberta in so far as the formula used for shared programs is concerned. Mr. Chairman, so long as this injustice continues and there is no satisfactory reason given, other than that there is a disagreement in principle, we shall continue to make these representations whether it is trying the patience of the minister or not.

Throughout the past few months we have heard a great deal about something called co-operative federalism, and during July and August when the new fiscal arrangements between the provinces and the federal government were being passed through this house, this term "co-operative federalism" was used a great deal.

On more than one occasion several ministers of the crown, including the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance, have said that the provinces have a certain area of jurisdiction and that the federal government has a responsibility to treat citizens of Canada throughout the nation in the same way. Yet we have this discriminatory action with respect to sharing the cost of hospital-

ization continuing, and apparently a stubborn refusal on the part of the government, particularly the Minister of National Health and Welfare, to recognize that the province of Alberta as well as other provinces ought to have the right to administer these acts in the way they choose.

The premier, minister of finance and minister of health of the province of Alberta have been to Ottawa on a number of occasions to put forward the view that they believe that a so-called deterrent fee of $1.60 to $2 per day is not only a valid and justifiable means of collecting some part of the cost of operating hospitals but also acts as a deterrent in that it leaves some responsibility for this service with the individual. I want to quote from a speech made by the minister of health of the province of Alberta on February 15 of this year in which he said in part:

> In the first place, it certainly discourages abuse of hospital benefits. I don't suggest that many people are going to stay in the hospital when they don't have to be there, just because it doesn't cost them anything to be in the hospital, but certainly the daily charge that is levied against the patient ensures that no one is going to remain in the hospital any longer than they require the hospital care. This is important in order to make beds available for those who need them more. In addition to this, the co-insurance fee is a method of dividing financial responsibility in an equitable manner between the individual who is getting the benefits of the service and the public who are paying the rest of the bill.

A few minutes ago the Minister of National Health and Welfare suggested that this principle might be accepted with regard to the recommendations of the Hall commission report. In other words, when we reach the stage where the federal government is going to set up a national medicare or medical scheme the government will probably accept the recommendation in the Hall report that there be a deterrent fee so that there will be some individual responsibility for the services provided. With regard to the argument that no one who is sick and in a hospital should be obliged to pay any part of the cost, in other words, that it is the wrong time to collect any fee or payment when a person is sick, the minister certainly is not going to try to argue that everyone who tries to enter a hospital is destitute any more than it can be argued that every person requiring drugs is destitute. I would say that over 95 per cent of the people have resources that they can use in order to pay a small deterrent fee when they are in hospital, and to argue that it is not right or fair to collect a small deterrent fee when the person is using the facilities of a $24 a day hospital bed is no more correct than to say that there should not be a deterrent fee for the person requiring drugs. I think it can be argued equally well that no person should be charged for drugs when they need them if you are going to argue there should be no charge for the use of hospital services.

So, Mr. Chairman, the argument breaks down. But the interesting point is whether the province of Alberta is going to have to wait until the federal government accepts the principle of a deterrent fee. Apparently somewhere along the way, whether a few months or a few years from now, consideration is to be given to adopting the same kind of method that the province of Alberta has considered right and proper up until this time.

From 1957 and 1958 when the agreements were first made the province has used a deterrent fee of varying amounts. I think it started out at $1 per day. In relation to the actual cost of operating the hospital beds the amount charged today is no more than the initial amount. We think the present situation is unfair. We have had no satisfactory explanation except that there is some disagreement in principle. But today the minister told the committee that there is some validity to the argument with respect to drugs and perhaps a fee of $1 per prescription ought to be charged. She even went so far as to say this would bring about a certain amount of individual responsibility for these services so that they would not be abused.

I contend that this argument applies equally to the use of hospital beds. At the present time the taxpayers of the province of Alberta are having to pay approximately $1,700,000 over and above what they ought to be paying in relation to the other provinces. Perhaps $1,700,000 a year is not a large amount but it is the result of a discriminatory practice that we think should be changed. As a matter of fact, the Prime Minister had something to say about shared programs when he spoke to the federal-provincial conference on November 26, 1963. At that time he said:

> In many areas the federal and provincial governments are responsible for parallel action within their respective jurisdictions. Each must operate in its own sphere of jurisdiction, and respect the other sphere. That is essential to both the letter and the spirit of our constitution.

Then he went on to say:

> Such consultation and co-operation can be effective only if they are mutual, working in both directions. This is essentially what I have had in mind when speaking about the need for a "co-operative federalism".

In so far as resolving this problem is concerned there has been no consideration for the viewpoint expressed by the province of Alberta. For the past six or seven years they have repeatedly made representations to the federal government and so far, as I said, there has been a stubborn refusal on the part of the Department of National Health and Welfare to acknowledge the right of the province of Alberta, which is responsible for the administration of the act, to run its affairs in the way it chooses.

The federal government has not interfered with some of the other provinces which choose to levy an insurance premium. They do not deduct this from the approved costs of operating hospital wards. They do not take any objection to some provinces choosing to collect a part or in some cases all of their share of hospitalization costs through a retail sales tax or something of that nature. Officials of the province of Alberta have objected to the federal department very forcefully. I have here a letter dated November 23, 1962, addressed to the former minister from Hon. J. Donovan Ross, minister of health of Alberta, in which he says in part:

> Co-insurance charges in Alberta are considered by us to be equivalent of premium payments made in certain of the other provinces and should be accorded the same treatment.

I do not want to belabour this point, Mr. Chairman, but I must say to the minister that if some consideration is not going to be given to these very valid representations we are going to have to continue to belabour the point every time an opportunity arises.

I am not going to take the time now to go back into some of the other discriminatory measures contained in the new federal-provincial fiscal arrangements. However, this discriminatory action is not confined to the Hospitalization and Diagnostic Services Act. There are many other areas. This discrimination has been going on for a very long time. The argument, in so far as the government of Alberta is concerned, is valid and they have a right to administer this measure in the way they see fit without any interpretation of the regulations by the federal government to discriminate against Alberta and thus cause Alberta to pay a proportionately higher share of the cost of hospitalization all over Canada.

In case anyone is interested, Mr. Chairman, the collection of federal taxes in Alberta in the year 1962 was divided as follows: individual income tax, $126 million; corporations, $66 million; non-residents tax, $2 million, for a total of $194,758,000. Then, there was $5 million from the estate tax. On the basis of a population division, there was about $136 million from sales tax, excise tax, customs duties and so on. In total, the residents of Alberta paid $335,815,000 into the federal treasury. There were direct grants of $29 million in one form or another paid back to the province of Alberta. These were for a number of things including hospitalization grants. There was about $57 million paid under the tax agreements, and a share of a public utility amounting to $1 million. In any event, the total repayments to the government of the province amounted to some $90,794,000.

The injustice, Mr. Chairman, is that the residents of Alberta are paying into the federal treasury their share, and then some, on a per capita basis of the funds that go into the federal treasury. Then when it comes to a redistribution of those federal moneys, we find there is a discriminatory action against the province. I hope the minister and the officials of her department will take another look at this action to see if they cannot interpret the regulations in keeping with the spirit that has been expressed by the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance on a number of occasions, that all provinces have the right to administer their affairs in the way they choose and that all provinces shall be treated equally.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall vote 15 carry?

Mr. Olson: No answer?

Miss LaMarsh: I shall be glad to answer and tell the hon. member what he already knows. I have said a number of times, as my hon. friend is aware, that perhaps the most persuasive member of his party, the premier of Alberta, came to Ottawa and discussed this matter with the Prime Minister, the Minister of Finance, myself and our officials. The province of Alberta signed an agreement in writing, then knowing what the results would be. It now seeks to persuade the federal government to change this agreement. These representations were urged upon my predecessor as they have been urged upon me. It is simply a fact that we do not agree the deterrent fee is anything comparable to an insurance fee. We do not agree that it is a good principle to require an individual who is seeking a bed to pay a per diem charge. It is that fundamental a disagreement.

My hon. friend has said that I just finished saying I agreed in principle with the user

charge of $1 per drug prescription. I protested, Mr. Chairman, that I did not say it. I referred to the fact the royal commission had mentioned this as a way of raising money or as a deterrent charge, and I used this as one example which was given in the health report, certainly without indicating the government would adopt or approve such a proposal. Despite the very vigorous address of my hon. friend, I cannot hold out any hope there will be a change in attitude because the disagreement is fundamental and basic, notwithstanding the very good relationship there is between the Prime Minister and myself, and the premier of Alberta and the minister of health there, with whom I have had many discussions. It is felt that the authorized charge cannot be increased without the necessity then of reducing the federal contribution. There is no question but that Alberta can, if it chooses, increase from $1.50 or $2 to $5 the amount they wish to charge someone who is ill to go into hospital. This would simply mean the federal government would not share, in the same proportion which it presently does, the total cost of hospitalization.

Mr. Olson: If I misinterpreted anything the minister said, I want to apologize for that. Perhaps I did not hear her say that the thoughts she was expressing were some of the recommendations in the Hall report.

I should like to ask her if the premier of Saskatchewan, Premier Thatcher, has made any representations to her department to get the concurrence of the department with regard to the dispensation that would be made of deterrent fees? I understand he is seriously considering this as a valid and proper way of raising some of the funds required for the province's share of hospitalization.

The other point that was made was that the agreement signed some six or seven years ago must stand, notwithstanding the fact that there are changes taking place all the time. One of those changes is the cost of operating hospitals, which has been rising substantially. Will the minister tell us if there have been representations from Saskatchewan recognizing this as a valid way of collecting funds to pay the province's share? Have there been representations from any of the other provinces?

Miss LaMarsh: No, I did discuss with Mr. Steuart, the minister there, on a number of specific items, but not that in particular. I have noticed that the new premier of Saskatchewan has been quoted as talking about a deterrent fee, although no representations in any formal way have been made at this point. I should like to say, without any equivocation, that every province will be dealt with on exactly the same footing and on the basis of the agreement. I do not want my hon. friend to suggest that Saskatchewan, under its present leadership, will receive any more favourable treatment than Alberta. It is not a matter of party politics, it is a matter of the philosophy of the act when it came into being, at which time it was adopted by all the provinces. I do not mean in any way to detract from what I characterized as the very vigorous speech by my hon. friend, but he must realize that when we give consideration to a matter it does not mean that just because a province wants to do it the federal government says O.K. go ahead. Surely we must balance all factors and make up our minds. It must necessarily follow when you are dealing with other groups, particularly those which have an honest political philosophical difference, that you will find points on which you simply cannot agree. This happens to be one of them.

Mr. Pascoe: Mr. Chairman, I have a question dealing with hospital construction grants which will require detailed information that the minister may not be able to supply right now, but she might be good enough to provide me with it by letter. The details of this vote show a little over $2½ million for Saskatchewan. Will it be possible to have a breakdown on where this money went? Further, it shows an item of $9,666,577 for commitments, but points out that it was not necessary to spend this money. Does this indicate that some hospitals which were approved were not constructed?

Miss LaMarsh: No; with respect to the last question it means they were not finished. I would be very happy to reply to my hon. friend by letter, if that would satisfy him.

Item agreed to.

Welfare services—

40. Administration, operation and maintenance, including grants as detailed in the estimates, $4,060,300.

Mr. Knowles: Before vote No. 40 carries there are a few repetitious things I would like to say. I hope that does not rule me out of order, but it has been my experience in the house that with some things on which one feels strongly one has to repeat oneself quite often.

I listened with interest to the minister's remarks summing up the discussion on item 1. She has her own inimitable way of putting people off, but she does not put me off by the suggestion that there is a refrain running through many of our speeches, the refrain of more money being wanted for this or that particular program. This item is a general administrative one covering the various programs that come under the heading of old age assistance and the various other pension benefits.

Despite what the minister said today, and despite the concentration being placed on the benefits that will flow from the Canada pension plan, we have not reached the end of the road with respect to old age security and the other pension programs that come under the responsibility of this department. When I heard the minister say that we should not be asking for these things because they all cost money in terms that she could not calculate, I could not help but recall that that was the kind of answer I got when I first came to the House of Commons some 22 years ago.

At that time the old age pension was $20 a month. I was a very brave new member. I dared to suggest the pension should be increased to $30 a month and was told by the minister of finance—because at that time the old age pension came under the Department of Finance, not under the department of pensions and national health as it was then known—the same thing that the minister said today, that it would cost such a huge sum of money, that it was impossible. Later, when I got really brave and went out on a limb and suggested the abolition of the means test, I almost expected to be certified because of the attitude displayed on the government side.

We have moved a long way since that day, but we are not at the end of the road in terms of providing security and dignity and decency for our older people, and for other members of our society who do have a claim on the affluence and the abundance of our times.

I recognize that the Canada pension plan if we get it, as I hope we will this year, and if it becomes operative in 1966, as I hope it will, is going to make a real contribution to this whole problem of security for people of older years and, in some cases, for people not quite so old in years. But the problems that are coped with by old age security, old age assistance, the Blind Persons Act and the Disabled Persons Act are still with us, and I urge the minister and her department, busy as they are with the Canada pension plan and studying the Hall report, not to neglect to consider the needs for improvement in these other acts, for the benefit of all those people who will get nothing from the Canada pension plan because they are now 70 or over, or will be over 70 before it becomes operative. For all these people it is not good enough to provide them with just $75 a month. That figure should be increased, as I said yesterday, to $100.

There is also the whole question of reducing the eligible age. I know the Canada pension plan will make it possible, when it becomes fully operative, for people to draw $51 a month at age 65 without a means test. That is good, but it will take several years before that point is reached, and to ask people in this latter part of the twentieth century to settle for $51 a month for the rest of their lives surely is not consistent with what we are capable of doing.

I think I have read everything the minister has put out concerning the Canada pension plan, and I may say she has kept us pretty busy in that respect. I have also read the Liberal party literature with regard to pensions that was published in the last two election campaigns. I read the three white papers —the first one is getting a bit yellow and the second one a bit grey. I hope we can act on the third one while it is still white.

I read with interest the speech the minister was to have made in Toronto in September last, and which was made on her behalf by her parliamentary secretary. I read with interest the speech made some months ago in Kingston by the hon. member who is now the Minister of National Revenue, a speech which seemed to be an authoritative statement on the Canada pension plan. I have also read, though not every line of it, the actuarial report prepared by the government on the Canada pension plan. That was produced last year and in that document there appeared one statement I have not found anywhere else in all this literature, that is, an admission of the fact that even when the Canada pension plan becomes operative the old age security figure will not remain at $75 a month, and that as time goes on it will have to go up even as adjustments are made to the Canada pension plan.

I had hoped that that admission which was contained in the actuarial report would have appeared in the white paper in one or other of its versions. It is not there yet, but so far as I am able to watch the minister's nods up and down and right and left as I speak, I gather she agrees with me that $75 a

month is not a figure fixed for all time for old age security.

Even though it would have to devote some time to it, I urge the department to do some re-assessing of the pensions and benefits paid under these various pieces of legislation. It is going to be fine, a quarter of a century from now, when people who retire under the Canada pension plan will have a reasonable amount on which to retire. It is going to be fine, when people who become disabled and people who have dependants will have something reasonable to live on; but what about people in 1964 and 1965, and during the rest of this decade and the early part of the next one? If we are going to be consistent in our desire to improve the social security position, that desire must not only be for the future but also for the present. Therefore I rise to express the hope that some of the time of the department will be spent on reassessing these various statutes, the Old Age Security Act, the Disabled Persons Act, the Blind Persons Act and others that this department administers. It does seem to me the amounts paid under these acts need to be increased and that other changes need to be made.

My hon. friend from Kootenay West referred earlier today to the eligibility conditions in the Disabled Persons Act. All of us hear a great many sad stories in this connection. If I might mention one other matter, there is the requirement with respect to old age security benefits that one last year be spent in Canada before people can receive payments. In the case of people who have lived all their lives in Canada but who, at 65 or 68, have to go to the United Kingdom, or the United States, for reasons of health or for economic or family reasons, it is hard to explain to them that despite all the time they have spent in this country they cannot draw old age security payments unless they return and manage to spend one more year in Canada. This is a detail, as I have said, but it is an awkward detail in the experience of a good many people.

The over-all submission I am making is one which I hope the minister will take seriously. Yes, she is doing a good job in her fight to get the Canada pension plan. I suspect she has to fight a lot harder for it than some of us may realize. Yes, she is doing well to have 14 committees studying the Hall report, and I hope we will get moving soon toward a health charter for Canadians. But in doing all these things I ask that she and her department not forget the improvements needed by those people who have to depend on the pensions, benefits and allowances they get under these various other acts. I urge that these things be attended to as well.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Langlois: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to make a long speech; I will only make a few comments concerning item 40 of the estimates of the Department of National Health and Welfare.

I think the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) dealt to some extent with the matter I intended to cover, but I hope I will nevertheless be allowed to make a few suggestions, not only for the good of the Canadian people but also to help the government in its administration of the old age pension and family allowances programs.

It is a well known fact that at present the pensions or the amounts paid by the federal government to assist certain destitute people or certain persons in the provinces, are completely administered by the provinces. By the way, the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Olson) referred to those agreements a while ago.

Now, I must congratulate the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss LaMarsh) for her efficiency and for the courtesy with which she gives us answers and deals with the cases submitted to her. I wish to express special thanks.

It is true that a minister may not always control everything and look after every detail as he would like to, and it is precisely on that point that I wish to make certain observations concerning some administrative officers, who may come under provincial jurisdiction, in respect of amounts paid out by the federal government. In some cases, there is discrimination. It is true that the federal government makes those payments heartily and that the provincial governments try to administer them in the same manner, at least I am quite prepared to believe it. But every general rule has its exceptions.

In this field, unfortunately, exceptions are not rare. I think it may be caused by overzealous persons, and since we are all human, there may be also, in certain cases, personal feelings involved; that is why we, as members of the House of Commons, very often receive complaints in regard to the procedures followed by the officials in the distribution of pensions.

I am thinking here, for instance, of certain cases where the federal minister or depart-

ment grants an old age pension wholly administered by the federal government but which, afterwards, may be transferred to one of the social welfare administrations of the province.

I can recall two particular cases. The first is not necessarily one of old age pension—and I am quite willing to give the benefit of the doubt to the civil servants, federal or provincial, who conducted the inquiry which showed that the person in question, being mentally deficient, was unable to look after his pension.

As for the second case, with which I am personally familiar, it could very well be that, in some way, there was a certain abuse in the manner in which the pensioner handled his old age pension.

The party in question is 72. It is true that at that age, as at any other age, some people take a little more rope than they should. In this case, the man drinks a little and because there has been family trouble and reports have been made about him, he is deprived of the administration of his pension, even though he is quite lucid and has full control of his faculties. His old age pension is administered by the province.

I should not want to blame the federal or the provincial governments but I feel that, to a certain extent, the man should be allowed to present arguments against the government's contention if the latter withholds his pension because even if he is an alcoholic, I think that he is bright enough to look after his business. I know him personally.

This is just a minor detail, and I want to remind the minister that there are other more or less serious cases of this kind, which are sometimes left to the discretion of generally over zealous officials or of those who yield to sentiment. After all, we are all human.

As the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre did a moment ago I would like to urge the minister to raise the old age pension. I would also like to suggest that the old age pension be not increased in the same way as last year when legislation was passed to raise the pension and then a tax was introduced to meet the increase.

At that time Mr. Lesage was paying an additional $10; he, indeed, can do as he likes, but it happens that some pensioners in old people's homes, who were formerly getting $75, had their $10 withdrawn by Mr. Lesage, after the federal government added the same amount under the last amendment to the Old Age Pension Act, because the beneficiaries were in old people's homes. If Mr. Lesage thought that it was logical to award them ten additional dollars before, I do not see why those senior citizens would not need them now.

Therefore, I would suggest to the minister that an agreement be entered into with the provincial governments, so that the minister or the provincial premiers who may have a tendency to act in such a way continue to give what money they were previously giving, because the person previously in need does not see the colour of the $10 given by the provincial government when the federal government decides to give an amount of $10 for the same purpose.

I find it strange that it is the federal government which levies taxes but it is the provincial government which benefits, because it was previously paying $10 to pensioners in homes for old people and the latter should therefore have received $85 but they only get $75.

And I should like to go farther. A few minutes ago the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre said that he had gone out on a limb and had the impression that he was going a little too far when as a young member he first came to the house he asked that old age pensions be raised from $20 to $30, while today he is asking for the abolition of the questionnaire which the 65 year old man must answer before he is allowed a pension.

I must congratulate him for the step he took several years ago and for pressing the government again today, because the $75 old age pension is less than the $20 pension of that time, if you consider the increase in the cost of living and what an individual needs today to survive.

It is hard to understand how a person can live on $75 a month especially at that age when people are physically deficient and more prone to illness, the body being less resistant than it was at 20. Doctors and druggists do not reduce their rates just because the customer is 75; on the contrary, some of them may take advantage of the situation because the scheme is administered haphazardly. So, half the pension goes to pay medical expenses and the recipient has only $38 or $40 left to live.

Mr. Chairman, it is certainly not unreasonable to ask for a pension increase; indeed, such a step would be even more fruitful if pensions started at the age of 60.

I understand the situation. In my area, that is in Thetford Mines and the vicinity, some 600 miners have been laid off. Many

of them are fathers of families and some of them have 10, 15 and 20 years of experience in the mines. A certain number of those men are 60 and, of course, they are still on the labour market, because they cannot get a pension from the mining company or from the federal government. Those who find work take the place of younger men who could otherwise start a career. Thus, the young people are just as worried as the older workers.

As far as I am concerned, I would be in favour of paying the pension at age 65 without any means test and that the test be compulsory in the case of recipients who have just turned 60. Very often a man of 60 who has worked in a mine for 20 years is ill and can no longer work. Needless to say that a 65-year old individual cannot live on a monthly pension of $75; he can barely exist on that.

I appreciate, as the minister said, that a lowering of the age required for the old age pension would give rise to additional expenditures. Very well, Mr. Chairman, and the same would apply in the case of family allowances; on the other hand, such expenditures would be worth while.

Mr. Chairman, if the intention is to pay an old age pension like the last one when the $10 increase was offset by a new tax, I would not approve of it, because the children would have to support their parents.

If the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has been called a demagogue, a few years ago, for asking that the old age pension be increased by $10, I am taking the chance of being called a demagogue for suggesting to the minister to draw the necessary funds from the Bank of Canada in order to finance consumer credit. And, at this point, I would suggest to the minister to kindly pay special attention to my remarks: she must use the Bank of Canada to finance consumer credit and that without interest; as far as credit granted to production, it is all right, because the selling price includes production costs as well as the interest paid to the bank by private enterprise, but consumer credit should not bear any interest.

This is where I ask the minister to look to the Bank of Canada to provide that money without interest, so that old age pensions and family allowances could be raised and that additional money, put in the hands of consumers, could circulate and also cause goods to circulate. Such money, in the long run, would return to its natural source and get back to the Bank of Canada. But, while in circulation, what would it make possible? Everything hinges on the consumption of goods, and do not forget that money merely represents goods, their legal tender. Instead of bartering a quarter of pork for a dozen of eggs, a monetary unit was established which we now use.

Mr. Chairman, it is quite all right for the government to control its own business, but it should finance consumer credit through the Bank of Canada. Whether it is called old age pension or national dividend, it does not matter; but let us face the facts with regard to the existing production and also consider that by meeting the existing natural needs, the national credit will only be improved in relation to the country's requirements. The same situation would prevail regarding family allowances.

I wish to point out to the minister that a survey was conducted in France following an increase in family allowances paid in relation to the number of children—I think the minister could inquire personally about this. It was established in France that family quarrels and divorces were considerably reduced when those various increases came into force. The trouble had been caused by the fact that the head of a family, being out of a job, had been unable to meet his family's needs. It was inevitable that after a certain period, some tension developed within the family, giving rise to quarrels, divorces and forcing public welfare organizations to take charge of the children. Finally, the state had to handle the problem and provide assistance just the same.

If the father and mother do not work, their children need food, clothing and shelter just the same, which means that the state has to provide for them. At one time the state gave a larger share of its revenue to the family itself so that, in turn, the latter would look after its own needs. That is how some kind of order was restored in French homes.

If the father was out of work, he had at least an income that enabled him to feed his children and, consequently, the mother might have had less reason to criticize the father, although he might not have been to blame for not working.

The same situation is found here. As a member of parliament and representative of the families in my riding, I am in a position to know that some of our citizens are faced with the same problem. As a matter of fact, when they come to me with their problems that might disrupt the family, I always discover, if I dig far enough, that financial difficulties are

at the root of everything in 99 cases out of 100. Besides, they come to me for financial help. And that is true on a nation-wide basis.

That is why I ask the Minister of National Health and Welfare to be kind enough to consider the possibility of increasing old age pensions in order to ensure at least sufficient security to those who worked for years towards our country's progress and development in all fields.

I point out to the minister that it would be normal for those older people to stop worrying about the future and enjoy a measure of security. All their life, they were concerned about the future of their country and of their children, because the children represent the future of the nation. Consequently, it seems to me that it rests with us today to take up the challenge and help them a little, so that they can go through the last years of their life in peace, satisfied that they played their part and confident that the present generation will carry on their effort.

I also ask the minister to consider seriously helping large families through higher family allowances, because the welfare and security that can be extended today to those children will precisely promote the prosperity of this country in economic, social and cultural fields.

Indeed, it rests with us today to help those children who perhaps will be in a position to help us tomorrow.

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the minister for the wonderful task she is doing, but at the same time I also want to take a minute to call to her attention a proposal which was submitted to the authorities by the Société des jeux d'hiver de Québec which I understand was set up two years ago.

The president of that organization came to Ottawa and I had the great honour to introduce him to the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss LaMarsh) so that he could set out the program that his group wanted to undertake.

Mr. Chairman, hon. members probably remember that the national sport council recommended a grant to that organization to make possible the organization of winter sports in Quebec city in 1966. Perhaps now the year 1966 would be too soon, and there would be reason to postpone this undertaking to 1967, which might coincide with the celebration of the confederation centennial.

I would see in this proposal a real factor of unity, since all our Canadian athletes might get together and co-operate in Quebec city on the occasion of sport competitions which would create great interest and make the celebration of the centennial richer and more attractive.

Consequently, I call once more the attention of the minister to this fact, and perhaps she might give some details in informing the house on the negotiations in respect to this undertaking. Perhaps the minister would be kind enough to tell us whether those negotiations can be successful and are likely to result in an agreement, for I sincerely wish that this wonderful undertaking will be possible in Quebec city.

[*Text*]

Mr. Mather: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask a short question of the minister in regard to this item having to do with family allowances. I wonder whether the minister and her departmental officials are aware of the operation in New Zealand of the family benefits plan and, if so, what do they think of it? I understand under that plan family benefits may be capitalized to the extent of £1,000, paid in lump sum to the recipients of the family allowances. This plan was commenced in 1958 and capitalization of the fund has been used to provide assistance in home building for individuals in medium and low income brackets. I understand that since 1958, when this legislation was put into effect, some 50,000 homes have been built in New Zealand through capitalization of family allowances and state housing loans. I received a letter from the minister of finance of New Zealand this month in which he says the plan has worked very well and has enabled many people in those income brackets to build homes, who would not have otherwise been able to do so. This plan has been of great benefit not only to the recipients of these allowances, but to the home building industry generally. Has the department given any consideration to that plan?

Item agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: This completes the estimates of the Department of National Health and Welfare. The committee will now proceed to the consideration of the estimates of the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys.

DEPARTMENT OF MINES AND TECHNICAL SURVEYS

1. Departmental administration, including the administration of the Explosives Act and Canada's fee for membership in the pan-American institute of geography and history, $2,191,000.

Hon. W. M. Benidickson (Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys): Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity, as I appreciated the

opportunity given to me last session, to report on the activities of the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys. I speak before this assembly very humbly, because in large part the work of this department is of a technical and professional nature. I found there were some 300 employees who had doctorates from various universities in technical and specialized fields. I want to assure this assembly that it has been a delight to me, representing parliament and the people of Canada, to be the head of this department because I have found the greatest respect for our wishes and desires on the part of the officials. At all times they really wish to follow the wishes of our democratic parliament despite their great skills and technical knowledge.

The department is known as the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys but as I have travelled throughout the country since assuming office I have found myself generally referred to as the minister of mines. I want to assure my colleagues I have learned I am not the minister of mines. Indeed only about a quarter of our staff is devoted to the mining industry. If one looks at the government telephone directory, as I did after being appointed to office, he will readily recognize that the mines branch represents approximately only a quarter of the administrative duties and only a quarter of the personnel in this department, engaged on our behalf to serve the people of Canada.

In addition to the mines branch therefore there are many other aspects and branches that deserve the attention of the committee in examining the estimates of the department. So far as the over-all estimates are concerned, I think this department was one of the few that did not come before the house last year with supplementary estimates. I cannot say we will maintain that record in the coming year. We have one or two projects that we think cannot be deferred and we may come forward with supplementary estimates later in the year. If hon. members will examine the estimates for 1964-65, compare them with 1963-64 and keep in mind the necessary increases, particularly in salaries, I think they will find that the changes in our requests to the committee of supply this year are very modest indeed.

I am also responsible for reporting to parliament for the dominion coal board, whose estimates hon. members will find on page 228. There is no change in policy there. It is simply a matter of estimating the amount of tonnage that will move forward under the statutory approval of parliament already given.

Perhaps I might summarize very briefly some of the activities that have gone on since I last reported to the committee of supply. I have said that I inherited from the hon. member for Pontiac-Témiscamingue a fairly tidy shop. I think he will agree with me that the department is not a very controversial one at any time, but rather a most worthy department and one that I think has served Canada very well.

I have just returned from a visit to Alberta where I attended the 21st annual conference of mines ministers of the various provinces. For a while they felt they should meet solely at the provincial level, but for the last three days they have allowed federal representatives to attend on an observer basis. My predecessor as minister, the hon. member for Pontiac-Témiscamingue, was the first federal representative invited to attend. I think progress is evident here. There were 400 representatives in attendance at the conference in Alberta. It has grown from a meeting of provincial mines ministers, their deputies and officials to the extent that representatives of industry and others connected with both provincial and federal governments are now attending in very broad measure, and I think to mutual advantage.

The value of mineral production in Canada is perhaps not always recognized but it is now at the level of about $3 billion a year. Consequently there is a growing demand for scientific investigation covering all steps in the extraction, use and marketing of minerals and their derivatives. Our department contributes very substantially to this end. In some other phases of our work, particularly surveying and field explorations, there have been advances and innovations in work methods and instruments which I think should be reported to the house, because while in the initial stage the apparatus and machinery involved are expensive they have resulted in the end in an efficiency which I think is very much appreciated by those concerned.

Members of the house have not had the opportunity of seeing, as it has been my privilege to see as the new minister, the work being done by the department in the remote Arctic. I give as an example the polar continental shelf project carried on by the department, which is now in its fifth year. It covers land, sea and sea bottom with closely spaced hydrographic, geological, gravimetric, seismic, geomagnetic, glaciological and topographical tests and surveys. This empha-

sizes the department's special content of scientists and specialists who advise us in these matters.

In presiding over the department I take special pride in the recognition that has been accorded to our Canadian experts in all of the specialized fields. In travelling abroad they have been recognized as being very superior, earnest and knowledgeable, and we can take pride that in my department we have presidents of world wide organizations in practically all of these fields.

The surveys and mapping branch helped to open new vistas in surveying by co-sponsoring a seminar on air photo interpretation and by placing generally more emphasis on air photography in mapping. I think Canada is pre-eminent in this field. Then the aerodist, a recently developed airborne device for electronic distance measurement, was used successfully over land and sea. This device has been used a great deal by our department since we last reported to you and has deserved the reputation it has achieved. It has not only enabled surveyors to shorten work in difficult terrain from years to weeks, but it has provided also the first absolutely accurate measurements beyond the bounds of sight, such as between Sable island and the mainland of Nova Scotia. Within the last year it has been of immeasurable value in 40,000 square miles of terrain in northern Ontario and Quebec above the Canadian National Railway line.

Now, in the marine sciences, oceanographic research continued to expand and strengthen, and new marine investigations were started in the fields of geophysics, sea ice, theoretical studies and predictions. The new Bedford institute of oceanography, which I had the honour of opening last year late in 1963, operated at high pitch and began to attract international interest and acclaim. There was further integration of oceanographic and hydrographic work. Little attention was given in this house to an announcement which I had the pleasure of making after our oceanographic ship got into operation, namely the discovery of some anomalies in the ocean eastward from Nova Scotia. I believe these discoveries might be of some interest eventually to this country in the petroleum field.

Again, in this department we have the geological branch. The geological survey continued to press its mapping of Canada at reconnaissance scale, and 65 per cent of the entire country has now been covered by geological maps at scales no smaller than one inch to eight miles. This might not seem to be impressive, but our country is very big. A notable development in recent years has been special laboratory investigations of fundamental geological processes undertaken by a small but growing staff, along with the development of techniques and equipment.

I come now to the mines branch. Among the outstanding activities of the mines branch since we last reported to you has been pilot plant tests on petroleum refining. There was great interest in this at the Banff ministers conference to which I referred earlier. These tests have been conducted with special attention paid to low grade oils and tar sands, the use of radiotracers, and so on. Every member in this house knows about the potential of the tar sands of Athabasca. We have in Ottawa a test plant that has been doing these studies and which has contributed to the successful development of a method of extracting enough vanadium from petroleum to supply the entire Canadian demand.

Then I should like to refer to the scientists from the geographical branch of the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys. They have continued to study land and ice forms and ancient plant remnants in the Arctic, to obtain a better picture of the geographical history of that remote portion of Canada. I want to refer also and pay tribute to the administration, personnel and information branches of the department. These, perhaps, are ancillary activities that do not receive the prominence some of the other branches of our department do. I want to say that I, personally, representing this house, perhaps see them most often and I view them, on your behalf and on behalf of the Canadian people, as interpreters, but I have to use my own sense in connection with the advice and programs that are advanced by these scientists. I thank the committee for their attention.

Mr. Martineau: Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the minister for the outline of the activities of his department which he has given to the committee. As a former minister, I join with him in paying a much deserved tribute to the scientists, technical and specialized personnel as well as the officials of his department who constitute a pool of specialized knowledge equal to any and second to none in this country. These gentlemen have not only co-operated with the political figurehead of the department at all times but also with the industries which avail themselves continuously of the facilities and products of the research carried on by the department,

as well as of the great reservoir of scientific knowledge available within the department.

I am happy to see that there has been no reduction in the amount of money required by the department. This is important. Last year some question arose as to whether or not some of the activities of the department would have to be curtailed as a result of an economy drive by the government. I think this would have been penny wise and pound foolish. There is no doubt but that the research carried on by the department translates itself into a greater economic activity in this country and, of course, the end result is a greater amount of money pouring into the government coffers.

This year the total amount sought by the minister for his department is $54 million, as compared with $46 million last year, an increase of about $7½ million. I am of course rounding out the figures, but it must be pointed out to the committee that only a small part of this, a little better than $3 million, represents actual increases in the services and costs to the department, the other part being moneys authorized by statutory grants, mainly cost aid, making up $4½ million of the increase.

The minister referred to many of the activities being carried out by his department. I was glad to hear him refer to many of the programs launched with such conspicuous success by the previous administration from 1957 to 1962. Among other things they included accelerated implementation of an integrated program of geodetic, topographic and hydrographic surveys, and such projects as continental shelf research and the upper mantle project, which I think has been discontinued. The minister did not refer to it in his opening remarks, and I would like him to tell us a bit about the upper mantle project. It is of a scientific nature that may not yield immediate concrete results, but it did elicit a great amount of interest at the time it was launched. I feel it is a project that should not be discarded, and any information the minister can give us about it would be appreciated.

Under the previous administration the marine science branch was established, which gave a new impetus to hydrographic and oceanographic research. I believe the minister may have had a slight lapse of memory when he referred to the opening of the Bedford institute of oceanography which he stated he had attended. I know the minister visited the institute, but it was inaugurated under the previous regime.

Mr. Benidickson: In fairness I think I should have said that it was the launching of the C.S.S. *Hudson* I attended, and this of course is an adjunct to the oceanographic institute.

Mr. Martineau: I thank the minister for the rectification he has just made. The *Hudson* is indeed an adjunct to the institute of oceanography and it has been described as a floating laboratory. I would point out that its construction took place during the years we were in power, but it was finally inaugurated into service by the minister. This was a most important event in the history of marine science in this country, and I do not believe it was given sufficient prominence either in this chamber or in the press generally, because the facilities afforded by this ship will significantly increase the capabilities of our oceanography and hydrographic services.

The pool of very specialized, competent officials and trained scientific personnel that the department controls should be used in a broader way, and I believe the government should give serious consideration to co-ordinating the many research services carried on by many different departments. Huge sums of money are being spent on research, but to my mind there is not sufficient co-ordination, and the maximum yield is therefore not being extracted from the research done. The minister would be well advised to investigate the possibility of amalgamating all these research sciences and services under his own department, perhaps to form a new department, be it the department of research, or some other suitable name. It will have to come to that if Canada is not to lose the race entirely in the field of industrial and scientific research.

I congratulate the minister on the work he is doing. Being in charge of the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys is a little different from being in charge of any other department, because the minister is continually dealing with people who possess immensely more technical knowledge than he himself generally has. This may place him under a certain handicap but I do not think it is a real handicap. The minister should draw upon that personnel and ask them to use their imaginative talents to the utmost, in order that the great expansion of the department which was launched in the years of our administration will be carried forward into a new era of real expansion and new projects of great significance. Therefore I urge the minister to consider the establishment of a select committee to consider plan-

ning. Probably this is being done, but more emphasis should be given to planning a new program of real expansion, a program that is needed more now than ever before in the history of our country.

As the minister said, the mines branch of his department is the one best known by the public at large, and the minister himself is generally referred to as the minister of mines. It is gratifying to note that mineral production in this country has continued to expand—that it has expanded probably at a rhythm in excess of that enjoyed by most other mineral producing countries since the end of the second world war. Production has now reached a value of around $3 billion. This is a staggering amount of money and, indeed, it represents a significant fraction of our total gross national product. It is obvious therefore that the efforts of the minister and his department should be directed toward sustaining and further increasing the output of this industry.

Although its output is increasing, the mining industry is faced with serious problems. One of these concerns the efficient recovery of minerals from low grade deposits. Most of our great producing mines have been in existence for many years. Some of the largest have been forced to close down within recent years because of the lack of reserves. Instead of mining the high grade stuff, the industry now must spend greater sums of money and exert more ingenious efforts in order to extract sufficient pay dirt to make its activities profitable. This has created a host of problems which must be faced by the industry, and this is where the mines branch has a definite duty to perform by showing the greatest possible degree of imagination in assisting an industry which is of paramount importance to our prosperity.

There is also the problem presented by the increased competition which faces the mining industry in Canada. Though the state of our industry continues to be good, competition at the international level is constantly increasing. The impact of trading conditions is made clear when one remembers that three fifths of the total output of our mines is exported to other countries. It is therefore most necessary that the department, and not only the department but the government as a whole, should make every effort to extend to our mining industry all the assistance possible. I know the pegging of the dollar at 92½ cents two years ago has helped to keep our mining industry alive. I do not think many of our producers would be in business today had it not been for the fixing of the dollar at 92½ cents. There was a dire need for such action in many fields, but nowhere more than in the mining field. Fortunately, this step was taken by the previous administration and I was reassured last week when the Acting Minister of Finance, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, told the house that the present exchange rate of the dollar was satisfactory and the government had no intention of changing it. I think this was reassuring news to our export industry, particularly to the mining industry.

[Mr. Martineau.]

But there are other ways in which the government and, in particular, the bureau of mines, could help the mining industry. One suggestion is that teams of experts be sent to the producers to work right in with the miners, the superintendents and the mining captains to help them become more efficient. I was talking not long ago with a mining engineer of very extensive experience in industrial and mining engineering. I was astounded to hear him say that probably not more than 10 per cent of our mines were operating in a really efficient manner. I do not think he meant they were necessarily inefficient. He probably meant that with increased aid they could operate much more efficiently. Such assistance would produce immeasurable benefit, in my opinion, for the industry itself, for the workers and for the mining communities in general. These teams should be organized by the bureau of mines, trained, and sent right out to the centres of production. Let them go where gold and other metals are produced. Let them pay attention to work studies. Let them show the producers how to make the utmost use of human and material resources as well as greater use of the science known as industrial engineering.

Some industries, including some mines, have made intensive use of the new techniques and as a result have achieved savings which in the case of the larger firms have been most substantial. One firm, Stelco, for example, made savings amounting to as much as $5 million in one year. This was the result of greater supervision of production processes. My point is that it is one of the prime duties of the mines branch to encourage the producers to make use of modern methods, and that the branch should go in and train producers in the use of these methods. This would probably be an innovation, though I know there has been some contact between the mines bureau and the producers in the past, especially in the gold mining industry. However, I feel there is room for improvement and that these contacts could be intensified.

I would also urge the minister and, through him, the government to give greater aid to those at the grass roots level, if I may use that expression, of the mining industry. I am thinking of the prospectors. There are still great mineral discoveries to be made in this land as has been shown most vividly in the last few months in the Timmins area, for example. We have seen how prospectors, working very often without assistance and with the most rudimentary means, have been able to find great deposits. The amazing thing is that these deposits are often found close to existing mines. One might imagine that such areas, which are known as mineral producing areas, would have been well explored, prospected and analysed in every way. If there were any mineral veins lurking around the subsoil in that area they would have long ago been discovered, but this has not been the case, as experience shows every day.

The real glamour of the mining industry is vested in the prospector, he is the man who does not fear to face great physical hardship, who goes out into the wild and rugged sectors which abound in our land, and who very often by sheer determination and faith in his lucky star will hit the jackpot, as it is commonly put. As a result a new mine may be established. I think the government should bend itself to consider the needs of such a person who is so important to the over-all saga of mining in Canada. Let the minister be able to provide facilities for loans or subsidies to the prospector to enable him to get the technical and scientific gear and equipment necessary to carry on his trade. He is not helped enough by the government, and special facilities should be provided him. I urge the government to give serious consideration to assistance of this sort which I am sure would mean very little in terms of the fiscal position of the government, but which might result in much increased prospecting activity throughout Canada, and therefore greater discoveries at a time when new discoveries are urgently needed by the mining industry. As I stated a few minutes ago, deposits are getting lower, the grade of ore is getting lower, and more difficulty is being encountered in obtaining deposits than before.

Another way in which the government could help the mining industry would be in considering the elimination of the tax on production and equipment machinery. It is no exaggeration to say that that tax has virtually crippled, in many cases, small marginally producing mines. It has, of course, considerably impaired the competitive position of these mines and it would seem that there is no real fiscal justification for a tax of that nature which attacks, as it does, the very things which lead to increased production in the country. At a time when the Minister of Finance is continually speaking of the need for that type of expansion, why should that tax remain? In addition, the way it has been applied should be closely considered by the minister. The minister was himself the former and very brilliant and able financial critic of his party and I am sure his counsel would have more than just passing influence at the decision making or policy making level. I think he should make urgent representations in this regard to his colleague, the Minister of Finance.

I realize that the minister has received briefs from the metal mining association and others which have in a very lucid way set out the difficulties which the tax has caused, and to my mind caused unfairly. Therefore I am sure that the minister, who really has his heart in the right place, is going to exert every possible effort to see that this situation is corrected. At the same time, he being, as I know he is, an expert on the different financial and taxation statutes on the books, he should look into some of the sections of the Excise Tax Act, because some clarification is needed there. I am told that the way some sections are being interpreted does not permit the mining companies to qualify for the exemption provided on materials which are used directly in the productive processes. These materials are normally exempted, yet by some bureaucratic technique, about the finer subtleties of which I confess I am ignorant, these companies cannot or do not seem to be able to obtain this exemption. Therefore, new mining ventures are often not pursued, which results in a loss to the mining industry and the gross national product, a loss of revenue all round and also of employment opportunities.

Mr. Benidickson: Mr. Chairman, may I say that I have spoken to the officials in front of me and we will make representations to the minister again.

Mr. Martineau: I realize the minister is aware of the problem, but by stressing it probably some action will result. I know this action is much hoped for by the mining industry.

I was happy to see that the cost aid program has been extended with some modifi-

cations. This has helped the industry a great deal and has given it the stability it needs. But, of course, it is far from being the answer to many of its problems; it is only a stopgap measure.

Last year I spoke of the necessity for a revision in the world price for gold. Like most people, doubtless the minister himself feels that the present price is not at all realistic. It is artificially held, yet it seems to work against the very people who maintain the price. The gold reserves of the United States government have dropped drastically in recent years and have reached a point that is critical. In fact, the gold reserves of the United States are today not much more than that which is required to guarantee the currency. This situation is the complete reverse of the situation which existed 10 or 15 years ago. The reason for this is that world supplies and resources of gold are dwindling. Gold has also been hoarded, I believe, by other powers. Yet the governments of the western world seem to stand idly by and let the situation go from bad to worse. Canada has a certain voice in the control of the international monetary fund and in world councils, and although I know the United States has at times expressed its disfavour of the idea I think that pressure should be applied, inasmuch as pressure can be applied, to see that there is a revision in that price. If there were, I think a period of great prosperity for our gold industry and our mining industries in general would follow.

These are about the only remarks I have to make at this time, Mr. Chairman. I wish to conclude, and to congratulate once again the minister and all of his officials from the deputy minister down who are performing such a fine job. The department constitutes a very unique and extraordinarily marvellous tool for progress, for research and for greater prosperity not only in the mining industry but in many other industries.

Great imagination should be used in order that this tool can be completely used, resulting in a full yield drawn from that great reservoir of trained scientific personnel. There should be no fear of innovation; indeed innovation should be the new watchword of the department. If that is the attitude adopted, and I think it will be, we can expect great things from the minister and his department, which will benefit us all.

Mr. Pugh: Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a few remarks about these estimates. I am glad to welcome the minister, and in view of the subject I wish to discuss, perhaps I should have addressed him as the minister of telescopes.

There is a radio telescope located on high ground in the Okanagan valley near Penticton and Oliver, fulfilling the role for which it was constructed. I understand plans are in existence for the construction of an optical telescope somewhere in the British Columbia mountains, and I should like the minister to give us the latest information available in this regard. Naturally I favour the location of such a telescope in the Okanagan area, and I do so for a great many reasons. The minister and his departmental officials have travelled through this area and given very thorough consideration to the location of a site for such a contemplated telescope, and I hope that nothing will be done to impede this research. I think this is a very wonderful project, one which could very appropriately be associated with the centennial of confederation.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take up too much time dealing with this subject, but I should like to point out that there are many desirable locations in the Okanagan area. Such a telescope could be constructed at almost any desirable altitude in an area having all the necessary elements to the successful operation of such an instrument. There seems to be some good argument for locating this instrument in close proximity to the radio telescope now located in that area. Many advantages would be gained by such a location, particularly on the administrative side. I am sure that following the establishment of such a telescope there would be a number of technical men moving to the area, and I might say that British Columbia would more than welcome those people to this area. The individuals who live there now as a result of the estabishment of the radio telescope I am sure enjoy the effervescence of the climate. I believe the radio telescope operates more efficiently in that area than perhaps it would anywhere else. In that area there is very little interference in the way of noise or pollution from industry, which would spoil the situation.

Perhaps I should also mention the fact that whenever a project of this kind is undertaken it has been a tourist attraction. While I do not suggest the telescope should be located there to give a boost to the tourist industry, there would be an added advantage in this way. Perhaps I should repeat that in the Okanagan area such an instrument could be located at almost any altitude that

was desired, in an area isolated but easily accessible. I am sure I speak fairly for the people of the Okanagan area when I say they would welcome the establishment of such a telescope there. I hope the minister will give us some information in this regard before his estimates are passed.

Mr. Benidickson: Mr. Chairman, I do not think I have received more correspondence from members of this house about any subject within my purview than I have about the construction and location of this large optical telescope of advanced design which, when constructed, will put Canada in a very up to date position in comparison with other countries of the world. We in this department feel that the establishment of such a telescope would be an appropriate project to honour the centennial of our confederation. There are so many members of parliament from that area where the telescope will probably be located, according to advice from my officials, who have communicated with me, that in my remarks I may overlook some of their names and suggestions. However, I should like to point out that certainly the last speaker, the hon. member for Okanagan Boundary, has discussed with me the desirability of his area as a location, as have the hon. members for Kamloops, Kootenay East, Okanagan-Revelstoke and others. I can assure them all that our plans have not advanced beyond our thinking that nothing more wonderful could be done by our department to celebrate the centennial than the construction of this telescope. The final proposition has not gone to treasury board, let alone to the cabinet, and I can assure hon. members that this is such an important technical project it would probably necessitate the expenditure of something between $9 million and $10 million, and once constructed would be one of the two or three of the greatest existing in the world today. I can assure hon. members of this committee, particularly the seven, eight or ten who have indicated their interest in a location for this telescope, that if I am the minister at the time the site is chosen, it will be chosen on a strictly technical basis as the best possible location, so that Canada can move forward and maintain its longtime position in this scientific field.

Mr. Pugh: Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to hear the minister say that the final decision as to the location will be made on a technical basis, and I am sure that regardless of where this telescope is located in British Columbia, no one in the interior will point a finger at the government and suggest favouritism, because they are aware of the great number of exceptionally well qualified men in his department.

I do not think the telescope would ever be put in an improper place, and probably this would be the best place in the end. I was pleased with the minister's statement that this would be a rather wonderful centennial project. Of course it would. Compared with all the ideas for smaller projects that have been put forward, I feel it is of such importance and is such a magnificent venture that it should be brought to fulfilment. I hope the minister will press his colleagues strongly in this regard because every dollar spent on a project of this type will mean a return in human interest and keeping our country abreast of the times in this field. I do not think any other project can compare.

Mr. Benidickson: Mr. Chairman, I can assure the hon. member that this project has really touched my interest very much since it was presented by the research people of the department. I think a large optical telescope would be something that would make Canada pre-eminent in this field for quite a long time after our centennial in 1967. But I would point out to all members that some of the technical features are elevation, access roads, community settlement and a requirement for a dry and relatively clear climate in an area which has a record of lack of turbulence of any kind in the atmosphere. The scientists are considering these matters. To those who have spoken to me about this project in the knowledge that it would be a unique asset to their particular regions I have pointed out these factors. We have a general idea that the proper place is somewhere in western Alberta or British Columbia, but until we get an indication that this particularly large expenditure will be approved by the government no commitment can be made. However, I have assured everybody who has written me that our technical people certainly will visit each and every area that has been suggested.

Mr. MacEwan: Mr. Chairman, I have a few brief remarks to make on these estimates. I travelled to Sudbury during the past year in a party of 30 members of the House of Commons. For the record may I say that the trip was made at no cost to the taxpayers of Canada. It was organized by the amiable member for Sudbury. The Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys and the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources accompanied us. As a result of the camaraderie

which developed on the trip we made a sort of bargain with the minister that we would not be too tough on his estimates, but I think we should have our say at this time.

At that time we visited the Frood-Stobie mine of the International Nickel Company. I come from an area where coal mining is the most important industry, and having worked in coal mines during the summer, having lived in a coal mining town, having associated with coal miners and my people having been coal miners all their lives, my eyes were certainly opened by this visit to a hardrock mine. Electric lighting is something you do not see in a coal mine and the visit certainly was a revelation to me. If such trips can be organized at no cost to the taxpayers I think they would be of great advantage to members of the house in learning what goes on in various Canadian industries.

Mention was made of the Bedford hydrographic institute by the former minister, and also the shipbuilding program which I understand is being carried out. This program was inaugurated by the former government and I congratulate the minister on continuing it. Hydrography and oceanography are of great importance today in the development of our country. We know that many matters of national importance come under this department, and only through the carrying out of surveys and research can we hope to develop our great country. I congratulate the minister on his work in this regard and I hope he will continue. It is most important to our country.

A matter more on the domestic side, shall I say, was raised by the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg. It is dealt with in the answer to question No. 1,646 to be found on page 7569 of *Hansard*. It has to do with the wage scale for employees of the minister's department, and employees on certain ships of the Department of Transport. It is pointed out in the answer that by placing all employees of the Department of Transport on the same wage rates the department has more flexibility in moving crews from one vessel to another which would allow for better career planning. The answer continues:

> The effects of this exception on wage rates applicable to personnel serving on Department of Mines and Technical Surveys vessels operating in the same area as vessels of the Department of Transport are presently under consideration with a view to eliminating any resultant unwarranted differences in rates.

I suggest to the minister that this is good. I have had representations in this regard, as has the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg and probably other members as well.

[Mr. MacEwan.]

I hope treasury board will make an exception, as it seems to me the words used with regard to personnel on Department of Transport ships would apply equally to personnel on ships of the minister's department, in that there would be more flexibility in moving crews from one vessel to the other which would allow for better career planning.

I wish to refer to another matter which actually comes under the estimates of the northern affairs department but certainly has a lot to do with coal mining and the minister's department. I refer to the Atlantic Provinces Power Development Act under which subventions were inaugurated by the former government that are payable to commercial users of power in the Atlantic area using power generated from thermal plants utilizing coal. At the end of the year they receive a cheque by way of subvention which cuts down their power costs and means a great deal to them. Certainly there has been no intimation of any change in this policy, which is most important to the Atlantic area. In my area there is a thermal plant at Trenton which provides power for the region and is also linked by grid with the province of New Brunswick. When New Brunswick has been short of power that thermal plant has supplied power to that province. This has been most beneficial and I hope this policy will be continued.

The heavy water plant in the constituency of the hon. member for Cape Breton South for which tenders have been called will also provide a market for Cape Breton coal. At one point the Minister of Industry said the plant would be there, and then he was not quite sure. B.A. Oil then came forward with a submission allegedly involving a lesser cost for the production of heavy water, but apparently upon investigation this was found not to be the case. The plan is going ahead. Industrial Estates, a Nova Scotia crown corporation, has played and is playing a great part in the financing and establishing of this heavy water plant.

In this regard it should also be noted that the new atomic power plant to be built in Ontario will provide a market for the heavy water produced by the plant in Nova Scotia. The Minister of Industry referred to it in a statement he made in the house not too long ago. During the last few weeks I have had conversations with the engineer from the Nova Scotia power commission who has been assigned to act as liaison officer with Deuterium of Canada Limited, the company which is constructing the heavy water plant. He told me they were very happy to see that

this plant was being proceeded with in Ontario because it would provide even more markets for this heavy water plant than had been anticipated originally.

There is a matter which disturbs us a little bit, and it was referred to some time ago by the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria. It is a statement made at the conference which was attended by the minister. This statement was made by a member of the dominion coal board, Mr. Whittaker. The hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria asked the Prime Minister whether or not Mr. Whittaker, the managing director of the coal operators association of Canada, was stating government policy when he called on coal transportation officials to work for the eventual elimination of the federal subvention on coal transportation. This subvention on coal transportation is most important to the maritime provinces, especially in the Cape Breton area where much coal is produced which is marketed here in Ontario. It is sold to the Ontario hydro commission. In fact, as hon. members probably know, one large ship has been constructed, the S.S. *Cape Breton* I believe, which has been used to transport coal, and another ship is now being constructed to carry on this trade. These subventions are necessary and must be continued in order to assist this area. Any suggestion by a member of the dominion coal board that they be eliminated would, I hope, not be considered by the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister did say, in reply to the hon. member's question, that this statement did not reflect government policy but he would be glad to look into the matter at once. Let us hope that this member of the dominion coal board, who has a great deal to say about matters pertaining to coal in Canada, will not prevail upon the government. Of course the coal board has to go to the government before there is any change in policy, so let us hope there will be no change in this regard.

There is a final matter which I should like to bring to the attention of the minister. It has been brought forward annually ever since 1957, when I became a member. As the officials will know, and as succeeding officials have become aware, I refer to the oceanographic ship *Acadia*. This ship has been put up for a long time in the port of Pictou, in my constituency. Each year about this time a question arises as to whether or not the *Acadia* will be based there for the winter. I believe this subject bears repetition so I will put on the record the fact that this ship means a great deal to the Pictou area, not only to the town but the whole area. It means much to the shipyards in the way of refitting and repairs, and means much to the local merchants. Many of the crew members, of course, have their houses in this community and their children go to school there. This is a matter of great importance to them.

My final point in this regard is that Pictou is in a designated area. It comes under the New Glasgow employment office. Certainly when an area is designated, that does not mean that the present industries—this ship represents an industry—will be moved out of the area. Certainly the Minister of Industry should be interested in this matter. I remind the minister that the former minister, the hon. member for Pontiac-Témiscamingue, made provision that the ship should remain there, as did the present minister last year. It has been stated that since the oceanographic institute is at Bedford, the *Acadia* should remain there. However, it is a small ship and it does not operate in winter. It means a great deal to the Pictou area, so I urge the minister that this ship be retained there.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, may I just point out that we have a Nova Scotian minister, the Minister of Labour. This department, and particularly the branch relating to coal mining, is most important to the Atlantic area. Let us hope that the minister of this department will consult with the minister from Nova Scotia on all matters so important to the Atlantic area, especially those relating to coal mining and subventions on coal transportation. Let us hope that they, in turn, will prevail upon the Minister of Finance, who is from another province, that the Atlantic area is also a part of Canada and is important. Let these ministers be heard in the cabinet, and let them speak on behalf of the economy of the Atlantic area.

Mr. Fisher: I will try to be succinct in my remarks relating to this department. The only question of an over-all nature that I wanted to raise was the suggestion that the government should be considering looking at every department to see whether or not it is necessary for them to have ministerial status any longer. This Department of Mines and Technical Surveys it seems to me is so little in the political centre of things, the partisan centre of things, that I believe it would be feasible to eliminate it. I certainly think we should have a report on this question. It is in the main a scientific and research or-

ganization, and since we now have both a Department of Trade and Commerce and a Department of Industry to look after the promotional aspects and trade aspects in this field, I wonder whether it is not time to consider putting the various agencies that come under this department in the Department of Industry, thus enabling us to cut down.

I believe that in political terms it would be much more important to have two departments of transport, one dealing with air and the other with the other means of transport, than to have a Department of Mines and Technical Surveys. I say this without casting any reflections upon the gentlemen who have been ministers in recent years. It seems to me it is becoming more and more apparent, despite the growth of the mining industry, that in the main the federal role is very much restricted to science and research. It seems to me that the necessity for the continuation of this as a department of government with ministerial status has just about come to an end. I certainly think that mines, and the various departments which are like it such as the Department of Forestry and perhaps the Department of Fisheries, are such that we might consider abolishing them for ministerial status on the basis that all they are doing is providing a technical service. There is not enough work to occupy a minister. My point is that since it is in the main administrative, and is not very political or partisan, it could quite easily come under a senior civil servant and be set up as a branch of the Department of Industry.

I have examined the publications of the department, its technical services, and looked at the general activities and I am not convinced that they could not be handled by an agency or a branch of another department. I think we should be considering means of reducing the size and numbers in the cabinet, rather than increasing them. One of the reasons I have come to this view stems from the inadequacy of this department when we get into any situation such as the Timmins strike. This is the biggest strike in mining in recent years in Ontario, and we have had a great deal of confusion about just what it has to do with the responsibilities of the department. In effect it appears that if the department has any role in this kind of situation it would be very much at arm's length, in some kind of research activity, and even there it would not appear to be very much.

One of the most controversial questions in northern Ontario in relation to the Timmins strike is whether a smelter or refineries will be built, where they will be located, what will be the situation in terms of economics, where the capital will come from, and what role the federal government or provincial government will play in the location. It is quite evident from the information given to me in the house, and apparent from the questions raised by the hon. member for Timiskaming and the hon. member for Timmins, that the department really has no major role to play in this whole matter. That is nothing to be ashamed of in connection with this particular case, but it reinforces the reality that this, as a department of government, has passed its time.

I think, just as the geographical survey was the first of the great administrative and investigating agencies developed in this country and has done a marvellous job, so this department is now just coasting on momentum, and it is time to raise the question as to whether we need the department any longer. This is no reflection on the research and other activities carried on in connection with the department. Dealing with the question of agencies, my friends in the maritimes and my friends in Alberta are aware there is a dominion coal board, but I have not been able to see that the minister really has any great role to play in connection with that agency, other than to make reports in the house and be some kind of intermediary.

There is one other point I want to raise with the minister, and again it reflects the lack of initiative and the prospect of modernity, if you want, in an extension of the activities of this department. I have raised with the minister the question of some kind of aid for prospectors. I know he will not mind my saying, I got a nice run-around from him, and an even nicer run-around from the provincial minister, Mr. Wardrope, who shares a constituency with me. Obviously the attitude of the federal government is, "Let us not get into something on which it is probably difficult to work out a good policy"; and so the minister is not prepared to move into this matter. The department has not got any interest in something like this that would open up opportunities for many little men, for people who live on the fringes—I am thinking of the geographical fringes—of our society, to get out and follow their interests.

No schools held in the last decade have had a higher ratio of interest than the prospectors schools held in Ontario. In almost every town that fringes on mineralized areas you find people going out, working, staking,

trying to capture their dream of finding something big. Very rarely do they go out with the kind of equipment that will lead to something great. Prospecting has become a function of very large companies that have good equipment. It may be just nostalgia on my part, but I think it would be a good idea to work out an arrangement to support prospectors. However, we get no leadership in this direction from the federal department and again the excuse seems to be put forward—"Why bother? This is really a provincial problem." Then when you take it to the provincial governments, aside from some interest in Saskatchewan and a little bit in B.C., they are prepared to let the thing go.

These examples it seems to me reinforce the question that I raised. Is it not time that we did away with this department, in so far as its having ministerial rating, and transfer the agencies, branches and survey groups within it under some minister who will look after all the scientific and research projects, and thus have real rationalization of government organization; or else it could be brought under the Department of Industry?

I would appreciate a reply in letter form from the minister on the last specific question I want to raise with him, which arises from questions I put previously in connection with prevailing rate employees who work for the department. A number of these employees with whom I have come in contact are unable to appreciate why they cannot be put on a permanent basis. The answer that was given to me—and I assume the information in the main came from the president of treasury board—was to the effect that this matter had been looked into and the government saw no reason to change its policy. I suppose the reason is that if these particular employees were given the kind of status they are seeking it would cause a ripple through the whole civil service. The argument put to me is that there are some unique features about the kind of work these people are doing in this department, that there is permanence in it, and because of this they think they are entitled to the kind of rights and privileges that accrue to a civil servant proper, and that prevailing rate employees do not have.

I would like the minister to write me a letter or memorandum setting out in greater detail the answers to these questions and what the prospects may be for changing this present relationship. I would also like a longer explanation than I have been given as to how the situation relates to prevailing rate employees in other departments.

Mr. MacInnis: Realizing hon. members on both sides are anxious to get these estimates through, I shall be very brief. The questions posed by my colleague from Pictou will no doubt provide me with many of the answers I seek, but he mentioned the heavy water plant, and this brought to mind the sort of dilemma the people of Cape Breton found themselves in when the minister announced the plant would be placed in Nova Scotia, and then claimed no such announcement was ever made. Because of this many people in Glace Bay were referring to it, not as the heavy water plant but as the hot water plant.

In the minister's announcement it is quite evident that the phrase used, that this would provide a substantial market for Nova Scotia coal within Nova Scotia, pinpointed the plant for Nova Scotia, but the later contradictory announcement caused a great deal of concern in the mining areas.

As was referred to by the hon. member for Pictou, and by the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria on Tuesday last, Mr. Whittaker, a member of the coal board, made a statement in Banff recently to the effect that subsidies should be done away with. The Prime Minister has assured us that this is not government policy. Nevertheless it is an unhealthy situation when somebody in an influential position, such as Mr. Whittaker, suggests this, because if it were adopted as government policy it would be very detrimental to the welfare of Cape Breton and Nova Scotia as a whole.

This is not the first time such a statement has emanated from persons whose words would give us cause for great concern. I should like the minister, when replying to the original question put by the hon. member for Pictou, to assure the people in the mining areas of Nova Scotia that neither Mr. Whittaker's statement nor the statement made by the hon. member for Coast-Capilano have any authority to back them up. I may say that this hon. member, the parliamentary secretary to the Prime Minister, has advocated such a move himself and this, as I say, has caused considerable concern.

We have had an outstanding example of co-operation by the department of northern affairs in helping to provide employment opportunities in my area. I would also ask that the department of mines, in co-operation with the Department of National Defence and the Department of Labour should work to find something in the way of alternative employment for the many miners who are

faced with idle times this winter and who have recently been laid off because of the single shift policy in the No. 18 colliery in my area. I think a good deal could be done in this direction, and the greater the number of government departments acting in co-operation to provide alternative employment possibilities, the better the chances will be of finding something concrete which will provide that employment. I have in mind such programs as were introduced by the previous government, in particular the fortress Louisburg project. This was one of the recommendations of the Rand commission. I may say I never did agree with much of what was contained in that report, though I have possibly been proven wrong in connection with the development at Louisburg. This development will mean a great deal to our area in the future. It has been helpful in providing employment, and I hope the program will be accelerated so as possibly to help out some of those men recently displaced at the No. 18 colliery.

I trust the minister, in co-operation with his colleagues in other departments, will do everything he can to assist in the event of light industries coming in to build around the heavy water industry. I have in mind in particular a metal fabrication industry which is showing some interest in locating on Cape Breton. There are rumours it may establish a machine shop at the vacated naval base, and if that is the case I would ask the minister to give a helping hand if it is possible to establish that industry in the area. As I said, the Rand commission report never excited me and I did not agree with very much of what it contained. As for the statements which have been forthcoming from Mr. Whittaker and from the hon. member for Coast-Capilano, the people of Cape Breton and the mining areas of Nova Scotia generally find them most disturbing, particularly since the hon. member for Coast-Capilano is the parliamentary secretary to the Prime Minister, and they want an assurance that such statements carry no weight whatsoever.

In addition to those statements, one other piece of information has come to my attention. It has to do with the recommendations of the Rand commission report. I questioned the minister about this shortly after he had returned from his trip to Cape Breton and I referred to the intention of some people, people in a position to act if the government accepted the policy, to implement the recommendation of the Rand commission referring to the reduction of production to three million tons a year. Such a reduction if it were put into effect would mean, in my estimation, together with the loss of the second shift at one colliery, possibly the elimination of another colliery altogether, and it would be a blow which the area certainly could not take. I ask the minister to give us an assurance that such a recommendation would get no consideration whatsoever and that the government would turn a deaf ear to any such proposal, as it would to the suggestion concerning the subvention. I believe the department could contribute a great deal, in co-operation with other departments, to promoting alternative employment and it is my hope that any industry wishing to develop in the mining areas, whether associated directly with the heavy water plant now under way or not, will be assisted in every way possible by the hon. gentleman and his officials.

Mr. Benidickson: Since the hon. member for Cape Breton South and the hon. member for Pictou have both referred to a statement made by a member of the dominion coal board perhaps I should take this opportunity to reply to the point which has been raised. I will refer to the other matters later, in a general way.

May I say that on Wednesday I was in Alberta where I met the members of the coal board. At that time I had not seen the statement referred to; the board had met a week earlier at Lake Louise. But I did see Mr. Whittaker, and since returning to Ottawa I have seen the Canadian Press report which, I imagine, is the basis for the remarks of the hon. member for Cape Breton South. I have also noted the question which was raised on Tuesday by the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria, in reply to which the Prime Minister said that if Mr. Whittaker's remarks had been accurately quoted they were not an indication of government policy.

I completely agree. I do not think the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria was properly reporting what Mr. Whittaker said. It was obvious to me, at least, from Mr. Whittaker's remarks, that he was referring only to the western sales of coal under subvention, which hon. members know are all export items bearing no relation whatever to maritime producers. He was referring to 800,000 tons on which assistance is given by subvention, in the light of the far more substantial subventions applied to the production of eastern coal. Mr. Whittaker simply said that since the purchasers of this 800,000 tons of western coal were in Japan, the subvention

itself introduced an element of uncertainty in the minds of the buyers which induced them to prefer another source of coal, such as Australia. His suggestion was that since the factors which called for the subvention were transportation costs and, of course, costs at the mines themselves, efforts should be made to introduce new efficiency in production and to reduce the cost of transport from the coal mines of Alberta and British Columbia to Port Moody to an extent which would eventually, perhaps, eliminate the necessity of a subvention to compete with Australian supplies. He had no reference at all to the maritimes.

Mr. MacInnis: I thank the minister for that reply but it does bring up another question. I might point out here that the Prime Minister did not use the word "if" in the answer he gave to the question asked by the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria. Now that the minister has taken care of Mr. Whittaker's statement, would he give us the assurance that the statement made by the hon. member for Coast-Capilano will also receive the same treatment from the government?

Mr. Benidickson: I have not seen the other statement. I felt that the colleague of the hon. member for Cape Breton South had not read the full text, as I have, of the Canadian Press dispatch with respect to Mr. Whittaker's statement so I should like to see the other statement before I comment on it.

Mr. Moreau: Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to speak on these estimates until I heard the comments of the hon. member for Port Arthur in which he advocated virtually the elimination of the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys. It seemed to me he suggested that the activities of this department might be put into some other minor portfolio. I should like to make a few comments about that because I have rather the opposite view to that held by the hon. member for Port Arthur.

I should like to see the role of the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys enlarged. Perhaps we are striving toward the same end but are just taking a different road to get there. Maybe the department should be renamed to something like the department of scientific services. I think the department of mines has played a unique role in Canada and perhaps we should take a lesson from the experience we have obtained in the mining field and apply the same principle to other industries in Canada. I refer to the role of government in providing research facilities for industry.

I noted that the hon. member for Port Arthur lauded the role of the geological survey branch, and certainly this is a very important branch of the department which has played a major role in the development of Canadian mining. As the hon. member for Pontiac-Témiscamingue pointed out, this role is an increasing one and a very important one to our economy. I feel there is a considerable misunderstanding here—and perhaps the hon. member for Port Arthur was quite accurate when he said also a certain amount of nostalgia—in regard to mining prospecting. The so-called prospector is, in my opinion, very much a thing of the past in the mind of the public. We do have people on the fringes of our northern communities who indeed play an important role in mining, but I suggest that they are not really prospectors any more. They are really brokers in real estate who follow up on larger companies or syndicates which are better financed and which make a discovery somewhere. These people then try to grab real estate near some of these finds. Reference was made earlier to the Timmins strike, and I suggest this is a very good case in point. In my opinion, prospecting has changed very much in Canada. Perhaps we lead the world in our approach to mineral exploration, and in this case scientific methods and a very well financed program resulted in the discovery of a very important mineral resource in Canada.

The view of the prospector, the prospector about whom I understood the hon. member to be speaking, who is sent to a prospectors' school for six weeks and financed in a grubstake sort of way, is that this discovery could never have been made by a prospector, because it was a discovery which was not exposed in any way and could not have been discovered by the old methods used 20 years ago. I am not suggesting for a moment that mines will not be found by the direct visual method ever again, but I do think that in the last 20 years this method has been a diminishing factor in mineral exploration and will continue to become smaller and smaller. The role of a prospector as I see it today—and I include myself in this category—is one of more sophisticated and better technical and scientific support to a program, although I think this sort of program is really beyond the scope of one individual, or even a small group of individuals.

As I have said, I should like to see the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys

enlarged so as to include a scientific support role for industry in general. As I was saying earlier, we have had unique experience in the mining industry of how this could be made to work. I disagree very strongly with the hon. member for Port Arthur when he suggests that this department has really ceased to play an important role in this industry. We are increasingly faced with the problem of beneficiating lower and lower grade ores, as the hon. member for Pontiac-Témiscamingue pointed out. We are also faced with the problem of doing scientific research in Canada, which has certainly lagged and is a role we must increase. We know very little really about the earth's crust and the larger, broader scientific matters. I feel this is a very important and useful role and perhaps the emphasis of the department has shifted from one of cursory mapping—although this will continue to be an important part of the department's activities—to one of more detailed exploration and scientific examination, as well as developing new techniques in mining exploration through research, all of which is necessary if this country is to maintain the position it has achieved in the world.

I should like to see the department expanded in order to play a similar scientific support role to industry in general. I feel that with this very advanced technology into which we are running now, with the problem of automation and so on, the department could be playing a very important role. I hope the minister will be putting his sights in this direction and that the government will agree to the department's assuming the kind of role which I think it should be playing in industry generally.

Mr. Dinsdale: Mr. Chairman, it is encouraging to see the number of members who are taking part in this discussion this afternoon. It has been characteristic of the consideration of the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys estimates by the committee of the whole, that the consideration has in days gone by been rather cursory and hasty. I know there are good reasons for this fact, as the hon. member for Port Arthur intimated a moment ago. Perhaps the policy and political functions of this department are not as pressing as those of the other departments which come before this committee. I think there is also another explanation, Mr. Chairman, in the fact that the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys has operated in a very efficient fashion over the years. I do not think there is another department of government that has established a reputation among the various aspects of the business community in Canada which would exceed the reputation of the department we now have under discussion.

It is customary to extend compliments to the men and women who are responsible for this happy state of affairs, and I join in those courtesies that have been extended by other members during this discussion. The department for many years had an outstanding deputy minister in the person of Dr. Marc Boyer who was succeeded by a man with the same qualities and qualifications, Dr. Van Steenburgh. I think these men have given the leadership to the department which has resulted in that high degree of efficiency that has been established.

Having emphasized the importance of this department I want to make some comments along the lines of those made by the hon. members for Port Arthur and York-Scarborough. It is quite true that the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys and the mining industry occupy a vital place in Canada's economy, inasmuch as they are concerned with resources development and the wise management of both renewable and non-renewable resources are of utmost importance to the continued growth of Canadian economy. I have been looking through the very excellent reports circulated by the department from time to time in respect of various Canadian minerals, and it is interesting to note that the economic upsurge which began some four years ago in Canada was strongly based on the growing strength of the Canadian mineral industry. The improved balance of payments situation that has been noted by economists in Canada in the past few years again derives in great part from this upsurge in the Canadian mineral industry. I do not have the current figures, but in 1961 when I was more intimate with this department than I am at the present time, I think something like 40 per cent of Canada's total exports were derived from the mineral industry, and the order of priority in that balance of payments situation was minerals, wheat and tourism. I understand that order is still holding—minerals out front, wheat second and tourism in a very close third position in the important role of improving Canada's balance of payments situation.

The economic upsurge which began some four years ago was stimulated and encouraged by a deliberate attempt to stabi-

lize the Canadian dollar, beginning in June of 1961 when the stabilization fund was used to lower the value of the Canadian dollar in relation to the United States dollar. This was part of a deliberate program and policy to encourage industries that were already playing a major role in Canadian economic life.

I should pay a compliment as well to the role the officials of this department played in the successful trade crusades which took place during those years, in providing personnel with the necessary technical skills and knowledge needed to take the message to those nations around the world which were contacted during those very useful and successful trade crusades efforts.

All these achievements were brought about in the face of stiffening world competition. It is a well known fact that in respect of a good many basic minerals there is a glut on the world market at present. The fact that Canada was able to improve its position is of great credit to the dedicated men and women who served in this department.

Various members from different parts of Canada have spoken this afternoon in recognition of the importance to the total Canadian economy of the mining industry, not only in respect of mining itself but also in respect of subsidiary benefits. As a westerner from the prairies I am conscious of the impact of the opening of the Thompson nickel mine in northern Manitoba on the total economy of the province of Manitoba. That mine opened in 1961 and is gradually prospering, broadening the economic picture of that province. The development of potash in Saskatchewan is having the same effect, and we are all aware of the petroleum development in Alberta which has enriched the economy of that province beyond all expectations. The development of asbestos in Quebec and Newfoundland are, of course, playing similar roles there. I think I should pay tribute as well to the industry itself, because it is not only the government that has been active in the development of Canada's mineral potential. Industry is contributing something close to $1 billion per year in research and promotional efforts, encouraging this important economic activity.

In reference to the point raised by the hon. member for Port Arthur and commented upon by the hon. member for York-Scarborough, I do feel that now is the time when the role of the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys might well come under reappraisal and re-examination. I say that, from the standpoint of personal experience, because during the period when I was the minister in the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources, I had the privilege of being acting minister for the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys for some months.

It was brought home to me forcibly at that time by virtue of administering the two departments that there was a very close relationship between the functions of the resource aspect and also the northern aspect of the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources, and many of the functions of the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys. Oceanography, glaciology, the aeromagnetometer surveys, the Canadian geological survey, the geodetic surveys—all these scientific surveys so capably carried out by the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys have a vital and increasing bearing on the success of Canada's attempt to develop her northern frontier.

It is a well known fact, as many commentators have noted, that the economic development of the huge area north of the 60th parallel is going to depend on the development of its rich mineral potential, that vast storehouse of mineral wealth which up to the present time has been pretty well a frozen locker because we have not devised techniques to make exploitation economically feasible. I have before me a recent article by Mr. Bob Hill who has travelled extensively in the north. The article is headed "Minerals in the Northland" and subheaded "Successful Exploitation Far From Assured". The basis of Mr. Hill's remarks in his recent article of August 21 is that successful exploitation is far from assured because we have not yet applied modern scientific techniques to that area in such a manner as to make it economically feasible to exploit this vast storehouse of mineral potential.

If there is going to be a reappraisal and reassessment of the role of the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys, it would seem to me that consideration might well be given to a closer co-ordination with the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources. This point was again brought forcibly home during the period when we were preparing for the resources for tomorrow conference. A decision had to be made initially with regard to how far the conference was going to go in considering resources. Was it to be restricted to renewable resources or should it also take into consideration the non-renewable mineral resources of Canada? Solely because

of the restrictions of time the conference discussion was restricted to the field of renewable resources with a strong recommendation that there should be a similar conference to consider our non-renewable and exhaustible mineral resources.

I can recall being reminded from time to time by the minister of resources of the province of Quebec, Hon. René Lévesque, as we proceeded to plan the resources for tomorrow conference that the only reason the federal minister was involved at all in the discussions was that Ottawa did have some responsibility for the resources of northern Canada. It is a well known fact that the provinces have jurisdictional control of their own resources up to the 60th parallel in the prairies and up to the Arctic region, of course, in the province of Quebec.

Here again, emerging out of the circumstance of a thorough discussion of Canada's resources, the thought spontaneously emerged that there was a close co-ordination between the functions of the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources and the services provided by the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys. Therefore, so far as the point raised by the hon. member for Port Arthur is concerned, I do not think we need to think in terms of the Department of Industry or other departments, but what we need rather is closer co-ordination at the federal and provincial levels in all branches of government which are involved in the development of our resources.

This is demonstrated by the major breakthrough that occurred at the resources for tomorrow conference resulting in the establishment of the permanent body, the council of resource ministers and the secretariat attached thereto. This is a major breakthrough in intergovernmental co-operation and co-ordination. The success of the resource ministers council, located in the city of Montreal as it is, to get it away from any Ottawa orientation, will be determined by the success that the provincial governments have in co-ordinating resource activities of the various departments at the provincial level, and the leadership given at the federal government level in co-ordinating the functions of the Department of Fisheries, the Department of Forestry, the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources and the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys whose activities in basic scientific research affect the whole area of resource development.

I should like to suggest that the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources is in a position to assume some of these functions because in the past two or three years it has shed itself of certain functions. For example, until four years ago the Department of Forestry came under northern affairs and national resources. In the past two years the Canadian government travel bureau was moved from national resources to the Department of Trade and Commerce, and more recently responsibility for Canada's museums has been assigned to the Secretary of State's department. Here is a change that has been going on without too much detailed planning. It is something that fits into the whole Glassco concept of government reorganization and co-ordination and I would recommend that the minister give attention to this situation.

Mr. Lloyd: Mr. Chairman, some observations made during the course of the review of the estimates of the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys have prompted me to make some remarks on this occasion. First I should like to express unequivocal support of those members from the maritime provinces who consistently assert the need for a continuing active awareness of the needs of the coal mines and fisheries of Nova Scotia. Without equivocation, as I say, I associate myself with those members who would like to see at Ottawa a continuing active awareness of these two great resources of Canada.

You may fiddle and tinker with administrative machinery, but in such tinkering for heaven's sake let us not lose sight of the main objective, which is to provide to enterprising Canadians every possible assistance from the government to discover the way whereby we can make the most extensive use of the God given resources which we have within the boundaries of our great nation. I would think that any move to abolish a ministry such as the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys and make it a division of the Department of Industry would just be going in the wrong direction.

I think those who subscribe to the view that the free enterprise system contributes to competition would certainly want to see the government perform the role of providing those entrepreneurs who perhaps do not have the resources of the bigger ones, with the fullest possible advantage of the research the government may be able to undertake. I, for one, have always advocated and will always advocate in this house that if there is any role the government should be performing most extensively and actively it is in the field

of research in connection with our natural resources. In this way the government can equate, if you like, the opportunity for those who lack the same capital resources as some of the larger companies who are presently encouraged by tax concessions to engage in research work to further their position in the economic cycle of events in Canada. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I heartily endorse the views of the members of this house who advocate the strengthening and expansion of the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys in the field of research, rather than the restriction of those activities.

I should not like to see these activities weakened, lessened or placed in the hands of possibly already overburdened ministers in some other departments. I would be more concerned about breaking down some of the responsibilities of the ministers in this government of Canada than I would be in adding to the responsibilities of some who may be already overburdened, having regard to the fact that some of these departments are so complex now it is impossible for parliamentarians to really follow what is happening.

For example, Mr. Chairman, I think it is a great thing for a government to be concerned about its dollar expenditures. However it must always reconcile those expenditures with the fact that the economy in all parts of our nation is being assisted whenever government dollar expenditures will assist it. It seems to me that we must be very alert when pursuing tax savings to ensure that we do not put any area of Canada in an economic condition which we all deplore. We do not want to add to the volume or size of the designated areas in our pursuit of one thing which happens to be produced efficiently in a central area of Canada, and which the consumers of Canada want or need. I can see sometimes that various ministers who are desirous of economizing end up being penny wise and pound foolish.

I think it would be most unwise, for example, for us to be too quick to criticize subsidies and subventions to the maritime provinces. Let it always be remembered that the industries in the central part of Canada which are turning out products are producing tax carrying products and the consumer, no matter where he lives in Canada, will be making his contribution to the treasury of Canada. I think sometimes this fact is overlooked.

The opportunities for Nova Scotia in the field of oceanography, Mr. Chairman, and the challenge that it presents to extend our fisheries resources to areas hitherto undreamed of in international markets, deserves the fullest attention of a single minister, rather than being placed as a division in another department of government.

Mr. Southam: I, like other members on this side, do not intend to take too much of the committee's time this afternoon. However, like the hon. member for Brandon-Souris, I feel that the number of participants in this discussion is evidence of the importance of this department of government. I wish to take this opportunity of expressing my congratulations to the minister, and to his very efficient department, for carrying on their work to the gratification of the members of this committee over the past year. The former minister of mines and technical surveys, the hon. member for Pontiac-Témiscamingue, has expressed on behalf of our party the constructive criticism that should be directed toward this department.

Personally, I rose to say a few words in connection with the coal industry in Saskatchewan. As I have mentioned on several previous occasions, the coal industry in Saskatchewan is a very important part of our economy, particularly in the southeast corner of the province. In looking over the last report of the dominion coal board I noticed some paragraphs that gave me some concern. I quote:

> Production of coal in western Canada during 1962-63 totalled 5,104,000 tons, a decrease of 444,000 tons from production in the previous year.
>
> The biggest drop in output occurred in the Saskatchewan lignite field which produced 2,069,000 tons, a decrease of 325,000 tons from the tonnage of the year before.

Now, this lignite field, as most hon. members know, is in the riding of Moose Mountain and is a very important part of the economy. I continue to quote from the report:

> Alberta bituminous coal production was 558,000 tons, a decrease of 124,000 tons; and British Columbia and Yukon production was 882,000 tons, a decrease of 120,000 tons. The only production increase in the west was in Alberta sub-bituminous coal. After many years of steady decline, followed by a levelling off last year, sub-bituminous output rose to 1,595,000 tons, an increase of 125,000 tons.

Of course, the significance of this increase stemmed from the fact that it could be ascribed to the first six months of digging coal for the Wabamun thermal electric plant, recently enlarged by the addition of a 150,000 kilowatt coal fired generating unit.

Mr. Benidickson: I very much hesitate to interfere with the hon. member for Moose Mountain, who is himself very courteous to

the house, but it has been the practice to deal first with the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys and then the coal board. I do not know the wish of the committee, but perhaps it would be possible to dispose of the items that are under the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys and then refer to the dominion coal board.

Mr. Southam: I am sorry if I have transgressed any of the rules laid down, Mr. Chairman. If you wish me to reserve my remarks until some future time—

Mr. Martineau: Perhaps the minister would be agreeable, since the hon. member has already launched into his remarks, to allowing him to continue his discussion of this item.

Mr. Benidickson: I have no serious objection. I believe the hon. member for Kootenay West wants to say something about coal. I was just thinking about the possibility of disposing of certain items of the estimates, not for the convenience of myself but of the officials who are standing by.

The Chairman: Is the suggestion made by the minister agreeable to the committee?

Mr. Martineau: Several members have spoken on the subject and the hon. member who has the floor is quite advanced in his remarks. I think it would be better if he concluded.

Mr. Southam: I appreciate the help of the committee in this respect. I was glad to notice that on the order paper, under date of June 29, the minister has the following resolution:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to amend the Coal Production Assistance Act to extend until the 31st day of October, 1969, the period during which agreements may be made under section 3 of the said act.

The amendment introduced to that act by the former minister in December 1962, proved of great value to the lignite industry in Saskatchewan, and no doubt to other coal producing areas, particularly where it had effect on the consecutive payment of loans. This part of the amendment was very beneficial, because rather than having to pay double indemnity, or 60 cents a ton, where they had two loans they could make their payments consecutively.

Earlier this session I was glad the Minister of Trade and Commerce stated the government would follow the previous government's policies with respect to a national grid system. If such a system could be developed at the earliest possible opportunity it would be of particular benefit to that part of Saskatchewan, which contains about 20 per cent of total Canadian coal deposits. With the thermal steam generation plants that could be developed, similar to the one developed by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, that area could put into a grid system many million kilowatts of cheap power, which would enhance the economy of that part of the province. I know it is a question of technological development concerning the economical transmission of power over long distances, but I am sure the engineers will overcome this problem in the not too distant future.

In conclusion I wish to ask a specific question with regard to groundwater surveys in Saskatchewan. A great advance was made on this work under the previous government. It is work that is very important to Saskatchewan, as it is one of the more arid regions of Canada. The development and utilization of water is most important to our economy, something which has been evidenced by the many questions and debates on the water problem affecting eastern Canada this year. The Saskatchewan provincial government has been conducting widespread surveys. There is a lot of subterranean water in Saskatchewan, but the surveying and developing of it places quite a load on the province itself. The federal department should accelerate its program in this respect.

Mr. Benidickson: In answer to the hon. member's last question, this season in cooperation with the provincial government we had eight or ten workers dealing with the matter of sunken rivers and subterranean waters. There will probably be a paper available shortly, but the work is continuing.

The Chairman: Shall the item carry?

Mr. Benidickson: I still wonder if it would be possible for some of the mines and technical surveys items to receive the approbation of the committee, and leave other items open if necessary, items like 65, 70 and so on, that relate to the coal board. Would that meet with the approval of the hon. member for Kootenay West, who is always here?

Mr. Herridge: It just so happens that the hon. member for Kootenay West wants to hear the minister talk on the national coal board and the government's policy.

Mr. Benidickson: Having regard to the procedures in the past in dealing with these estimates, I have not with me the officials concerned with the dominion coal board. It has been traditional that we deal with the

mines branch before dealing with the coal board, and if that will suit hon. members, on the next occasion I will have the advice of the officials from the dominion coal board.

Mr. Herridge: If I am allowed, I want only a few minutes to say a few things. I have been sitting here all afternoon because I am very interested in this department, which is one of the departments which rather hides its light under a bushel. I am interested because of the geographical, topographical, geological and resource development of the mining industry in the Kootenays. I was interested in the remarks made by various speakers such as the hon. member for Port Arthur and the former minister, with respect to the organization and reorganization of the department.

This is strictly a scientific research and technological department, which is fortunately not subjected to the day to day buffeting of political partisan questions, and I think it is a good idea to keep the department within those confines. I shall not go into questions of reorganization or things of that sort, but I do suggest as a result of the discussion this afternoon that it is obvious a good many members are not aware of the over-all services performed by the department.

Though it is too late this session, I suggest that the estimates of this department should be referred to the committee on mines, forests and waters where the departmental officials would have an opportunity to explain to members of the committee the services they perform, what I consider a sort of socialistic service provided for free enterprise, and where the officials could answer questions.

Mr. Benidickson: I would welcome that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Herridge: I am delighted to hear the minister say so—where they, with the better knowledge of the functions of the department and the services it is performing, can give consideration to what can be done to increase still further the assistance it is rendering to the Canadian people as a whole and to industry in particular.

These are the few remarks I have to make at this time. I am glad to hear that the minister is agreeable to my suggestion.

Item agreed to.

Mining and metallurgical investigations and research—

35. Administration, operation and maintenance including Canada's share of the cost of the commonweath committee on mineral processing and $50,000 for grants in aid of mining and mineral processing research in Canadian universities, $4,985,000.

Mr. Churchill: I should like to ask the minister in connection with this item what progress has been made in research activities concerning other uses for uranium. There was some activity a few years ago in connection with the discovery of other uses for this metal—using it to strengthen steel, for example. Has this been a successful research operation? I think the department has some connection with the work which was being undertaken.

Mr. Benidickson: The hon. gentleman had some responsibilities in this field in the past and he will recognize that this is an interdepartmental affair involving the present Department of Industry and the Department of Trade and Commerce as well as the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys. Some developments have taken place. Some alloys have been developed which look as though they may be useful in conjunction with uranium. Such information obtained from government research has been made available to the steel companies of the land, but that is about as far as I can go.

Item agreed to.

Geographical surveys and research—

45. Administration, operation and maintenance including the expenses of the Canadian permanent committee on geographical names and the national committee for Canada of the international geographical union, Canada's fee for membership in the international geographical union and a grant of $500 to the Canadian association of geographers, $653,000.

Mr. Martineau: Would the minister say a word about the upper mantle project? Is it still being carried on?

Mr. Benidickson: Yes, it is continuing. It is a project with which the hon. gentleman was very familiar when he was minister. It has not yet been completed.

Item agreed to.

Research in astronomy and geophysics—

55. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and equipment, $944,000.

Mr. Rapp: Could the minister explain the increase in payments under the Emergency Gold Mining Assistance Act in 1964-65 compared with the previous year?

Mr. Benidickson: The terms of payment came before parliament last year and the only change was a restrictive one which meant that no longer would we make payments under the act except to mines where 50 per cent of the employees were already within an existing community. The reason for the increase

in payments is simply that the grade of ore has been lessening and the cost of production has been increasing.

Item agreed to.

The Chairman: The dominion coal board.

Mr. Knowles: Five o'clock.

Resolutions adopted in committee of supply this day reported and concurred in.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Churchill: For the convenience of hon. members could I ask the leader of the house to outline the business for Monday and Tuesday?

Mr. Favreau: On Monday, Mr. Speaker, we shall take as the first order, order No. 67 as it appears on today's order paper which is a resolution preceding a bill to amend the Farm Improvement Loans Act. Then we shall take up order No. 35, a resolution preceding a bill to implement certain recommendations of the royal commission on transportation. After that, we will continue the debate at the committee stage of Bill No. C-72, otherwise known as the redistribution bill.

On Tuesday, if the resolution concerning the Farm Improvement Loans Act has been passed, we shall proceed with the second reading and committee stage of that bill, after which we would take up consideration of a resolution which is being placed on the order paper concerning farm machinery syndicates.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being after 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 RESPECTING BIRTH CONTROL METHODS

Mr. R. W. Prittie (Burnaby-Richmond) moved the second reading of Bill No. C-48, to amend the Criminal Code.

He said: Hon. members will have noted that this bill was seconded, not by a member of my own party but by the hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Willoughby). I requested the hon. member to do so in order to emphasize the non-partisan nature of this amendment and also because the hon. member for Kamloops is a member of the medical profession and of the Canadian medical association, a body which is interested in the passage of this amendment to the Criminal Code.

[Mr. Benidickson.]

At the outset, I wish to state that this bill which I have presented has nothing to do with the world population problem. It has nothing to do with the total size of the population of Canada; we are still a long way from being overcrowded in this country. It is about an archaic law on our statute books which says it is illegal for competent persons such as physicians, pharmacists, pastors and priests to give information on family planning to married couples who want such information.

Section 150 (2) (c) now reads as follows:

> Every one commits an offence who knowingly, without lawful justification or excuse, offers to sell, advertises, publishes an advertisement of, or has for sale or disposal any means, instructions, medicine, drug or article intended or represented as a method of preventing conception or causing abortion or miscarriage.

It goes on to say:

> (3) No person shall be convicted of an offence under this section if he establishes that the public good was served by the acts that are alleged to constitute the offence and that the acts alleged did not extend beyond what served the public good.
>
> (4) For the purposes of this section, it is a question of law whether an act served the public good and whether there is evidence that the act alleged went beyond what served the public good, but it is a question of fact whether the acts did or did not extend beyond what served the public good.
>
> (5) For the purposes of this section the motives of an accused are irrelevant.

Apart from that possible defence, section 150 is very complete and wide in its scope. Again these are the words of the statute which I want to emphasize:

> —offers to sell, advertises, publishes an advertisement of or has for sale or disposal any means, instructions, medicine, drug or article intended or represented as a method of preventing conception—

So the bill is very complete because it uses the word "any".

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are many means of preventing conception. There are mechanical devices, usually rubber, available for both men and women. There are chemical methods, notably the pills about which we hear so much today. There is the rhythm method which is widely used by members of the Roman Catholic faith. But the way section 150 now reads makes it illegal in Canada to advise, prescribe, sell or supply any method of preventing conception.

The terms of the Criminal Code generally are administered by the Department of Justice. However the food and drug directorate of the Department of National Health and Welfare authorizes for use and sale in Canada certain types of birth control pills. In my opinion it is a bad law because it is

so widely disregarded by such a large element of the population, or if you like by such a large and respectable section of the population. Any physician who advises patients on contraceptive methods is breaking the law. Any druggist who sells contraceptive pills or devices breaks the law. Any cleric who advises his parishioners about family planning is breaking the law. Thousands of these people are breaking the law every day because of this archaic statute. More than that, Mr. Speaker, I consider this section of the Criminal Code, which is in that general section of the code dealing with pornography and sexual offences, to be an unwarranted interference by the state in the private lives of married couples. What should be essentially a private and personal affair is in the Criminal Code where it has no place.

We all know that the majority of the Canadian people pay very little attention to this law. Most couples of average income and higher have no difficulty in obtaining the information and devices necessary for family planning. They simply ignore the law. But there are large numbers of people who, because of the circumstances of their lives, depend upon the public health services for their medical care. In most cases the public agencies which serve these people—hospitals and social welfare departments—do not give contraceptive information because it is contrary to the law to do so. So there is this element of the population who may want this information and help but who cannot get it.

There is an exception, Mr. Speaker, and that is the city of Toronto. Recently the council of that city discovered that the city social welfare department was supplying and paying for birth control pills on prescription to recipients of social welfare. The council's committee made an investigation and reported back to the council, and the council and board of control agreed that their social welfare department should continue this practice. I applaud their courage and good sense, but it seems to me that if the law is to be enforced the mayor, controllers and aldermen of the city of Toronto all ought to be taken to court under section 150.

I am sure that all hon. members are aware that there is widespread support in the country for the passage of this bill. Most members have received thousands of letters from their constituents favouring it. Several of our leading newspapers and magazines including the Vancouver *Sun,* the Edmonton *Journal,* the Toronto *Globe and Mail,* the Toronto *Star,* and *Maclean's* magazine have given strong editorial support for this amendment to the Criminal Code.

Many of the religious denominations have declared themselves in favour of this amendment. These include the board of evangelism and social service of the United Church of Canada and many of the presbyteries of that church, the council for social service of the Anglican Church of Canada and quite a number of the synods of that church. The 90th general assembly of the Presbyterian church, meeting in Toronto in June, passed a resolution in favour of this amendment. The Unitarian Church of Canada, of which I am a member favours this reform. The Baptist conventions of Ontario and Quebec have also endorsed approval of this bill. Quite a number of other organizations have gone on record during the past year or two as supporting a change to section 150 of the Criminal Code. These include the children's aid society of Ontario, the Canadian medical association, the Canadian association of obstetrics and gynaecology, the Canadian council of women, and the voice of women. By no means least, and as one would expect, the planned parenthood associations in Vancouver, Edmonton, Winnipeg, Toronto, Hamilton and Ottawa have worked assiduously for this particular reform.

Now, Mr. Speaker, people have said to me many times that the Roman Catholic church would prove a real obstacle to getting this type of bill passed. I am not at all sure that this is the case. The Roman Catholic church is not opposed to family planning as such. It recognizes that there is a case for family limitation. The church distinguishes between what it calls natural and unnatural methods of controlling conception. The present debate within the church has to do with that very subject—what is natural and what is not. Inasmuch as I am not a member of that church I do not want to comment further on the present debate within the church, I only want to say that many prominent clergy and laymen of the Roman Catholic church take the attitude that they do not wish to impose their beliefs upon persons of other faiths.

As an example of that particular viewpoint I want to quote from a news story in the Vancouver *Sun* in March of this year which reported on a panel discussion in Vancouver. One of the members of the panel was Father James R. Roberts of the Roman Catholic matrimonial tribunal of the archdiocese of Vancouver, who has something to say in the article. The article reads:

Bad laws breed disrespect for the law itself, according to Father James R. Roberts, member of the Roman Catholic matrimonial tribunal.

"For any law to be effective and serve the community it must be backed by the general acceptance of that community, otherwise the mass violations (even in good conscience) of that law, produce disrespect for the law," he explained.

"Prohibition did not have the support of the community and the disastrous results of that puritanical law prove this point," he added.

In his opinion the basic issue is one of civil rights.

"We (Roman Catholics) support the principle of civil rights for Negroes and for Indians but all this would be hogwash if we were not truly sensitive to the current question of civil rights in B.C.

"And the law prohibiting the sale and use of contraceptives here is an infringement on those rights," he said, enlarging on remarks he made at a panel discussion last week on quality or quantity.

Father Roberts said that he "realizes many non-Catholics in Canada hold the Roman Catholic church responsible for the preservation of this archaic legislation".

"But this is not true," he said.

"Although we may hold that certain methods of birth control are immoral, we are not obliged to force our moral code on the civil law," he explained.

I realize that everyone in the church does not hold that view, but there are a very substantial number of the theologians and laymen of the church who do hold that view. It is a matter of civil rights for each person to decide for himself.

Yesterday the general council of the Canadian medical association wired the Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau) urging passage of this bill. Last night the 21st general council of the United Church of Canada meeting in St. John's, Newfoundland sent a telegram to the Prime Minister asking that there be a free vote on this bill. I do not believe, Mr. Speaker—I do not think I am being naïve about this—that there is any plan to talk this bill out. I understand that there is wide support for it in all parts of the house. I understand that there can be a free vote, but if there is to be such a free vote I would respectfully ask members who want to speak in favour of the bill—and there are quite a few—to keep their remarks quite brief so that we can proceed to a vote, because there is no general plan as far as I know to talk it out. If we can do that and give the necessary reading to the bill today we can correct one part of our law which many thousands of our citizens have asked to be corrected.

Mr. Joseph P. O'Keefe (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, despite the rather plausible argument of the mover of this resolution I wish to voice my personal opposition to the bill proposed. I do not for a moment suggest that in this matter, or indeed in any other, I am voicing the views of all my constituents. I am confident however, that I reflect the feelings of a great many people, and most certainly my own.

I oppose this bill on principle and not merely as a matter of conscience. Our function in proposing legislation—as I understand that function—is to propose and to enact laws which are in the best interests of the common good. This bill asks us to legalize that which is beyond our jurisdiction. My opinion is that the determination of what is morally good or bad is not within our competence. I suggest we legislate within a determined area of morality. For instance, theft, murder, and other crimes are not morally good or bad simply because we make them so by legislation. They are against the natural law, and not because Canadians, British, United States or other legislators declare that they are.

I oppose this bill in practice. What has been the experience of those countries which have enacted this legislation? Cursory reading indicates that some countries at least are now very much concerned over the consequences of the legalized sale of contraceptives. They have experienced, and are now experiencing depravity, promiscuity and a rampant recklessness among the young—and not only the young.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this government or of any government, is, or certainly should be, to promote the common good and to work diligently for a more equitable distribution of wealth. The government knows full well that, in fact, contraceptives will be purchased especially by unmarried people and by the young, resulting in corruption of public morals. In my opinion this or any government should not permit these gravest of social evils, evils which attack morals, attack married life and attack the family, the very foundation of our society. The family should and must be protected at all costs.

May I quote a word or two here from an address given by His Excellency the Governor General at the opening ceremony of the Canadian conference on the family. His Excellency said:

> To my way of thinking, the best and surest way of developing generous and idealistic hearts, of giving the community men and women who are well balanced and conscious of their responsibilities to their country, is to protect the family, for the family—far from opposing the interests of society—is capable of giving to the universe the human beings who are prepared to put justice and truth before their own personal interests.

Any government, but particularly this government, has to work for the material better-

ment of the people, and to work for a better distribution of food, of work and of wealth. Let it not be said finally that we are merely legalizing what is being done anyway. This argument is pragmatism at its lowest and its very worst, and unworthy of public mention, unworthy of representatives and unworthy of this house. Such an argument could extend to anything, for instance to a certification of firearms and their indiscriminate use, and we would then witness assassination and mass murder. How pragmatic can we get?

The answer to the problem of poverty, Mr. Speaker, is obvious. We must increase the supply of food and jobs, and certainly not decrease the population. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, not wishing to emphasize the obvious, I oppose this bill in practice, on principle and in all conscience.

Mr. Charles J. M. Willoughby (Kamloops): Mr. Speaker, in seconding this motion I did so because I support the amendment and consider the act as it now reads as being a serious hypocrisy. The law as the act now stands is not being enforced, which makes the hypocrisy even more obvious. I feel this bill involves a great national issue and affects the enforcement of law and order not only in this regard but in regard to other laws, and leads to a disregard for laws generally.

This bill also has some international implication. The last speaker made a very pertinent remark when he suggested one of our duties in this country involves the distribution of food. I do not intend to go into this subject in detail, but I wonder whether he is aware of the fact that the world population today is almost three billion, that four out of every five deaths in the world today are directly or indirectly the result of lack of proper nourishment, and that empty stomachs know no laws? I am sure he is aware that communism thrives when stomachs are empty. Statistics have been presented which indicate that in 40 years the population of this continent will have doubled, and that in 65 years, at the present rate of growth, the world population will be in the neighbourhood of 50 billion. To support the population expected in the United States within 25 or 30 years that country will have to find 400 million more arable acres of land.

Mr. Habel: Would the hon. member permit a question? Is he not now, by the remarks he is making, departing from what the hon. member who sponsored the bill said was not its concern, namely the world population?

Mr. Willoughby: I recognize the fact that this bill does not directly implicate world population, but how can we assist the world population conscientiously while at the same time remaining hypocrites in our own country? We must increase the world food supply. I suggest there are only two ways out of the problem created by world population explosions. One is to create more arable land and grow more agricultural products—growing four blades of grass where only one grows now—or assist in curtailing the increase in the world population. How can we do this with conscience and yet remain hypocrites? Canada has ample space and an ample food supply, but we have an international duty.

I suggest the problem envisaged by the mover of this bill is not a religious one. I have the greatest respect for any religion and would be the last one to criticize, but because of our hypocritical attitude, if the law involved was enforced most medical men and druggists at the present time would be in jail. How ridiculous can a situation become? No one is permitted to accept advice in respect of contraceptives as the law is now, and no one will be compelled to accept that advice if and when the law is changed. Let us put all the cards on the table rather than pushing some of them under it.

I should like to conclude by endorsing the remarks of the proposer of this bill, and by emphasizing at the present time that most religious organizations in Canada are prepared to support the amendment. The Canadian bar association has recommended that this amendment be made. The Canadian medical association has also recommended that this amendment be made. Most religious bodies, if they have not endorsed the amendment, do approve of family planning.

Interestingly enough, Mr. Speaker, on the average family planning has not curtailed the number of children in most families in Canada. It has been done in such a way that it has been for the benefit not only of the parents but also of the children. The result is that on the average Canadian families are larger today than they were before this subject was ever introduced. There is nothing to worry about on that score.

As a medical man, the big factor so far as I am concerned is that this type of proper instruction will overcome the terrible illegal abortions that are performed. I do not think we should overlook that fact for one minute. I endorse the bill because the present provision in the act is hypocritical and a real farce. The amendment is endorsed by all the

organizations I have mentioned and I feel that under the circumstances the house should approve it to remove this hypocrisy from the Criminal Code. In doing so I believe we will offer no offence to any person or organization.

[*Translation*]

Mr. C. A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, I rise to protest against the passage of this bill. I have seen many happenings in the house but this time things have gone too far. When I hear men speak in favour of such legislation, I wonder where the people of Canada are going.

This is working toward the destruction of the human race.

Not satisfied with having authorized the opening of drinking places on practically every street corner to facilitate the degradation of modern society, not satisfied with having enticed our young girls and our women to taverns and grills to degrade womanhood, we are now seeking to make women sterile. In my opinion, that is a diabolical scheme.

Mr. Speaker, the whole of Canada must speak out against those who support this bill. We have no right to put such a dangerous, indeed, such a diabolical weapon into the hands of the people.

Most of us are Christians, and as such, it is our duty to put up as strong a fight as possible against this legislation.

A few minutes ago, I heard someone say that this is not a religious problem—

[*Text*]

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. The hon. member has just implied that those who support this bill are not Christian. I dissociate myself from that implication, and I ask him to withdraw it because it is not true. I support the bill and I am also a Christian.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier: It it well and good to disassociate oneself, Mr. Speaker, but I will prove to you what I am saying.

Someone said a little earlier that this is not a religious problem. Well, if he goes over his religious principles, he will read in the gospel: Thou shall not kill. It is one of the ten commandments.

I wonder if the killing of a barely conceived child is not as much a murder as that of a 40 or 60 year old individual.

I do not understand that the law of man can prevail over the law of God. That is why I say to the hon. member who rose a little earlier—

[Mr. Willoughby.]

[*Text*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. The hon. member for Carleton on a question of privilege.

Mr. Francis: Mr. Speaker, the reflections made by the hon. member on the consciences of other members of the house are not in order. I for one support the bill, and I am not endorsing murder or anything like that. The implication that I am is an unwarranted reflection upon the consciences of members of the house.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): The Chair recognizes that the argument the hon. member for Roberval is now making is a very delicate one indeed. I am sure he would not wish to make any inferences that would in any way interfere with the thinking of other members of the house.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to attack anyone. I only wanted to put forward Christian principles. If the cap fits someone, it is not my business, and even less my fault.

Mr. Speaker, I maintain that we cannot in any way support this bill which reads as follows:

> Offers to sell, advertises, publishes an advertisement of, or has for sale or disposal any means, instructions, medicine, drug or article intended or represented as a method of causing abortion or miscarriage, or—

I say that this bill is unacceptable and I shall make every effort so that it is not carried for my province. If others want to accept it for their own province, they are free to do so, but I swear that in 15 years there will only be French Canadians left in Canada. That will be the result of this bill.

Today, we are afraid. It is said that in the year 2000, there will be too many people. Well, Mr. Speaker, let us not worry about that; man is stupid enough to destroy himself, you can be sure of that. God is stronger than all that. People should not worry about how many of them there will be in the year 2000. That is not the purpose of the bill. I think that it was determined by people other than members of parliament and that it comes from much higher.

Imagine the result if people could get such drugs at all the little corner stores. Imagine what would happen to our young people, in our homes. Think of what would happen to our people; in ten years from now, with this system, there would be no people left and the

Black and Chinese people would come and replace us in Canada.

Those are the consequences the passing of this bill would have, if its application were to be left to individuals who are not prepared to accept those drugs. That is a problem.

First, it is a medical problem, besides being a moral problem. I appreciate that if it takes the advice of higher medical authorities, the government will be able to legislate in such a way as to enable, not all the people but the competent authorities, to use certain drugs in cases of sickness, great weakness and so on, but it should be severely controlled, like all poisons, some drugs and injections which are now reserved exclusively to the medical board.

I suggest that it is not at all the business of the house to study this problem, but we should rather leave it to higher medical authorities from which the government might take advice, as it always does—

[*Text*]

Mr. Francis: Will the hon. member permit a question? He said that this is no business of the House of Commons. May I ask him why, since this concerns part of the Criminal Code which was enacted by this House of Commons?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, this happens to be prohibited by the Criminal Code, because our fathers were much wiser than some of us are today. They thought that natural law should not take precedence over divine law, and that is why we have today some very judicious clauses in the old Criminal Code.

I realize that the more we seem to become refined, the more stupidly we act. I believe that the old saying: "He who acts the angel, acts the beast" is still true. I also realize that we are heading in that direction today.

I stated that this was a medical problem which should be submitted to the relevant authorities. If our prominent medical authorities were consulted on this point, as are high religious authorities on the moral aspects of the case, I am sure that we would obtain legislation more in keeping with the medical point of view, and that it would not be legal to sell those drugs like a bottle of Pepsi, in the corner store.

Those are our reasons, Mr. Speaker. If, today, vaccines or shots of all kinds, which are only given with a medical prescription, were sold in all the small stores, in short, if all drugs and remedies subject to medical prescription were made available to the general public, I think that the house would commit a grave error. And that is exactly the error we are about to commit, if we pass this bill.

This is a field which should be restricted exclusively to the higher medical authorities. Furthermore, we should bear in mind the serious moral problem which the passing of this bill would create in every province, especially in the province of Quebec where the majority of the people are Roman Catholics.

[*Text*]

Mr. Willoughby: Will the hon. member permit a question? I understood him to say that this should be left to the medical authorities. I would appreciate the hon. member telling me how this could be left to the medical authorities, when if they give this advice they are breaking the criminal law?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier: If I read the bill correctly, I think the medical authorities accept it as an ordinary medical product just as any other patent medicine. That is precisely to what I am objecting. I do not want birth control pills to be sold as freely as Buckley's syrup or any other such medicine. I think most of the hon. members will agree with me that the bill, as it now stands, is simply dreadful. If the bill only provided for a study of the question by the medical board, I would support it. But the purpose is to make this available to the public, and to that I object. I suggest that the people are not ready for such publicity, particularly when we know the meaning of publicity nowadays. It is said that everything is a matter of publicity, that anything worthless can be sold with good publicity.

Mr. Lachance: Social Credit for instance.

Mr. Gauthier: It would be the best thing if Social Credit could make use of that publicity, but the old line parties and financiers prevent it from doing so because it is not a paying proposition.

Publicity has to be curbed, Mr. Speaker. The only means to curb publicity is to refer this question for consideration by higher authorities who are as competent as most of the members of the house, because, for my part, I am speaking as a father putting forward his principles as a Roman catholic. I know that the bill conflicts with ethics and public interests, though some members have involved the Roman Catholic religious authorities when speaking of public interests. Religious authorities favour public interests

but let no one try to distort the question for this reason. Roman Catholic authorities are opposed to the bill as drafted.

[*Text*]

Mrs. Konantz: May I ask a question? Does the hon. member realize that the Canadian medical association have given their endorsation to this bill? If so, does he realize that the drugs to which he is referring would be given under prescription only and that this bill would not change that?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier: I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, to hear that, but, if you read this bill, unless I do not know French anymore, or do not know how to read, it is not that at all. Advertising and publicity are to be allowed. Read the bill carefully and you will admit that it becomes a popular product. Now, it is for this very reason that we will always oppose such a bill as long as the sale of this product will not be subjected to medical prescription.

It is for this reason that we are against this bill. I believe there are others who wish to express their opposition as well, and I shall give them the opportunity to express their opinion to prove that I am not the only one opposing this bill.

[*Text*]

Mr. Lloyd Francis (Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I will not take up too much of the time of this house. I know that the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. O'Keefe) has spoken, and much as I respect his views I do not agree with them. I have had a great many communications on this bill, even more than I have had on the flag. I have received something like 800 individual communications with regard to this bill. I have had resolutions from four churches in my riding and communications from a substantial number in addition to those.

I should like to put on the record the official views expressed through the authorities representing the different religious bodies in Canada. The Anglican Church of Canada, on September 2 and 3 of this year, at a general meeting of the executive council of the general synod and its council for social services, passed the following resolution:

Whereas the Lambeth conference of 1958 has, within the concept of the exercise of responsible freedom, given general approval to the practice of family planning and has set forth some of the principles to be considered by Christians in such practice;

And whereas for all people in Canada the exercise of responsible freedom in the area of family planning with due respect for civil law, is made impossible by existing legislation which prohibits the sale or dispensing of instruction, medicine or drug, or articles for use in family planning;

And whereas for certain groups in Canada the exercise of responsible freedom in the area of family planning is not possible either for economic reasons, or because of lack of factual knowledge or understanding, thus making the achievement of a full and rich marriage and family life more difficult than it might otherwise be,

This council for social service meeting in joint session with the executive council of general synod,

Urges that every effort be made to amend present legislation in Canada in such a way as to make legal the dispensing of information and means under competent medical or other professional guidance, so as to enable spouses, irrespective of their economic circumstances, who wish to exercise their freedom in planning and spacing their families in accordance with their physical and economic means, to do so with adequate knowledge and instruction.

And affirms that the dissemination of information about family planning within the context of the principles enunciated by the Lambeth conference of 1958 is a responsible practice within the education and pastoral ministry of the Anglican church.

In June 1964 the Baptist convention of Ontario and Quebec passed a resolution, the text of which I do not have in front of me, but it acknowledged the fact that very many people are violating the law as it now stands, and recommended the deletion of the words from the Criminal Code "preventing contraception or".

The Presbyterian Church of Canada adopted the following resolution at the last meeting of the general assembly:

That the general asembly call upon the federal government to revise section 150, subsection 2c of the Criminal Code of Canada re conception control—

And it gives the wording.

—so that in matters relating to the prevention of conception, the clergy, medical profession, family counsellors of governmental and municipal agencies and druggists be exempted from the section of the law having reference to advertising, instructing or selling to married couples.

Then there is the United Church of Canada:

Report of the board of evangelism and social service, 1964 approved by general council of the United Church of Canada.

And this is a substantial re-endorsement of the 1962 general resolution of the general council:

Whereas section 150 of the Criminal Code of Canada deals with, "offences tending to corrupt morals", and subsection 2c of this section states that "everyone commits an offence who...offers to sell, advertises, publishes an advertisement of, or has for sale or disposal any means, instruction, medicines, drugs or article intended or represented as a method of preventing conception or causing abortion or miscarriage",

Whereas section 150 (2c) offends against the religious beliefs of the majority of Canadians since it makes a criminal offence of something which the churches believe to be a moral necessity in these days;

Whereas the act as it stands tends to inhibit social agencies from offering advice and assistance in family planning;

And whereas legalizing of the advertising, sale and instruction in the use of contraceptives would tend to reduce the number of unwanted pregnancies, and would tend to diminish the number of illegal abortions;

And whereas the majority of physicians are prepared to prescribe for their patients appropriate contraceptive measures, i.e. those which are religiously, medically and aesthetically satisfactory;

And whereas section 150 (2c) has never been rigidly enforced by legal authorities;

And whereas section 150 (2c) prevents Canada from taking an effective part in aiding those nations attacked by population explosion, which, if unchecked, must inevitably lead to lower living standards, world instability, and ultimately, to war.

Be it resolved that this board:

1. Recommend that subsection 2c of section 150 of the Criminal Code of Canada be amended by the deletion of the three words—"preventing contraception or".

2. Recommended that the church take responsibility at the local level for the encouragement of planned parenthood associations where medical leadership can be given.

3. Recommend a copy of this action be sent to the Minister of Justice, the Solicitor General of Canada and the members of parliament.

Mr. Speaker, I shall now quote from the *Globe and Mail of* January 7, 1964, an interview by Mrs. George Cadbury, secretary of the Toronto planned parenthood association:

Though the P.P.A. executive is top-heavy with Anglican and United Church ministers, rabbis, professors and doctors, the association is unable to get a charter from the provincial government, unable to advertise, and severely restricted in its operations.

This is the result of the cloud which has been raised by the present wording of the Criminal Code. An organization, a planned parenthood association, seeks to incorporate and cannot get a charter for the promoting of its activities in which its members believe, according to their own religious counsellors. There is no question of this being anything other than a free vote according to conscience, and members of this house can vote as their consciences dictate.

I listened to a member from the other side who spoke in exaggerated terms of what were religious opinions and what were crimes in moral law, but we have to recognize that there are differences—differences in consciences, differences in religious affiliations and points of view. The official organs representing the opinion of something like 50 per cent of the population, according to the latest census, have gone on record asking this parliament to delete these three words from the Criminal Code of Canada. A substantial majority of the population of my riding, Carleton, are represented by these particular religious bodies whose authorities I have quoted. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the members of this house will recognize that this is a matter of conscience and should not be a matter of the Criminal Code. I hope they will exercise that conscience freely, and allow this bill to go to a committee.

Mr. Choquette: May I ask the hon. member a question?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as it is clear that such a measure would pave the way for the most damaging abuse and the most awful immorality, is my colleague not of the opinion that, if the purpose of the amendment is really to be achieved, its wording should not be quite so general? It seems to me that its present form is not conducive to the attainment of the objective the sponsor of the bill has in mind. On the contrary, it would open the door to frightening abuses.

[*Text*]

Mr. Francis: Mr. Speaker, I am quite happy to recognize there may be amendments that should be considered in committee. If the hon. member believes it is possible to improve the bill, then I think that is the appropriate place to do it; but I do believe at this stage the bill should be permitted by the house to go to committee.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I observe that the hour of six o'clock is approaching in a moment or two and that the time available for discussion of this bill is about one minute. In view of that fact, and the further fact that the hour devoted to private members' public bills was encroached upon today to a considerable extent, so that the hon. member did not have a chance to introduce his bill until quite a few minutes after five o'clock, I would like to ask the house to agree that this bill retain its place on the order paper, especially in view of the great interest of hon. members and many members of the Canadian public in it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. Does the house agree that Bill No. C-48 shall retain its place on the order paper?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): There is not unanimous consent.

An hon. Member: Bigots.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Raymond Langlois (Mégantic): Mr. Speaker, maybe I have just time to say two or three words in the few remaining seconds. I am glad to be able to say that I am against the bill now before us. My stand is based on words which are to be found in the book on which we took our oath of office when we came to this house. Those words are: "Go forth, multiply, and fill the earth." I did not find there any words saying that, if at anytime there are too many of you, use the means made available to you by the government.

[*Text*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Order. The hour for the consideration of private members' business has expired.

At 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 NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE

Administration—

1. Departmental administration, $2,099,000.

Health services—

5. Administration, operation and maintenance, including grants as detailed in the estimates, $7,239,450.

10. To authorize general health grants to the provinces, the Northwest Territories and the Yukon Territory upon the terms and in the amounts detailed in the estimates and under terms and conditions approved by the governor in council including authority, notwithstanding section 30 of the Financial Administration Act, to make commitments for the current year not to exceed a total amount of $39,236,391, $31,000,000.

15. To authorize hospital construction grants to the provinces, the Northwest Territories and the Yukon Territory upon the terms and in the amounts detailed in the estimates and under terms and conditions approved by the governor in council including authority, notwithstanding section 30 of the Financial Administration Act, to make commitments for the current year not to exceed a total amount of $29,666,575, $20,000,000.

Medical services—

20. Administration, operation and maintenance including authority to make recoverable advances in amounts not exceeding in the aggregate the total of all amounts to be paid by the governments of provinces and territories under agreements to be entered on terms approved by the governor in council with such governments in respect of health assistance to persons residing on Indian reserves other than Indians and to residents of the territories other than Indians and Eskimos, $31,033,000.

25. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and equipment including payments to hospitals and other institutions which care for Indians and Eskimos as contributions towards the construction of hospitals and related facilities, $3,449,000.

Food and drug services—

30. Administration, operation and maintenance, $4,093,000.

35. Construction or acquisition of equipment, $241,000.

Welfare services—

40. Administration, operation and maintenance, including grants as detailed in the estimates, $4,060,300.

45. National welfare grants—To authorize, on terms and conditions approved by the governor in council, national welfare grants to provinces and welfare agencies including schools of social work, and to individuals in the form of scholarships and fellowships, $1,000,000.

DEPARTMENT OF MINES AND TECHNICAL SURVEYS

A—Department—

Administration services—

1. Departmental administration including the administration of the Explosives Act and Canada's fee for membership in the Pan-American institute of geography and history, $2,191,000.

Administration services—

1a. Departmental administration, $157,000.

5. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and equipment including common-use field survey equipment, $458,000.

Field and air surveys, mapping and aeronautical charting—

10. Administration, operation and maintenance including purchases of air photography and the expenses of the interdepartmental committee on air surveys, authority to make recoverable advances not exceeding the amount of the share of the United States government of the cost of binding annual reports and maintaining boundary range lights and a grant of $1,000 to the Canadian institute of surveying, $6,785,000.

Marine surveys and research—

15. Administration, operation and maintenance including Canada's fee for membership in the international hydrographic bureau, $7,131,000.

20. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and equipment, $3,360,000.

Geological research—

25. Administration, operation and maintenance including Canada's share of the cost of the geological liaison office, British commonwealth scientific conference, London, England and $100,000 for grants in aid of geological research in Canadian universities, $6,650,000.

30. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and equipment, $394,000.

Mining and metallurgical investigations and research—

35. Administration, operation and maintenance including Canada's share of the cost of the commonwealth committee on mineral processing and $50,000 for grants in aid of mining and mineral processing research in Canadian universities, $4,985,000.

40. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and equipment, $383,000.

Geographical surveys and research—

45 Administration, operation and maintenance including the expenses of the Canadian permanent committee on geographical names and the national committee for Canada of the international geographical union, Canada's fee for membership in the international geographical union and a grant of $500 to the Canadian association of geographers, $653,000.

Research in astronomy and geophysics—

50. Administration, operation and maintenance including the expenses of the national committee for Canada of the international astronomical union, Canada's fee for membership in the international astronomical union and a grant of $3,500 to the royal astronomical society of Canada, $2,102,000.

55. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and equipment, $944,000.

General—

60. Polar continental shelf project, $1,596,000.

END OF VOLUME VII